

2011-12 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MAY 3, 2012

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 5 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 5 STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 5

The fifth meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2011-12 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, May 3, 2012, at 2:31 p.m., as a joint meeting of the two bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 24 academic professional members, 22 civil service members, 121 faculty/academic professional members, and 16 student members. President Kaler 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

Interpretation of the Administrative Policy on Credit and Grade Point Requirements for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree
Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 5, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendments to the Administrative Policy on High School Preparation Requirements for Undergraduates and Admissions for Undergraduates
Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 5, 2012

Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendments to the Administrative Policy on Declaring an Undergraduate Major
Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 5, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Administrative Policy on Master’s Degree: Performance Standards and Progress
Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 5, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Administrative Policy on Master’s Degree: Completion
Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 5, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Administrative Policy on Doctoral Degree: Performance Standards and Progress
Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 5, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Administrative Policy on Doctoral Degree: Completion
Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 5, 2012
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Establishing an Open-Access Publishing Fund at the University of Minnesota Information for the University Senate

Scholarly publishing has long served to facilitate communication and collaboration among researchers and to disseminate ideas and knowledge. Providing open access to published research greatly increases the speed and efficiency of communication among researchers, and disseminates ideas far more widely than ever before – but embracing the advantages of new technologies also requires developing new approaches to key issues such as management of intellectual property rights and sustainable models.

Open Access Options

Researchers who wish to make their works openly accessible have an array of options. Some closely resemble long-established journal publishing processes; others are more innovative. Common open access options include:

- Authors retaining the right to distribute copies of their works online, via personal websites, institutional repositories, and/or subject-related repositories.
- Authors choosing to publish only in fully open access publications, in which all contents are freely publicly available.
- Authors publishing in a “closed-access” journal that allows individual articles to be made openly available (so-called “hybrid” open access).
-

Fully open access publications and hybrid publications are often supported through institutional funds via grants, hosting or service provision, membership fees, or subscriptions. But authors also often have to pay significant fees to make their works openly accessible in these venues.

Individual authors' access to funds that can be leveraged for open access fees varies widely, imposing unequal burdens on authors.

Open Access Funds at Other Institutions

Many leading institutions have addressed these challenges by creating funds to help authors meet the new costs of open access publishing. The sixteen signatories of the Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity (COPE), for example, have established “durable mechanisms for underwriting reasonable publication charges for articles written by [their] faculty.” Other institutions have developed their own policies and procedures.

Most institutional open access funds include principles and criteria related to:

- **Eligible Submissions**– which types of publications are eligible (hybrid/full OA; articles/monographs/data/proceedings)
- **Author eligibility** – which individuals are eligible to apply for funds
- **Effects of external fund availability (grants, etc.)**
- **Appropriate and sustainable administration of the open access fund**

Proposal

The Senate Library Committee proposes that University of Minnesota establish an institutional fund to underwrite University of Minnesota authors' costs in making their published works openly accessible. The fund would be supported by both the Office of the Vice President for Research and the University Libraries, and would be overseen by a review panel comprised of sponsors and faculty, with a role of reviewing eligibility (not content). The fund would cover all scholars on all campuses.

We recommend the following standards and principles.

- **Eligible submissions**
 - Funds are available for peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly monographs, conference proceedings, and data sets.
 - Funds may be used only to cover open access publication and submission fees.
 - Author fees for open access journals (as determined by listing in the Directory of Open Access Journals,¹ membership in the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, or adherence to Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association Code of Conduct)² will be covered in full. Author fees for “hybrid” journals will be covered up to 50%.
 - Funds may not be used for publications that do not make works fully openly available immediately upon publication.
- **Author eligibility**
 - All scholars (faculty, researchers, post-docs, graduate students, and staff) at the University of Minnesota may apply for funds for their publications that otherwise qualify.
 - Authors receiving funds must deposit a copy of the publication in an approved open access repository, such as the University Digital Conservancy (the University of Minnesota's institutional repository.)
 - In the case of joint authorship, support for author fees will be pro-rated based on the proportional contribution of the University of Minnesota.
- **Effects of external fund availability (grants, etc.)**
 - Authors with no external funding associated with the publication will be given priority, but authors who have external funding that cannot be used to underwrite open access fees will also be eligible. Fees occurring after the closure of a grant are eligible.

¹ Directory of Open Access Journals <http://www.doaj.org/>

² Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association and Code of Conduct: <http://www.oaspa.org/>

- Authors who *could have* applied for grant coverage of open access fees but failed to do so will not usually be eligible for institutional open access support, unless their grant application was made before the institutional open access fund existed.

We recommend that the fund be piloted with no less than \$20,000 per year of available support to authors, and that funds be distributed on a rolling basis. The program's support levels and effectiveness should be evaluated as funds are exhausted or at the end of two years, whichever occurs sooner. OVPR and the University Libraries will partner to raise awareness of this new support for the wide dissemination of the research of University of Minnesota scholars.

Appendix: Further information

Article Processing Fees (from SPARC)

<http://www.arl.org/sparc/publisher/incomemodels/guide2-1.shtml>

This explains the different variations of article processing fees, the rationales for the fees and the transition for some publishers to the hybrid model.

Campus-based Open Access Publishing Funds (from SPARC)

<http://www.arl.org/sparc/openaccess/funds/>

This page includes the pdf of the guide "Campus-based Open Access Publishing Funds: A practical guide to design and implementation" by Greg Tananbaum (Feb 2010), as well as templates for FAQ and fund applications.

Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity (COPE) Overview:

<http://www.oacompat.org/>

List of signatories: <http://www.oacompat.org/signatories/>

OA Journal Funds (in the Open Access Directory)

http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_journal_funds

More comprehensive than the SPARC list, includes European and Canadian institutions and links to the web-sites for the funds.

**NEIL OLSZEWSKI, CHAIR
LIBRARY COMMITTEE**

3. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS Amendments to Athletic Policies Information for the Twin Cities Delegation

For Information:

According to the charge for the Advisory Committee on Athletics, "All policies formulated by the Advisory Committee on Athletics will be reported to the Twin Cities members of the Senate Consultative Committee for action and to the Twin Cities Delegation for information after the Twin Cities members of the Senate Consultative Committee have acted. The Twin Cities Delegation has the authority to reverse or modify a decision by the Twin Cities members of the Senate Consultative Committee."

The packet of policies is available on the web at:

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usenate/docs/120503aca_policies.pdf

Paper copies will not be provided at the meeting.

**VIRGINIA ZUIKER, CHAIR
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS**

4. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Patricia Anderson
Staff
Facilities Management
1943 – 2012

John Arnold
Professor
Veterinary Medicine
1911 – 2012

Arthur Ballet
Staff
Theatre Arts and Dance
1924 – 2012

Lois Beck
Assistant Professor
St. Paul Library
1921 – 2012

Jane Bennett
Staff
University of Minnesota Duluth
1914 – 2012

Istvan Bodnar
Lecturer
Degree Programs
1937 – 2012

Lloyd Brandt
Building and Grounds Worker
Residential Life
1920 – 2012

Betty Brecto
Professor
Business Services – University of Minnesota Crookston
1926 – 2011

Sinattha Chan
Staff
Nutrition
1939 – 2011

William Cochrane

Staff
Applied Economics
1914 – 2012

Kim Coffee
Staff
Extension Services
1979 – 2012

David Cooper
Staff
Extension Services
1954 – 2011

William Cromwell
Professor
North Central Experiment Station
1923 – 2012

Carol Daly
Academic Professional
Continuing Education
1941 – 2012

Gary DeCramer
Staff
Public Affairs
1944 – 2012

Richard Difabio
Professor
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
1952 – 2011

LeRoy Dilley
Staff
Rosemount Research Center
1926 – 2012

Mavis Dion
Staff
UMHC Hospital
1944 – 2012

Jeanne Dougherty
Staff
Physical Plant
1924 – 2012

Sayed El-Kandelgy
Staff
Animal Science
1935 – 2012

Harold Fahl
Staff
Facilities – University of Minnesota Morris
1928 – 2011

Sally Flax
Staff
International Studies
1925 – 2011

Carol M. Frentz
Staff
Campus Mail
1943 – 2011

John Getrick
Pipe Fitter
Physical Plant
1928 – 2011

Marilyn Gorlin
Staff
Education
1925 – 2011

Velvl Greene
Professor
Public Health 1928 – 2011

Terry Halverson
Staff
University of Minnesota Duluth
1947 – 2012

Delbert M. Hanson
Staff
Scientific Apparatus Services
1928 – 2012

Robert Hendricks
Assistant Professor
Institutional Reporting
1938 – 2012

Harold Herlofsky
Staff
Media Resources
1929 – 2012

Mavis Huddle
Staff
Extension Services
1934 – 2011

Donald Hunninghake
Professor
Pharmacology
1934 – 2012

Margaret J. Jahr
Staff
Food Services – University of Minnesota Duluth
1921 – 2011

Harold Johnson
Staff
Printing
1926 – 2011

Roger Johnson
Staff
Accounting
1930 – 2012

Bertram Kern
Staff
Facilities Management
1941 – 2012

Virginia Kivits
Staff
General College
1912 – 2012

Linda Kleinsasser
Staff
Research
1946 – 2011

Frank Kotula
Staff
Scientific Apparatus Services
1926 – 2012

Sander Latts
Professor
General College
1935 – 2012

Patricia Lenhardt
Staff
Center for Reading Research
1955 – 2010

James Malosky
Staff
University of Minnesota Duluth
1928 – 2011

Francis Mayer
Staff
Facilities Management
1949 – 2011

Jane M. McBurney
Staff
Interior Design and Planning
1931-2011

Michael Metz
Lecturer
Family Social Science
1944 – 2012

Thomas Moran
Staff
Facilities Management
1964 – 2012

William Morton
Staff
Hormel Institute
1934 – 2011

Kathleen Mullen
Staff
Medicine
1947 – 2011

Trayce Nagel
Staff
Academic Health Center
1962 – 2012

Robert Nygren
Staff
UMHC Hospital
1954 – 2011

Margaret O'Connors
Staff
Coffman Food Service
1923 – 2012

George Ogbonna
Staff
St. Anthony Falls Laboratory
1956 – 2011

Mary Ann Olson
Staff
National Health Professions Placement Network

1933 – 2012

Harvey Patzwald
Staff
Minnesota Union Administration
1922 – 2011

Gertrude Peplinski
Staff
University of Minnesota Duluth
1924 – 2012

Victor Perman
Professor
Veterinary Medicine
1926 – 2011

Berton Pfeifer
Staff
Lake Itasca Forest and Biology Station
1915 – 2012

Armand Renaud
Professor
French and Italian
1918 – 2012

Donald Reynolds
Staff
Coffman Maintenance
1936 – 2011

June Rogier
Assistant Professor
University Library
1921 – 2011

Maria Rose
Nurse
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
1923 – 2012

Genevieve Schuster
Staff
Pediatrics
1923 – 2011

Doroteo Sicoc, Jr.
Staff
Environmental Services
1928 – 2011

Virginia Tombers
Staff

Hospital Word Processing
1921 – 2012

Linda Ulland
Staff
Extension Services
1946 – 2011

Frank Unger
Professor
Medical School
1922 – 2012

Dewayne Vick
Staff
Physical Plant Operations
1927 – 2009

Lawrence Weaver
Dean
Pharmacy
1924 – 2011

Theresa White
Staff
Bookstore
1931 – 2012

Alice Wilcox
Associate Professor
Humanities and Social Science Library
1925 – 2012

Virginia Williams
Staff
Provost
1939 – 2011

Veronica Wood-Bartlett
Associate Professor
Humanities – University of Minnesota Morris
1914 – 2012

Lynda Young
Staff
Dental Hygiene
1950 – 2012

Mary Zumberge
Staff
Engineering
1922 – 2012

STUDENTS

Sara A. Genrich
College of Liberal Arts

Gary Tinsley
College of Education and Human Development

5. INTRODUCTION

Scott Studham, Vice President and Chief Information Officer

This introduction was tabled to the next meeting.

6. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that at the last meeting, SCC met with Vice President for Human Resources Kathy Brown to discuss the job family study taking place for civil service and academic professional employees; spoke with Virginia Zuiker, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Athletics; and approved a few policy changes and a resolution related to the marriage amendment to the Minnesota Constitution which all appear later on today's agenda.

7. MINUTES FOR APRIL 5, 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/minutes/120405.pdf>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

8. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**Procedure on Hiring Senior Administrators: Senate Committee Involvement
Action by the University Senate**

Hiring Senior Administrators: Senate Committee Involvement (Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester)

Related Policy: Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and Academic Professional and Administrative Employees

When hiring senior administrators, the appointing authority will involve Senate committees in forming search committees and in interviewing finalists, as more fully described below. The appointing authority will contact the chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), who will coordinate the involvement of other committees as appropriate.

Administrative Positions Covered and Associated Senate Committees

A. The following list specifies the positions to which this process applies and the Senate committees that are to be involved in the search process.

President**	Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC)
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost	FCC, SSCC , Educational Policy
Senior Vice President for the Academic Health Center	FCC, SSCC
Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration, <u>University of Minnesota System</u>	FCC, SSCC
Vice President for Research	FCC , Research
Vice President and Chief Financial Officer	FCC, SSCC , Finance and Planning
Director <u>Special Assistant to the President for, Government Relations</u>	FCC, SSCC
Vice President and Chief of Staff, President's Office	FCC, SSCC
Vice President and Chief Information Officer	FCC, SSCC , Information Technologies, Library
Vice President for Human Resources	FCC , Faculty Affairs
Vice President for Equity and Diversity	FCC, SSCC , Equity, Access, and Diversity
Vice President for University Services	FCC, SSCC , Finance and Planning
Chancellor (not Crookston or Duluth)	FCC, SSCC

Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education	FCC, GAPSA , Educational Policy, Research
Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education	FCC, SSCC , Educational Policy
Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs	FCC , Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure
<u>Vice Provost for Distributed Education and Instructional Technology</u>	
Vice Provost for Student Affairs	Student Affairs
Assistant/Associate Vice President, Sponsored Projects Administration	Research
Associate Vice President Audits	Finance and Planning
General Counsel	FCC, SSCC , Judicial
University Librarian	Library
Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action	FCC, SSCC , Equity, Access, and Diversity
President and CEO, University of Minnesota Foundation	FCC , Finance and Planning
Director, Intercollegiate Athletics (Twin Cities campus)	FCC, SSCC , Advisory Committee on Athletics, Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics

~~B. For any other senior administrator positions for which a search committee will be established, the appointing authority should inform the chairs of FCC and SSCC of the pending search and provide opportunity for the committees to participate as described if they choose to do so.~~

Senate Committee Participation in the Appointment of Search Committees

~~Members and chairs~~ Non-administration members of search committees for the specified positions will be chosen by the appointing authority after consultation with ~~appropriate Senate committees as described in this section~~ the chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC).

A. The appointing authority will ask the chairs of ~~the specified committees~~ SCC to submit, by a specified date, nominations of faculty, P&A, civil service staff members, or students, as appropriate, to serve on the search committee. The appointing authority will identify

~~the number of individuals in each category expected to serve on the search committee. Nominees need not be members of the specified committee.~~ The number of individuals nominated should be greater than the number of ~~faculty members or students~~ expected to serve on the search committee (perhaps twice as many), in order to provide the appointing authority flexibility in the choices. The appointing authority will select the ~~student and faculty~~ members of the search committee from among those nominated or will ~~explain any deviation to the Senate committee~~ consult with the SCC chair about alternative choices. ~~The relevant Senate committee(s) may nominate additional individuals (who are not faculty or students) for the appointing authority to consider for search committee membership.~~

- B. ~~The Senate committee(s)~~ SCC chair will ordinarily be given at least two weeks notice of the need for nominees to the search committee.
- C. If the ~~Senate committees are~~ SCC chair is unable to provide nominations by the date specified, the appointment authority may appoint the search committee without Senate committee consultation.

Senate Committee Participation in Interviews of Finalists

~~Members~~ Representatives of the ~~specified Senate committees~~ Faculty, Student, P&A, and Civil Service Consultative Committees and the members of the designated additional committees will be given an opportunity to attend an interview with each finalist. Interviews ~~with committees~~ will be scheduled irrespective of the scope of the search (full, limited, or non-competitive appointment); in the case of non-competitive appointments, ~~the committee there~~ will be given ~~the~~ an opportunity to interview the finalist before the position is offered to the finalist.

Interviews may be arranged for ~~committee members~~ governance participants alone or in conjunction with others, but will be separate from any public presentation by the finalist. ~~When more than one committee is appropriately involved in finalist interviews, a joint session may be scheduled.~~

The ~~Senate committee~~ SCC chair will be supplied, in advance of the interview, copies of the position description and the curriculum vita of each finalist, for distribution to governance participants.

~~The Senate committee~~ Governance participants will provide its comments as quickly as possible to the appointing authority. ~~The committee's~~ Their views ~~will~~ may be submitted as a single document, ~~prepared by the chair or his or her designee, and may include minority views.~~ Committee members may also submit individual comments summary of opinions or as a collection of individual comments.

It is understood that ~~committee~~ governance interviews, especially during the summer or when scheduled on short notice, may involve ~~less than a majority of committee members~~ small numbers of participants and there may not be consistent representation for all the finalists for the position. The hiring process should not be slowed or hindered by ~~the possible unavailability of committee members~~ this circumstance.

If the ~~FCC or SSCC~~ SCC chair determines that other Senate ~~C~~ committees should participate be represented in interviews with finalists, ~~FCC or SSCC~~ he or she may delegate responsibility for ~~participating in interviews to other committees of the Senate~~ identifying individuals to such other committees. ~~FCC~~ If the Faculty Consultative Committee is identified, it may invite other faculty members, including past members of FCC, to participate in the interview process. ~~SSCC may designate student representatives other than SSCC members to participate in the interview process.~~ FCC and SSCC may also designate additional committees to participate in any

interviews The same is true for the P&A, Civil Service, and Student Senate Consultative Committees and their respective constituencies.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

*The protocol was adopted by the Senate on February 18, 1993, as part of a consent package, without debate, and approved by the administration on April 26, 1993.
Revised Fall, 1998, to reflect changes in the University's administrative organization and titles of senior officers.*

*In the parlance of the categorization of administrative appointees at the time this protocol is written, it covers class numbers 9301-9305, 9314, 9316, 9321-9328, and a few of the individuals in class 9330.

**The selection of the University President is the legal responsibility of the Board of Regents and the search committee for this office is the members of the Board. The Board of Regents has customarily consulted the Senate Consultative Committee regarding the search and included faculty, staff, and student representation on a search advisory committee.

COMMENT:

The Senate Consultative Committee found that it was too complicated to ask central officers to consider which of a multitude of committees they should involve in searches. This revision provides that the chair of SCC will receive all requests for participation in searches and will consult with the different senate constituent groups with each search. This change is intended to simplify and streamline the process of consultation on and participation in searches.

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**9. EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Resolution Supporting the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Service Pledge Drive
Action**

MOTION:

The University Senate supports the Equity Access and Diversity Committee's (EAD) proposal to establish a Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Community Service Pledge Drive to honor the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

COMMENT:

Earlier this academic year, the EAD proposed establishing the MLK Holiday as a "day on" rather than a "day off" whereby the University would encourage more members of the University community to engage in various community service activities. This proposal was submitted to the University's Public Engagement Council (PEC) for its review. While the PEC strongly supported the idea of encouraging more members of the University community to engage in

community service, it identified a number of personnel, human resources, and financial issues that would make it difficult to operationalize a day of service during an official University holiday. In response, it was determined that the legacy of Dr. King would be honored with a *community service pledge drive* that would not limit community service to the holiday but rather would extend it throughout the spring semester.

The MLK holiday would serve as a launching date for a University-wide community service drive where members of the University community (faculty, staff, and students) would be invited and encouraged to pledge hours for service at community-based agencies. The pledge drive would be conducted in partnership with the United Negro College Fund/General Mills MLK Day Collaboration, and is endorsed by the University of Minnesota Public Engagement Council.

**IRENE DURANCZYK, CHAIR
EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Irene Duranczyk, Chair of the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee (EAD), stated that this resolution is the product of four years of study and conversations with the Office of Equity and Diversity. This service pledge will demonstrate the University's commitment to equity and diversity throughout the year.

Q: Will the service pledge be available on each campus?

A: Yes as all volunteer service will be done through outside agencies.

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

APPROVED

**10. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Resolution on the Proposed Minnesota Constitutional Amendment on Marriage
Action**

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."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.”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”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.”³

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

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

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

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that he expected that everyone in the room was aware that Minnesota voters will be presented this fall with an opportunity to vote on whether to amend the State’s constitution to enshrine within it the principle that marriage shall not be defined to extend to same-sex couples.

Approval of such an amendment would certainly garner national attention. To the extent that the University recruits students, faculty, and staff from a nationwide pool, and to the extent that otherwise well qualified people from the GLBT community would doubtless find approval of the amendment to signal a less than welcoming environment in our state, this is a matter of legitimate concern to the University as an institution. He is making this point because some will question whether the University Senate should advocate a position on what might otherwise be called a social—and obviously, also a political—issue.

However, while he views the institutional human resources argument as perfectly legitimate, he would advance the proposition that it is not necessary, in this instance. When the University engages in academic activities, defined broadly, it is protected by an extremely robust Regents Policy on Academic Freedom—a policy which also speaks to academic responsibility, and, importantly, which encompasses “speaking or writing on matters of public concern.” If the University Senate, as a governance body, failed to speak on this matter, it would be failing to live up to the institution’s academic responsibility.

Professor Cramer then noted that he would now be speaking for himself, as opposed to necessarily on behalf of SCC. In 1958, Hannah Arendt, a philosopher who had fled Nazi Germany for the United States 17 years earlier, wrote in an essay entitled Reflections on Little Rock that “the free choice of a spouse is an elementary human right.” That assertion derived from her assessment of the similarity of anti-miscegenation statutes in the United States with those of the regime she had fled. She had the courage to note the patent immorality of such laws in spite of their ubiquity, and he, for one, is hard pressed to find any fault in her argument. Nor does he see much difference in preventing people of different races from marrying compared to preventing people of the same sex from marrying. Both restrictions are abhorrent, and especially so when clothed in law.

On the arch above Northrup auditorium, one can read that “we, as a University, are Dedicated to the Advancement of Learning and the Search for Truth.” When the State contemplates setting into its foundational document a policy denying some of our colleagues, our brothers or sisters, perhaps some of our sons, or daughters, so fundamental a civil right as the right each to choose his or her own spouse, how can the University Senate not speak out? To do otherwise would be, far from seeking truth, acquiescing to having truth enshrouded in the dark confines of bigotry, intolerance, and hatred.

He then saluted the Student Senate for having already taken a position on this issue, and he is relieved that poll after poll shows the next generation to be by far the most tolerant and open-minded on this subject of any in American history, even if they may not yet constitute a majority of voters.

Steven Pearthree, Chair of the P&A Senate, then noted that on April 6, 2012, the P&A Senate discussed a resolution concerning the proposed constitutional amendment. An online vote was conducted and the resolution from today’s agenda was approved with 30 votes in favor, four opposed, and five abstentions.

Amy Olson, Chair-elect of the Civil Service Consultative Committee (CSCC), stated that the CSCC believes in the equal rights of all individuals and strongly supports the intent of the Senate resolution. The CSCC also believes that the proposed amendment to the state’s constitution is unjust. However, it is concerned about the resulting perception left by the language of the Senate resolution. Senators have sat through numerous discussions in the past few years regarding the unrestricted freedoms individuals have at the University. These include the freedom of speech, the freedom to hold respectful discussions, and the freedom to publish. It is interesting that the citizens of the state, who hold these same rights, are now at the mercy of the University’s ideology. She asked senators to consider the privacy and freedom of speech issues that may impede a citizen’s right to vote due to the Senate’s perception of what citizens may or may not agree with or vote for during the election. In a survey done by Civil Service Senate members, responses indicated that this is a political issue that should not be of concern to the Senate.

Joshua Preston, Chair of the Student Senate, drew attention to the recent marketing campaign for the University, which is the idea of the University of Minnesota Proud. He has never been more University of Minnesota proud than in this moment as the Senate is now taking a stance on this issue. It is not a political issues but instead a human rights issue. While he believes in freedom of speech, he is proud that the University is standing up against this abhorrent, wrong-headed, and downright bigoted attempt to institutionalize discrimination.

A senator then commented that this resolution does not extend rights to one group of people by disadvantaging another. Instead it treats one group of people as the same quality as person. The University has a clear responsibility to stand up and say that its students, staff, and faculty are all people and should be as equal. It is everyone’s right to disagree and speak on this point, however, the University and the state should not allow the institutionalization of discrimination.

Every student, staff, and faculty member needs to feel welcomed and the University has a responsibility to lend its voice to this debate.

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

APPROVED

**11. CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE
Statement on Funding for Classroom Facilities and Technologies
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following statement.

Statement on Funding for Classroom Facilities and Technologies

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) supports the Office of Classroom Management and its planning for lifecycle maintenance and renewal. CAS recommends no further cuts to the classroom lifecycle funds to maintain the basic-level of maintenance and renewal of classroom infrastructure. CAS furthermore recommends restoring funding to the FY08 levels by the 2016-17 biennium, in order to provide a quality standard for classroom facilities, technology and support that is appropriate for a major, nationally ranked university.

COMMENT:

Students and instructors deserve classroom space that contains technology that is working and furnishings that are not broken and are in reasonably good and safe condition.

Classroom facilities and technologies require periodic maintenance and replacement, and identification of and planning for lifecycle costs is a fiscally prudent approach to management of classroom facilities and technology infrastructure. Deferred maintenance is expensive in the long run.

We note with great concern that classroom upgrade work continues to be funded primarily with one-time funds (e.g., capital projects like STSS). The recurring lifecycle costs for these classrooms have not been funded. We are, however, accruing these costs. Given the importance of general-purpose classrooms, we cannot continue to defer these costs without jeopardizing our teaching and learning mission.

Central classroom operational recurring funding levels had risen to 79% of requirements (FY08) then fell to 37% of lifecycle need with recurring cuts in FY09, 10, and 12. Concurrently, the amount of managed learning space grew with new buildings and the addition of student study space. Because of low funding levels and increased demand for resources, faculty and students will be required to use facilities and technologies that have outlived their planned lifespan. This will degrade the learning experience.

In addition to classroom responsibilities, OCM has been assigned the management and maintenance of over 29,000 square feet of student study space. These study spaces represent an additional \$2.4 million in OCM-managed assets. In January 2011, OCM received one-time funding for the update of multiple study spaces on the St. Paul campus but has not received funding for recurring maintenance and renewal requirements.

The following charts illustrate a problematic trend: OCM's funding is decreasing while assigned space and tech equipped rooms is increasing.

Recurring Funding	% Change	Square Footage w/Study Space	% Change
FY08 4,325,530		FY08 340,000	
FY09 4,221,824	-2.4%	FY09 355,800	4.6%
FY10 3,063,551	-27.4%	FY10 363,430	2.1%
FY11 3,048,664	-0.5%	FY11 374,714	3.1%
FY12 2,648,013	-13.1%	FY12 389,328	3.9%

The University of Minnesota invested in its learning spaces, but without recurring maintenance and renewal, at some point the technology, fixtures and furnishings will be inaccessible due to failure.

Given the budget reductions and future uncertainty, OCM has placed the following projects on hold:

Project	Cost	Notes
20 Tech. Lifecycle Renewals	\$350k	Deferred technology updates to 20 Projection Capable Classrooms
Vincent Hall 16, EB	\$250k	Remove fixed seating; ADA, Fire/Safety, carpet & finish upgrade
Borlaug 335 & 365, St. Paul	\$475k	Replace 230 seats (no longer made); carpet & finish upgrades
Ruttan Hall B25/35/45, St. Paul	\$700k	Replace 445 seats (no longer made); carpet & finish upgrades
Keller 3111/3115/3125/3230, EB	\$925k	Replace 315 seats (no longer made); carpet & finish upgrades
TOTAL	\$2.7M	

At the end of March the Budget Office notified OCM that it would receive a nonrecurring post-budget O&M transfer of \$500,000 in FY13 to be used for the highest priority maintenance and renewal needs of classrooms and study spaces. OCM will also receive a \$2 million internal loan in FY13 for the upgrades in Keller, Borlaug and Vincent and for improvement of study space in Willey and Wilson Library. While this is welcome news in the short term for dealing with current maintenance and lifecycle replacement priorities, this loan will generate an annual payment obligation of \$277,000 beginning in FY14, thus further reducing available operating funds in FY14 and beyond.

Endorsed by the Educational Policy Committee, the Finance and Planning Committee, and the Senate Consultative Committee.

**SUE WICK, CHAIR
CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

12. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Kaler began by thanking the senators. As this is the final meeting of the year, he will have celebrated his first anniversary. It has been an enormous thrill, and a year filled with challenges and opportunities; the support and guidance of this body has been important to him.

When he started, he set out with five broad goals: to listen and learn, to continue to improve efforts to achieve excellence and to address critical issues of access and affordability, to intensify the University's advocacy and communications from Government Relations, to raise significant private philanthropy, and to improve operational efficiency by trimming administrative costs.

In the past 10 months, he has been to 14 faculty lunches with approximately 100 faculty colleagues, visited 21 departments or centers to talk with students, staff, and faculty, 50 faculty related events, conducted 21 staff sessions and 60 student events, watched the Gopher Women's team win the NCAA Hockey title, testified 7 times before legislative committees, met the king and queen of Norway, and milked a cow at the State Fair.

As for the story of excellence, there are many stories to tell as the University continues to teach and do research at the highest levels. External research funding keeps the University as the eighth-ranked public research institution in the nation, and the rate of growth of research in the past five years has been the fourth best in the nation.

The University is still refining the enrollment data for fall 2012 but he is told that the ACT scores of incoming Twin Cities students will be even better than those of last fall. While there was a slight decrease in applications system-wide, this was also true of peer institutions and is the beginning of the change in demographics in the upper Midwest.

As for advocacy, he individually met with 83 legislators. He reached out to thousands of alumni and business leaders state-wide to support the legislative agenda. He has also met with donors and potential partners across the nation.

On the operational excellence front, he has met with the senior leaders weekly since September in the first phase of a system-wide risk recalibration initiative. There are now 230 items identified for immediate approval. While some will not save large amounts of money, they will make work life more efficient and pleasant for all. They will also release funding for academic priorities and classroom maintenance. He is in the middle of reviewing the centers and institutes, which allowed feedback from many areas of the University.

This month he will be meeting with the Regents to review the budget proposal for next year. The main issues are recommendations that keep the University affordable or maintain affordability, rebuild the University's faculty, invest in research infrastructure, technology, student aid, and scholarships, and maintain a prudent budget structure that uses state resources responsibly.

The budget holds an undergraduate resident tuition increase of 3.5 percent, most if not all will be offset for students eligible for Promise Scholarship awards. 13,000 students system-wide receive four-year scholarships for families with up to \$100,000 annual income. This is also the lowest percentage tuition increase in this century.

The budget also reinvests in faculty and staff. After three years of furloughs, wage freezes, and increased health cost burdens, it is time to begin to reward faculty and staff for their hard work, dedication, and sacrifice. The budget recommends a 2.5 percent compensation pool increase for employees and \$500 will be an across-the-board increase. For the lowest-paid employees, this begins to compensate for the health insurance benefit shift that was made last year.

The budget also includes \$34 million in new academic program investments, including \$4 million in research infrastructure and distance-learning technology. Faculty are also being added in areas of strategic importance with over \$7 million allocated for additional faculty positions across 13 colleges and campuses. Some funds were also retained for initiatives around operational excellence.

Meetings have begun at the leadership level to work on the three-period plan for the academic calendar. Finances and calendar issues are being assessed at this time. He has sought information through a system-wide email and many thoughtful responses were received.

Next week the Board will also act on a letter of intent that will meaningfully improve the University's relationship with Fairview and will provide University physicians more operational and governance authority and move forward a vision for a new and a much-needed ambulatory care center.

In conclusion, he thanked senators for their help, guidance, comments, support, and work in the Senate which takes away from time spent in teaching and scholarship, but is critically important to this University as it moves forward aggressively into a bright future.

13. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: At the last University Senate meeting, there was a discussion regarding the use of technology and sharing information. Since that meeting, implementation of SciVal has taken place and many of his colleagues have opted out. When information was requested from the University regarding this purchase, no responses were received. 8000 academics have signed that they do not want to publish, referee, or serve in editorial capacities for Elsevier, which is the company sponsoring SciVal. Why did the University decide to spend \$750,000, how was the decision made, and did the faculty have an opportunity to raise meaningful objections before the decision was made?

A: As he does not know the answers, he will refer these questions to Vice President Mulcahy for a response.

Q: Through your commitment to recognizing the hard work of faculty and staff, a 2.5 percent salary increase is planned. As she has heard rumors, she would like clarification. Is this increase optional or will colleges be able to opt-out if they cannot afford the increase?

A: Opting-out would be an enormous mistake for colleges. They would need to make a compelling argument, of which he has not heard.

Q: What is the administration's vision for relations with the City of Minneapolis regarding the University's capital improvements and their public works programs in light of Vice President O'Brien's eminent retirement? She had a wonderful sense of how to advance the University's agenda and work with local government to make good things happen and minimize the bad things. People who work and study on the West Bank are finding it very difficult to get on and off campus. This was already a challenge due to light rail construction, so he was stunned when the city decided to close major intersections on Riverside Avenue a month before the end of the semester. Can the University find ways to do better and avoid senseless disruptions of work?

A: The University should try. Given her history with the City and the University, Vice President O'Brien has generally been effective. However, the University does not seem to be able to communicate about things that affect what the University does. For the recent West Bank work,

the University was only provided with 3-4 days of notice of the closing of on and off ramps from Interstate 94, which is inconvenient if someone is in an ambulance trying to reach a hospital. Communication with the City will be on the agenda for the new vice president. However, all constructions projects face an ending prior to the Minnesota winter, which is why some cannot be delayed until after classes end.

Q: On July 1 the Stafford loan interest rate reduction will expire which will results in interest rates doubling from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This will cost the average student roughly \$1000 per year. Is the University considering issuing a statement on its position on this issue?

A: The University had communicated vigorously with all but one member of the congressional delegation regarding this issue. He was late to an earlier meeting today because he was at a lunch with Representative Klein, who chairs the House Education Committee. When asked this question, he noted that both parties in the House and Senate have realized that increasing interest rates in an election year is a bad idea. What is lacking is how to pay for this reduction.

As a background, rates were 6.8 percent until a few years ago when they were reduced to 3.4 percent. The government actually borrows money for these loans at 2.1 percent. The difference creates a slush fund. When the reduction was made, it was with the provision that the rate would return to the original percent. To pay for the rate reduction to continue, Democrats are proposing a reduction in a variety of areas in the defense budget while Republicans are proposing funds from Obamacare. A solution will likely be found, but it might only be for one year.

14. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

15. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

16. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:14 p.m.

17. FACULTY ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS Amendments to Athletic Policies Information for the Faculty Senate

The packet of policies is available on the web at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsenate/docs/120503faocia_policies.pdf

18. CLERK OF THE SENATE REPORT Faculty Consultative Committee Election Results Information for the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill Twin Cities vacancies on the Faculty Consultative Committee, Professors James Cloyd, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, and Rebecca Ropers-Huilman were elected to three-year terms (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2015).

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

19. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that FCC has met four times since the last meeting of the Faculty Senate. One of those meetings was a discussion with President Kaler and Provost Hanson on the many mid- and long-range challenges looming on the horizon for higher education, including new models for educational credentialing, the tension created when higher education is viewed by some as simply a job training exercise, the need to partner as effectively as possible with the K-12 system to improve college readiness and close demographic achievement gaps, and how the impact on student and family finances associated with public disinvestment in higher education has affected demands on the time of the most recent generation of students.

FCC also held a separate meeting with Provost Hanson in the last month. Some of the discussion was focused on topics that have been percolating throughout this academic year, including evaluation of graduate programs. FCC members expressed support for reinvigorating the process by which departments and programs are periodically reviewed by outside experts, as such reviews will help in the selection of criteria by which excellence can be measured. The committee continued to discuss plans for modifications to the procedures for University-wide teaching awards, as well as plans for distance learning and e-education. With the participation and support of the Provost's office, governance will, over the course of the summer and into next fall, take on two new tasks. First is curating and assessing the present state of affairs for collegiate governing documents. Second is taking a careful look at the current array of policies associated with sabbaticals, single-semester leaves, and other potential leave programs, with an eye toward maximizing their utility and accessibility from a faculty professional development point of view, noting the constraints associated with various sources and magnitudes of available financial support.

FCC then met with Vice President and Chief Information Officer Scott Studham to hear his initial thoughts about the present and the future with respect to information technology at the University.

The committee also met with human resource officers to discuss the state of leadership assessment tools to be used for development purposes at the head/chair/director level, provided feedback on a manifesto from the Faculty Affairs Committee with respect to what constitutes faculty productivity, formed an ad hoc committee to plan a celebration of 100 years of University governance this fall, heard from Vice President Brown on the status of developments in the Office of Human Resources as a result of this winter and spring's strategic planning exercise, and heard a summary of the annual activities of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics from Professor Tim Johnson.

He then announced that next year's chair and vice-chair will be Professors Sally Gregory Kohlstedt and Michael Hancher, respectively. He wished them well and thanked them in advance for their service. Indeed, to help jump-start Sally's tenure at the helm, he thought she might find the following small text useful. It is called "*Herding Cats: Being advice to aspiring academic and research leaders.*" Good luck, Sally.

It has been an honor to serve this year as Chair of FCC. He is enormously grateful to his colleagues on that committee, and indeed to my colleagues on all governance committees, for their generosity in contributing their time, energy, and enthusiasm to shared governance. He asked senators to remain committed to the proposition that that level of energy must not flag when going forward in endeavors.

20. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS UPDATE

Professor Elizabeth Boyle, one of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons along with Professor Caroline Hayes, reported on two items. One is that higher education omnibus bill was passed last Thursday. She expressed thanks to Bob Crabb from the Bookstore and Jason Rohloff from Government Relations for their work regarding book requirements for courses. In the approved legislation, faculty are only required to request books up to 45 days prior to the start of a class and note if a previous version is acceptable. A requirement that course readings be posted in the class schedule was eliminated from the final version.

The second item is that the bonding bill is still pending, but its outlook is optimistic.

She noted that this is the final report for her and Professor Hayes as both are stepping down at the end of this session.

President Kaler then thanked both for advancing the University's story at the legislature throughout their time as faculty legislative liaisons.

21. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE 2011-12 Grade Data Discussion by the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

The Policy on Grading and Transcripts requires that "data on the mean grade point average by designator and course level, on the percentage of As awarded by course level, and on overall collegiate grade point averages will be prepared for grades awarded each Fall Semester...for all undergraduate students...[and] reported annually to the Faculty Senate."

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

SCEP Grading Distribution
 Fall 2011
 Data as of 1/27/2012

Campus	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
UMNCR	3589	2.82	39.20%	1097	2.82	34.82%	2530	3.02	43.20%	291	3.14	52.58%	676	3.24	49.41%
UMNDL	21899	2.8	35.82%	7225	2.87	33.30%	11625	3.03	38.46%	5191	3.28	49.72%			
UMNMO	4546	2.99	41.00%	1489	3.02	37.47%	1604	3.17	43.77%	651	3.4	52.23%			
UMNTC	56019	3.07	43.26%	12181	3	38.11%	48355	3.19	44.49%	18282	3.23	45.76%	6350	3.27	50.41%

University of Minnesota, Crookston

Academic Group	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's									
Acad Aff	3859	2.82	38.20%	1097	2.82	34.82%	2530	3.02	43.20%	291	3.14	52.58%			

University of Minnesota, Duluth

Academic Group	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
Bus/Econ	863	3.1	42.41%	1399	2.73	26.52%	3010	2.81	26.71%	1012	3.01	30.43%			
Cont Ed				53	3.64	77.36%	46	3.7	76.09%				35	3.03	42.86%
DMED															
Ed/Hum Srv	2656	3.02	43.60%	1378	3.01	40.93%	3037	3.15	48.21%	1545	3.59	65.24%	55	3.49	65.45%
Fine Arts	3688	3.13	51.98%	646	3.27	48.45%	476	3.42	63.24%	541	3.62	78.00%	17	3.91	94.12%
Lib Arts	6644	2.83	29.80%	1062	2.95	33.52%	2973	3.09	37.07%	714	3.2	44.96%	221	3.44	55.66%
Pharmacy	74	3.01	51.35%												
Sci/Eng	6223	2.51	21.48%	2683	2.71	28.33%	1901	2.93	32.25%	1369	3.08	37.84%	346	3.07	41.62%
UMD-Acad A	26	3.73	100.00%				18	4	27.78%						
UMD-Stu Lf	1722	3.39	59.29%				159	3.99	92.45%						

University of Minnesota, Morris

Academic Group	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	GPA	Pct A's									
Acad Aff	161	3.12	41.61%	70	2.74	47.14%	110	3.22	33.64%						
Div Educ	477	3.53	39.20%	236	3.24	49.15%	78	3.81	62.82%	292	3.73	57.88%			
Humanities	1888	3.22	51.38%	418	3.16	37.32%	442	3.32	51.58%	62	3.41	50.00%			
Sci/Math	1006	2.73	26.94%	421	2.75	24.94%	288	3.07	39.93%	200	3.09	38.50%			
Social Sci	1014	2.92	36.39%	344	3.12	43.02%	686	3.07	39.80%	91	3.43	65.93%			

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Academic Group	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
AHCS	103	3.44	59.22%				47	3.69	53.19%	476	3.12	28.99%	245	3.75	43.67%
CBS	2536	2.93	24.57%	1202	3.31	48.34%	1432	2.85	27.44%	1416	3.04	39.41%	58	3.35	50.00%
CCE	45	3.47	53.33%	20	0	0.00%	574	3.16	42.16%	555	3.28	51.89%	66	3.22	53.03%
CDES	1184	3.11	40.96%	672	3.23	41.67%	1312	3.32	47.03%	1097	3.21	34.55%	76	3.38	48.68%
CFANS	2635	3.08	42.28%	852	3.38	58.22%	2439	3.25	52.32%	1134	3.32	46.91%	181	3.32	55.25%
CLA	23564	3.2	46.08%	325	3.44	54.15%	24409	3.21	47.30%	3989	3.27	49.61%	1902	3.38	58.89%
CSE	14498	2.74	29.48%	6238	2.84	31.92%	4125	2.89	31.59%	4482	3.03	38.38%	1878	3.06	38.92%
CSOM	483	3.07	28.36%	1298	2.92	29.04%	5365	3.18	29.60%	1943	3.41	45.24%	742	3.18	39.62%
Dent				66	3.06	30.30%	165	3.09	28.48%	75	3.36	5.33%			
EHD	7036	3.31	60.93%	671	3.22	52.16%	4370	3.37	53.11%	1810	3.33	53.04%	976	3.57	71.00%
Health Sci	434	3.67	79.49%	29	3.93	93.10%									
HSPA	135	3.63	79.26%				94	3.68	76.60%	96	3.63	71.88%	14	3.53	71.43%
Med	219	3.52	41.10%				1881	3.01	41.57%	173	3.49	55.49%	65	3.37	46.15%
Nursing	123	3.83	39.84%	158	3.36	52.53%	518	3.63	70.85%	873	3.66	73.20%	124	0	0.00%
Pharmacy	774	3.62	71.06%				50	3.49	68.00%	45	3.53	66.67%	20	3.55	75.00%
Pub Health	876	3.58	72.83%				582	3.26	54.12%						
SRVPAA				87	3.92	94.25%	116	3.86	90.52%						
Ugrd Ed Ad	403	3.83	68.98%	61	3.4	60.66%	160	3.7	61.25%	23	3.67	34.78%			
UMR Chance	938	2.95	32.09%	382	3.09	30.63%	223	3.27	35.43%						
VMed				120	2.63	20.83%									
VP Sys Adm	33	3.23	42.42%				493	3.55	61.26%	89	3.76	89.89%			

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

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that each year at the last Senate meeting, grading data provided in the docket are presented for the prior academic year. They are often in a still smaller font than that used here and, with nary a ripple, the stone of the grade distributions sinks into the pond of disinterest, and the Faculty Senate goes on to the next agenda item. For a change, he would like to engage senators in a somewhat more thoughtful discussion of the topic.

In particular, he stated his own alarm and dismay at the degree to which grade compression has infected some of the colleges. He noted that while this phenomenon is sometimes called grade inflation, that ignores the fact that an A grade has nowhere to which to inflate, no more exciting letter having yet been invented.

As a reminder, the grading policy states that an A grade “Represents achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements,” a B “Represents achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements,” and a C “Represents achievement that meets the course requirements in every respect.” When a college reaches, in its 1000 level courses, a proportion of 61% As, as is now true for the College of Education and Human Development, perhaps it is time to adjust the course requirements up a bit as they no longer seem to be proving terribly challenging.

He believes that the University is in serious risk, through the abandonment of its commitment to rigorous academic standards, of having outside standards imposed upon it. There is considerable noise in the higher-ed policy/think-tank universe about taking the standardized testing precepts applied to the K-12 system under the No Child Left Behind regime and applying them to undergraduate education. Senators can debate the merits of NCLB another time, but it worries him a great deal that the faculty may soon be viewed as having so thoroughly abdicated its responsibility to maintain credible standards that it needs to be more closely monitored by outside agencies with dubious agendas.

Grade compression has reached a point where there is no bell curve anymore -- indeed, with more As awarded than any other grade, the curve doesn't even inflect, it just goes straight up. At the present rate, in 2050 or so, the grading curve will be a Heaviside function that turns on at the A. In point of fact, A is the new S. Is that really the message that faculty want to provide to students? Any work you do is sufficiently valid to warrant the highest possible recognition?

Moreover, what does he tell a student in his college, Science and Engineering, which has an A grading percentage in the high 20s to low 30s, when he or she complains about competing for a job with someone from CLA, where the same percentage is in the high 40s to low 50s, and both have been requested to provide transcripts? Is he really the only person bothered by enormous disparities in average GPAs as a function of college? When admissions tells us that the entering high-school class ranks and ACT scores are highest for the College of Biological Sciences and the College of Science and Engineering students, but these are the two colleges with the lowest average first-year GPAs, shouldn't that create a little cognitive dissonance? Savvy students in high-grading colleges have already noted the challenge associated with distinguishing outstanding performance when almost everyone gets an A. On March 29, 2010, the Minnesota Daily editorialized, “An institutional policy to combat grade inflation could take pressure off professors to grade easily in exchange for good reviews — which can affect promotion and

tenure decisions — and allow exceptional students to differentiate themselves. Students working under responsive merit conditions find themselves more intellectually stimulated, engaged and passionate about course material, which in turn elevates quality for all.”

Recently, the Carlson School mandated a fixed grade distribution in many of its lower division courses. He would like to know how it is working as well as views on the matter from his colleagues.

A senator then said that she has been arguing about this issue for years. She tends to never award more than 25 percent A's for the 3xxx and 4xxx courses that she teaches, but this standard has a cost when student evaluations are completed. However, integrity is needed for awarded grades so that they mean something.

Another senator requested better data than what is being presented today, as courses with small enrollments are not included. He asked that the GPA be normalized by student instead of the course.

A senator noted that his issue is teaching seniors who are not able to be anywhere near the mean grade in the course. He would also like to take a look at group projects in courses since he believes that many students can reach a 'C' for a course without having to complete much independent work.

Another senator stated that there is much research on the connection between grade inflation and student evaluations when they are used in the promotion and tenure process, as they are the only non-peer review aspects of this process. The Faculty Senate cannot discuss one without also discussing the other.

A senator noted that there are other factors to consider with this data. For the College of Education and Human Development, of the 7000 grades in 1xxx courses, most of these courses are physical education courses. It is likely that there are many 'A' grades being awarded in these courses, and that should be acceptable. For the 5xxx courses, these are primarily the Masters in Education courses which are competency-based courses. As the University graduates some of the best teachers in the state, if not the nation, she also does not have an issue with grade inflation for this segment.

Another senator stated that the challenge is what to do with this situation. Proposals that have already been made are unsatisfying. The idea of adding a percentage to a transcript is not an easy fix as percentages can vary in the same course from semester to semester depending on the students taking the course. Any proposal cannot disadvantage the students who happen to enroll with a strong cohort. One idea would be to create a policy that any course which, over a certain period of time, has an average of some percentage of 'A' grades, would automatically become an 'S/N' course. This designation would mean that the course only distinguishes competence from lack of competence. As an incentive to retain a letter grade option, faculty would need to be capable of distinguishing between passing, competent work, and superlative work that an 'A' is supposed to represent.

A senator then noted that while the University provides training before a faculty member can do research, there is no training on how to grade, yet it is a core competence that is assumed. To solve this issue, education should be provided to faculty on how to grade.

Another senator said that he finds grade inflation less troubling than another trend, which is the expectation for the amount of work in a course. Several years ago there was alarm about the four-year graduation rate. The emphasis on this was misplaced as many of today's students have other time constraints that make it impossible to graduate in four years. The University then

created financial incentives to take a higher credit load. Some students then end up doing less work for their courses, which affects their peers and dilutes the educational content in the courses. Faculty are then hard-put to create an environment where the expectations should be.

A senator stated that the media is reporting that students are not learning as much. She has also been surprised by the number of articles which discuss the incredible decrease in the amount of time students today spend studying as compared to the past, and then go on to state that faculty are not doing their jobs. A comprehensive approach is needed to the rigor and evaluation of students. When she first arrived at the University, she was a more rigorous grader, and received evaluation comments about how unfair her grading was as they encountered inflation in all their other courses. She also reminded senators of the studies which have shown the gender issue that is present in evaluations and the hostility that women and minority faculty encounter when the course is rigorous.

22. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Slate of Faculty Candidates

Action by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation and UMD Faculty Senators

MOTION:

To approve the following people to serve on the Committee on Committees for a term of 2012-15. A simple majority is required for approval.

SHAWN CURLEY: Professor of Information and Decision Sciences, Carlson School of Management.

RON HADSALL: Professor of Pharmaceutical Care and Health, College of Pharmacy

JANE HOVLAND: Associate Professor of Behavioral Health and Population Sciences, Medical School-Duluth Campus.

JOHN MATHESON: Professor of Law, Law School.

RICHARD MCCORMICK: Professor of German, Scandinavian, and Dutch, College of Liberal Arts

FOR INFORMATION:

Of the faculty/academic professional members, 1 shall be from the Morris campus and the remainder from the Twin Cities campus. All faculty members of the Committee shall be elected by the faculty members of the Senate from their respective campuses. The Twin Cities faculty members of the Faculty Committee on Committees shall be nominated by the current Twin Cities faculty members of the Faculty Committee on Committees and shall be selected so that the membership of the committee corresponds approximately with the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty in each college.

The current membership of the committee is available at:
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/committees/conc.html>

**JOANNA O'CONNELL, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**23. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics Charge
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 5(E) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate () at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

...

5. Faculty Senate Committee Charges

...

E. FACULTY ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics has responsibility for eligibility, compliance, and other issues relating to academic integrity of participants in the programs. This committee will work closely with the Provost, who as head of academic affairs is the senior administrative officer in charge of academic counseling programs for athletes. All policies formulated by the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics will be reported to the Faculty Consultative Committee for action and to the Faculty Senate for information after the Faculty Consultative Committee has acted. The Faculty Senate has the authority to reverse or modify a decision by the Faculty Consultative Committee.

...

COMMENT:

Up until the revision of the Senate constitution in 2005, the two athletics committees both recommended policy to the Assembly Steering Committee (the Twin Cities subset of the Senate Consultative Committee, under the structure when there were two governing bodies, the University Senate and the Twin Cities Campus Assembly). The Steering Committee approved the policies (or not), and then reported its action to the Assembly. When the constitution and bylaws were revised, this language was inadvertently dropped. The language was restored in the charge to the Advisory Committee on Athletics in 2006, but similar language was not proposed for the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA).

The logic of that reporting and approving relationship remains the same: there are policies that the FAOCIA is responsible for, some of which are quite detailed and arcane. These policies come up for revision periodically and new policies are established from time to time. It would be a considerable demand on the time of the Faculty Senate to have to consider each of these policies every time an amendment is needed.

The Faculty Consultative Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve this change in the Bylaws, reverting to the practice in place before 2005.

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 97 in favor, none opposed, and one abstention.

APPROVED

**24. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
2016-17 Crookston and Duluth Calendars
Information for the Faculty Senate**

Crookston 2016-17

Fall Semester 2016 (75 class days)

August 23	Tuesday	Classes begin
September 5	Monday	Labor Day holiday
October 14	Friday	In-service (no classes)
November 24-25	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 9	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 12-15	Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
December 15	Thursday	End of the term

Spring Semester 2017 (73 class days)

January 9	Monday	Classes begin
January 16	Monday	MLK holiday
February 20	Monday	In-service (no classes)
March 13-17	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
April 14	Friday	Floating holiday (no classes)
May 1	Monday	Last day of instruction
May 2-5	Tues.-Fri.	Final examinations
May 5	Friday	End of the term
May 6	Saturday	Commencement

May Session 2017 (15 class days)

May 6	Monday	May session begins
May 27	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2017 (39 class days)

June 5	Monday	Classes begin
July 4	Tuesday	Independence Day holiday
July 28	Friday	8-wk summer session ends

Duluth 2016-17

Fall Semester 2016 (72 class days)

September 5	Monday	Labor Day holiday
September 6	Tuesday	Classes begin
November 24-25	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 16	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 17, 19-22	Sat., Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
December 22	Thursday	End of the term

Spring Semester 2017 (74 class days)

January 16	Monday	MLK holiday
January 17	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 13-17	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 5	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 8-12	Mon.-Fri.	Final examinations
May 11	Thursday	Grad Commencement
May 12	Friday	End of the term
May 13	Saturday	Undergrad Commencement

May Session 2017 (13 class days)

May 15	Monday	May session begins
May 29	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 2	Friday	Final examinations; End of May session

Summer Session 2017 (37 class days)

June 5	Monday	Classes begin
July 4	Tuesday	Independence Day holiday
July 28	Friday	Final examinations; End of Summer Session

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**25. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
2016-17 Morris, Rochester, and Twin Cities Calendars
Action by the Faculty Senate**

Morris 2016-17

Fall Semester 2016 (73 class days)

August 24	Wednesday	Classes begin
September 5	Monday	Labor Day holiday
October 17-18	Mon.-Tues.	Fall Break (no classes)
November 24-25	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 9	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 12	Monday	Study day
December 13-16	Tues.-Fri.	Final examinations

Spring Semester 2017 (74 class days)

January 16	Monday	MLK holiday
January 17	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 13-17	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 5	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 8	Monday	Study day
May 9-12	Tues.-Fri.	Final examinations
May 13	Saturday	Commencement

May Session 2017 (14 class days)

May 29	Monday	May session begins
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 2	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2017

May 22-June 23	Summer session I (24 class days)	
May 29	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 26-July 28	Summer session II (24 class days)	
July 4	Tuesday	Independence Day holiday

Twin Cities and Rochester 2016-17

Fall Semester 2016 (70 class days)

September 5	Monday	Labor Day holiday
September 6	Tuesday	Classes begin
November 24-25	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 14	Wednesday	Last day of instruction
December 16-17, 19-22	Fri.-Sat., Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
December 15, 18	Thurs., Sun.	Study days
December 22	Thursday	End of the term

Spring Semester 2017 (74 class days)

January 16	Monday	MLK holiday
January 17	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 13-17	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 5	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 6-7	Sat.-Sun.	Study days
May 8-13	Mon.-Sat.	Final examinations
May 13	Saturday	End of the term

May Session 2017 (14 class days)

May 22	Monday	May session begins
May 29	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 9	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2017 (39 class days)

June 12	Monday	Classes begin
July 4	Tuesday	Independence Day holiday
August 4	Friday	8-wk summer session ends

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**26. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Faculty Salary Gender Equity
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

**Recommendations Regarding Faculty Salary Equity at the University of Minnesota
Women's Faculty Cabinet and University Senate Equity Access and Diversity Committee
Draft as of April 10, 2012**

Background

The Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) is a body of faculty women with an investment in an equitable and supportive culture for women faculty across all academic units at the University of Minnesota; the WFC acts as an advisory board to the Provost. The University Senate Equity, Access, and Diversity (EAD) Committee includes faculty, staff, and students who advise the President and administrative offices on the impact of University policies, programs and services on equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity from a system perspective.

In light of recent reports on salary equity (conducted by the WFC and external consultant Dr. Murray Clayton) that found unexplained gender gaps in faculty salaries, the WFC and EAD considered a variety of possible University responses. In part 1, we identify key principles for a thorough response that aims to address current inequities and minimize future concerns.

Parts 2-4 offer more detailed recommendations for monitoring salary equity by gender, identifying possible salary adjustments for faculty, providing training to department chairs/heads and deans, and. See parts 2-4. These recommendations primarily represent an endorsement of the suggestions laid out by Dr. Clayton in his December 26, 2011 report, with some additions that emerged in conversations about implementing these processes at University of Minnesota. The recommendations may not be implemented exactly as laid out here in each college/school, but we believe that modifications in process should be consistent with the key principles described in Part 1.

Part 1. Key principles for the University response

1. The salary equity reports should be taken as an opportunity to review decision-making criteria and processes and to increase the transparency of decision-making regarding salaries within departments and colleges/schools.
2. All units on the Twin Cities campus, including units within the health sciences, should participate in the salary review process with appropriate customization of procedures.
3. There should be a broad process of reviews of women's salaries initially, rather than only occurring if the faculty member comes forward with a request for an equity review.
4. Salary data should be analyzed by gender regularly, with reports available to the University community and public.

Part 2. Recommendations to the Provost's Office and Deans on oversight, training, and communications regarding faculty salary equity

1. The Provost's Office should work with the Office for Equity and Diversity and the Office of Human Resources to provide guidance and assistance to departments and colleges/schools regarding the establishment of salary review procedures.
2. The Provost's Office should lead on monitoring salary equity in the future and responding to issues uncovered in future analysis. This would involve:
 - Reviewing current data to determine which factors identified in Clayton 12/26/11 report are currently available in institutional records, whether retrospective data is available, and which factors might be incorporated into systems in the near future.
 - Preparing an annual report for the Twin Cities campus as a whole and also for each college/school separately that compares the following by gender and by race/ethnicity:
 - average starting salary of faculty;
 - average starting salary at each faculty rank;
 - number of faculty hired into each rank;
 - dollar value of "start-up" packages for faculty;
 - average percentage raise for faculty;
 - for faculty promoted in that year, average number of years to tenure and promotion and average number of years between promotion to Associate and promotion to Full Professor;
 - for each retention sought, the gender of the faculty member, the value of any salary increment, other support dollars, other conditions (e.g. provision of staff, lab space, etc.) in a University of Minnesota counter-offer and whether or not the retention bid was successful.
 - Reviewing college/school reports with Deans and college/school SEACs (see below).
 - Conducting a more comprehensive statistical analysis (similar to that conducted by Dr. Clayton in 2011) every 3 years.
 - Creating a University website to serve as a repository of reports related to salary equity.
3. The Provost's Office should incorporate additional training related to salary equity into the existing leadership development provided to chairs/heads and provide similar training and support to members of SEACs (see below).
4. Deans should require departments to describe their normal merit review process and salary decisions in explicit terms and share that information with faculty and the college/school SEAC in order to increase transparency and minimize inequities.
5. Deans should discuss salary equity concerns and identify remedies from department chairs/heads annually.
6. The Provost's Office should evaluate the sufficiency of the salary equity review processes, with consultation with the Office for Equity and Diversity, Office of Human Resources, Deans, and faculty, including the Women's Faculty Cabinet and the Faculty Senate, after two years.
7. The Provost's Office should share salary equity review processes and reports with the coordinate campuses.
8. The Provost's Office should identify funds for salary adjustments, with the expectation that colleges/schools will cost-share for the initial adjustments and colleges/schools will be responsible for more of the funds required for adjustments identified in future years.

Part 3. Recommended process for case-by-case salary assessments: Initial round of reviews

1. With the support and guidance from administration (as described in Part 2), departments should create Salary Equity Adjustment Committees (SEACs) to determine the size (if

- any) of the appropriate adjustment **for each female faculty member.**³ Departmental SEACs will be formed within large departments and by combining the task for 2-3 smaller departments. The SEAC should involve an uneven number of members, not less than three, and include tenured faculty and clinical faculty from the department(s) and one person from outside the department, normally a faculty member who is serving or recently served on the college/school SEAC.
2. Deans should create college/school SEACs to review the recommendations of departmental SEACs. These committees should be comprised of 5 tenured or clinical faculty members, at least 2 women, with input on membership from the Dean, WFC, FCC, and Provost's Office.
 3. For units that are not departmentalized (e.g. Law), a single SEAC should be formed to determine appropriate adjustments. Members will be appointed in the same way as college/school SEACs. Smaller colleges or schools may cooperate with another school with similar faculty in these processes.
 4. SEACs may "triage" salary reviews by first examining the full professors (where both reports found larger gender gaps) and then turning to associate and assistant professors in the following year or by using a regression model to identify and prioritize reviews of women faculty whose actual salary differs from the predicted salary by a certain amount. All women faculty should be reviewed within 2 years.
 5. Departmental SEACs should make a recommendation for each eligible female faculty member by examining that person's record and those of three other faculty deemed to be comparable or nearly comparable. (See Clayton 12/26/11 report, page 3, for more detail on the comparison process).
 6. Once departmental SEACs have determined any recommended adjustments, their recommendations and justifications should be forwarded to the college/school SEAC. Each faculty member reviewed should receive a copy of recommendations and justifications for her case. In addition, each faculty member reviewed should be told that she can make a counterproposal to the college/school SEAC.
 7. College/school SEACs should review departmental recommendations and any counterproposals. College/school SEACs will affirm departmental recommendations or make a different recommendation, providing a justification based on the same comparison criteria.
 8. Deans will receive departmental and college/school SEAC recommendations and take appropriate action. Faculty who were reviewed, but are dissatisfied with the action taken on their cases may appeal through normal University procedures.
 9. The above processes should be conducted outside of usual annual salary adjustment reviews for merit.

Part 4. Recommended case-by-case salary assessments in future: Requested reviews

1. After the initial round of reviews, **any member of the faculty** may request a salary equity review from their departmental SEAC or from their college/school SEAC. Procedures for the review, justification, counterproposal, college/school SEAC recommendation to the Dean, and appeal will parallel those of the initial reviews of women faculty.
2. Chairs/heads and Deans should identify faculty whose salaries seem to be outliers in light of their performance and productivity and request an equity review on their behalf.

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

³ Transgender faculty who do not identify as female (including faculty who do not identify as male or female) are welcome to request a salary equity review as described in part 2.

DISCUSSION:

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that FCC has maintained a strong interest in the topic of Gender Equity in Salaries since it was first identified as an issue by the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) some time ago. As has been reported in periodic updates to this body, the University is designing a response to the disparities summarized in a consultant's report delivered in January. The WFC, working with Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee (EAD), has made the recommendations presented in the docket to the provost, and as part of that process, the timing is propitious for the Faculty Senate as a whole to offer comments. This item is not presented for a vote, but rather to solicit thoughts and recommendations from senators.

Professor Caroline Hayes, former Chair of the WFC, stated that six years ago Senior Vice President and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan appointed a Women's Faculty Cabinet to advise his office on matters relevant to women faculty. Based on faculty input, a study of faculty salaries was recommended and in May 2010 the WFC brought him a report which suggested there were issues on the Twin Cities campus regarding gender distribution of salary. At all ranks there was a six percent difference, while full professors showed an eight percent difference.

Provost Sullivan then commissioned a second study, hiring a statistics professor from the University of Wisconsin – Madison who has published in and been an expert witness in this field. This study had the similar results, with a difference of 2.5 percent at all levels and 4.1 percent for full professors.

A set of recommendations came with the study, which were then augmented by the WFC.

Professor Charmaine Stewart, incoming Chair of the WFC, then reviewed the recommendations that were included in the agenda.

A senator noted that it is important that reviews not be done by department as there is gendering of disciplines which needs to be understood when reviews take place, as perception of the value of the field can affect job prospects as well as salaries. She is concerned that departments will be handling these reviews but it cannot address these systemic issues.

Professor Hayes replied that departmental issues were discussed, which is why salary equity adjustment committees are recommended to be formed both at the departmental and collegiate levels. Additionally, it is recommended that the departmental committees include an outside member, to present a different view, but it is understood that department members understand the discipline and merit issues associated with it. While this is not a perfect solution, action needs to be taken now that the study is complete.

A senator said that salaries are public information and, for those people setting salaries, should be reviewed at the college level. By reviewing these data, he noted that people in the arts are severely disadvantaged and women in these fields are at the lowest levels. These salaries are grossly unfair and unworthy of the University. He noted that while salary adjustments are usually set based on merit, he fully supports equity adjustments as well.

Another senator said that in his college, he has brought to the attention of the dean that all associate deans, as well as the dean, are male. Since that time he has been contacted by a number of female faculty that not only is there a problem with the number of women in the upper echelon, but that they have detected a discomfort among the associate deans with discussing these issues. Any process needs to be able to look at the entire ranking in the college to effect change at all levels.

A senator asked for more information on two factors. One is whether promotion in colleges is weighted more towards research and if the teaching load falls heavier on the women. A second is the issue of retention offers. In some cases, she has known that University retention offers have been given without a written offer from another institution. She does not know, but she assumes that male faculty are more willing to play the game for better retention offers. There is no reward for loyal employees. Retention offers separated by college and gender would also be helpful data. She then suggested that the University create a policy that retention offers will only be provided for competing, written retention offers and that there is a limit on the number of retention offers that can be made.

Professor Hayes noted that the recommendations do include tracking of retention offers. A recent study by the NRC of science and engineering fields indicated that it is false that women are more loyal and less likely to move.

A senator spoke in favor of the limited scope of the recommendations. Equity is a slippery slope and the University cannot solve all salary issues, especially when they relate to market prices. The University can deal with discrimination in a system where the rules are known versus overall inequity, and this will result in big steps forward. It is a trap and endless debate to try to solve the true values that should be reflected in salaries.

Professor Hayes said that these recommendations are an opportunity to rethink salaries and it can have a positive impact on women as well as equity policies for all.

27. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Administrative Policy on University-Administered
Graduate Student Fellowships and Traineeships
Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following policy changes (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck through~~).

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

University-Administered Graduate Student Fellowships and Traineeships: Twin Cities and Rochester

POLICY STATEMENT

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. Fellowships carry no service obligations. Traineeships may carry service obligations.

I. Eligibility and Selection for Graduate Student Fellowships and Traineeships

a) 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.

b) All students who meet the eligibility criteria for a fellowship or traineeship must be considered for the fellowship or traineeship with in accordance with using a specified an established review and selection processes and criteria. Recipients of graduate student

fellowships and traineeships must meet registration requirements and other terms and conditions of their award.

c) University colleges and departments, or other University units as appropriate, must publicize the fellowships the unit offers on a regular basis.

~~II. 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 leave 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.~~

~~III.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) The awarding collegiate unit, department, academic program, and/or external agency stipulates the benefits. 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 may be eligible for resident tuition rates. Members of the student's immediate family are may be eligible for resident tuition rates, subject to acceptable documentation.

d) Fellows and trainees are responsible for payment of charges not covered by the fellowship or traineeship (e.g., lab, installment, or late registration fees).

e) Fellows or trainees who leave 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.

e)f) 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.~~

~~IV-III. 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.)

REASON FOR POLICY

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

PROCEDURES

There are no procedures associated with this policy.

FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS

There are no forms or instructions associated with this policy.

ADDITIONAL CONTACTS

Subject	Contact	Phone	Fax/Email
Primary Contact(s)	Alison Skoberg	612-625-9310	skobe001@umn.edu

DEFINITIONS

Graduate Fellowship: a merit-based stipend award that an individual student wins competitively. The student applies (or is nominated) directly to the funding source.

Note: Fellowships offered through the Graduate School include full tuition and health insurance. Fellows may not hold more than a 25% assistantship, or its equivalent in other support, without a reduction in the fellowship stipend.

Graduate Research Traineeship: is awarded competitively to a department or to a group of faculty members in a particular disciplinary or interdisciplinary area, the discipline having been specified in advance by the funding agency. The University department or faculty group awarded the training grant identifies the recipients from among its students interested in studying in the targeted field.

Service: work performed that is typically recognized by payment of a salary.

Stipend: a fixed sum of money primarily paid to cover living costs and educational expenses while the recipient is enrolled in an educational program.

Salary: a wage paid for work performed.

Immediate Family (for the purpose of qualifying for resident tuition rate): spouse/registered same-sex domestic partner, children, or legal ward living in the household.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Colleges

- Publicize the fellowships the college offers on a regular basis.
- Clearly stipulate the benefits provided by each fellowship offered by the college.
- Fairly consider all students who meet the eligibility criteria for a fellowship or traineeship.

Programs

- Publicize the fellowships the program offers on a regular basis.
- Clearly stipulate the benefits provided by each fellowship offered by the program.
- Fairly consider all students who meet the eligibility criteria for a fellowship or traineeship.

Students

- Meet all requirements, terms and conditions associated with their award.

APPENDICES

There are no appendices associated with this policy.

FAQ

1. What is the difference between a graduate fellowship and Graduate School fellowship?

A graduate fellowship, based on academic merit, is a non-service award given to a graduate student at the University of Minnesota.

A Graduate School Fellowship is a non-service award based on academic merit that is administered by the central Graduate School. Most fellowships offered through the Graduate School include full tuition and health insurance, and fellows may not hold more than a 25% assistantship, or its equivalent in other support, without a reduction in the fellowship stipend.

1.2. My fellowship application does not require me to provide information about my financial status. Why is that?

Fellowships are typically awarded based on academic merit, rather than financial need. Need-based awards may require the student to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) to help determine the amount of financial aid a student may be eligible for from a broad range of sources (e.g., federal and state grants, federally- subsidized student work-study, and/or loans).

2.3. What is the difference between a “fellowship” and a “scholarship”?

The two words are often used interchangeably. Fellowships usually provide support for post-baccalaureate education and are based on academic merit. Scholarships usually provide support for undergraduate education and are based on academic merit or financial need.

3.4. What is the difference between a “fellowship” and a “traineeship”?

A fellowship is a merit-based stipend award that an individual student wins competitively. The student applies (or is nominated) directly to the funding source. The competition can be national (e.g., the National Science Foundation Fellowship) or University-wide (e.g., the Graduate School Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship) or department wide (e.g., fellowships from department funds.) The stipend is set by the funding agency each fiscal year. It is a non-service award requiring that the student be actively enrolled in a graduate program. Depending on the source of funding, the fellowship may provide tuition and health benefits in addition to the stipend. (**Note:** Fellowships offered through the Graduate School may include full-tuition and health insurance. Fellows may not hold more than a 25% assistantship, or its equivalent in other support, without a reduction in the fellowship stipend.)

Traineeships are awarded competitively to ~~a department or to~~ a group of faculty members in a particular disciplinary or interdisciplinary area, the discipline having been specified in advance by the funding agency. The University ~~department or~~ faculty group awarded the training grant identifies the recipients from among its students interested in studying in the targeted field. The agency invites proposals for the support and graduate level training of future scholars, scientists or engineers, in specific areas of interest. The training grant usually provides tuition and health

insurance in addition to the trainee stipend.

4.5. I have received a University-administered fellowship from my department and am also receiving federal grant funds for my graduate education. Can I use both the fellowship and my federal funds for educational costs in the same term?

Accepting additional financial support while already receiving another form(s) of financial aid may require that you reduce or pay back some of the funds from other sources. You should check with all of the sources from which you expect to receive funding in the same term to determine what restrictions or conditions, if any, there are on your acceptance of the funds.

5.6. I have received a University-administered fellowship and also have a graduate assistantship. Can I receive funds from both the fellowship and assistantship in the same term?

Some University-administered fellowships allow the recipient to receive additional funding up to the equivalent of a 25% graduate assistantship in the same term. Examples of such fellowships are the Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship, the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Fellowship, and the DOVE Fellowship. You should check with the source of your fellowship to determine what restrictions or conditions, if any, there are on your receipt of graduate assistantship, or other, support while you hold a fellowship.

7. If my fellowship covers tuition, does it also cover fees?

You should check with the source of your fellowship. Fees can represent a substantial sum each semester, and students should plan carefully when accepting an award.

8. If my fellowship covers tuition, does it also cover health insurance?

Check with the course of your fellowship to see if health insurance is covered.

6.9. Do I have to pay taxes on my University-administered fellowship?

University-administered fellowships ~~may be~~ are subject to federal and state taxes. You should check with the source of your fellowship to determine whether you must report your stipend for tax purposes.

7.10. Our graduate program has offered a first-year fellowship to an outstanding applicant and we would like to encourage the student to accept our offer by February 1. Can we expect the student to commit to our program by this date?

No. Students are under no obligation to respond to offers of financial support prior to April 15; earlier deadlines for acceptance of such offers violate the intent of the Council of Graduate Schools' Resolution Regarding Graduate Scholars, Fellows, Trainees and Assistants (http://www.cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/CGS_Resolution.pdf) . In those instances in which a student accepts an offer before April 15, and subsequently desires to withdraw that acceptance, the student may submit in writing a resignation of the appointment at any time through April 15.

8.11. I have a University-administered fellowship but will graduate two months before the end of the spring semester. I received my stipend at the beginning of the term. Do I need to pay back some or all of the stipend?

It is unlikely that you would be required to pay back some of the stipend if you graduate early,

but you should check with the source of your fellowship.

9.12. I have a University-administered fellowship and need to take a leave of absence in the middle of the fall semester. I received my stipend at the beginning of the term. Do I need to pay back some or all of the stipend? If I return for the spring semester, can receive the fellowship for that term?

You should check with the source of your fellowship.

10.13. I have a University-administered fellowship and my spouse would like to enroll in University courses. Does my resident rate tuition benefit also extend to my spouse?

Possibly. 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 ~~may be~~ are eligible for resident tuition rates. Members of the student's immediate family ~~may also be~~ are eligible for resident tuition rates, ~~subject to acceptable documentation~~. "Immediate family members" include spouse/registered same-sex domestic partner, children, or legal wards living in the household. "Acceptable documentation" includes a marriage license (in English or an English translation), a birth certificate, registered same-sex domestic partnership documentation, or a visa. See *Administrative Policy: Resident Tuition Rate* for more information.

14. I have received an Interdisciplinary Doctoral Fellowship and am also in a joint degree program that combines a first-professional degree and the Ph.D. degree. If the college of my first professional degree requires me to register in that college for one or both semesters of the academic year, how will this affect my IDF?

You need to register in the college of your Ph.D. program during the fall and spring semesters in which you hold the IDF or a Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship (DDF).

15. What does it mean to "publicize" fellowship opportunities?

"Publicize" means that the college or graduate program offering the fellowship must include reference to the fellowship—including eligibility requirements and the selection process and criteria—on relevant websites and/or in the program handbook.

16. What does "using an established review and selection processes and criteria" mean?

An established process is one that has been decided by the graduate program faculty and is consistently followed—e.g., a process in which awards are reviewed and decided by a regularly appointed faculty committee that reports to the program faculty.

RELATED INFORMATION

Board of Regents Policy: Tuition and Fees

Administrative Policy: Leave of Absence and Reinstatement from a Leave: Graduate Students

Administrative Policy: Resident Tuition Rate

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Nita Krevans, Chair of the Graduate Education Task Force, noted that there have been some revisions since the version in the docket was printed. A revised version was available as a

handout. The Faculty Consultative Committee had a few additional amendments. which included changes to clarify wording and reordering of some of the FAQs.

The basic goals of the policy are 1) to provide information to units about basic rules and alert students and units of the rules, 2) to remind everyone that selection is through an equitable, transparent, and justifiable process without any micro-level rules being included in the policy, and 3) to clarify the difference between fellowships and traineeships and other forms of monetary compensation for graduate students which reflect employment. No procedures are included for any fellowship or traineeship. As a reminder, this policy only governs University-administered awards, not awards that are made directly from a sponsoring agency to a student.

Q: If a program has funds for students who encounter hardship, would that fund violate this policy?

A: A fund of this type would not violate this policy as it would be a need-based award, not a fellowship or traineeship.

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, stated that Professor Krevans and her committee have heroically, over two years, built the equivalent of a graduate school from the ground up. The Faculty Senate and the entire faculty own her and her committee a vote of thanks for the enormous amount of work that has been done in this area.

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

APPROVED

**28. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Administrative Policy on Entrepreneurial Leaves
Action by the Faculty Senate**

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

29. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

30. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

31. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2011-12 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MAY 3, 2012

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 5

The fifth meeting of the Student Senate for 2011-12 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, May 3, 2012, at 11:36 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 22 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 elections were held in April for next year's leadership. She will become Chair and Kimberly Simon was elected Chair-Elect for 2012-13. At the April meeting they also met with Provost Hanson to discuss graduate education restructuring and Matt Sumera with a legislative briefing. At the May P&A Senate meeting, Vice President Studham will speak and there will be an update on the PULSE Survey.

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:

Thomas Sondreal, 2012-13 Chair-elect of the Civil Service Senate, said that Amy Olson will serve as Chair next year. Recent meeting topics have included the 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.

3. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Joshua Preston, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, reported that as this is the last meeting of this body for the year, next year's Chair will be elected later in today's meeting. Since the Student Senate approved its marriage resolution, the issue has snowballed and will now be presented to the University Senate later today for their approval. Lastly he urged senators to RSVP for the scheduled May 5 retreat.

4. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Duluth – Harrison Defries stated that the first UMDSA Congress meeting is today and senators have been finalized for next year.

Crookston – no report

Morris – Evan Vogel reported that MCSA has elected its two senators and he will serve again on the Student Senate Consultative Committee.

Rochester – Courtnee Heyduk noted that RSA held elections last week and its last community service event is this week.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly – Amit Singh reported that elections are continuing and GAPSA is participating in the Coffman Union second floor space advisory committee meetings.

Minnesota Student Association - Sophie Wallerstedt said that Moshe Volovik and Nate Schwab are MSA's two representatives to the Student Senate Consultative Committee for next year. MSA has worked on keeping two campus libraries open 24 hours a day the week before finals. Its leadership banquet is tomorrow night.

Minnesota Student Legislative Coalition – Chris Tastad said that MSLC worked this year to effectively communicate the student voice at the Capital by holding over 90 meetings with legislatures which established the MSLC name. MSLC members also provided testimony on 12 issues such as the bonding bill and textbooks. The body will be convening soon to elect next year's president.

Q: What organizations are included in MSLC?

A: The five undergraduate student associations and GAPSA.

Q: Does MSLC work with student lobby groups in other states?

A: MSLC participates in the Big Ten Student Association federal lobby trips, but there is no shared interest at the state level.

Q: How are members chosen?

A: The president is elected by the 12 member board. Each association either elects or appoints their members to the board and these members are encouraged to participate in the student association/assembly.

Q: Will there be a MSLC group at Rochester?

A: Yes. Both Rochester and Crookston are looking to form an MSLC and the structure of this group is determined by each campus.

5. MINUTES FOR APRIL 5, 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/minutes/120405stu.pdf>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

6. 2012 COUNCIL OF GRADUATE STUDENTS OUTSTANDING FACULTY AWARD WINNERS Information

For Information:

Ruth G. Shaw	EEB	CBS
Adrian D. Hegeman	Horticultural Sciences, Plant Biology, Microbial and Plant Genomics Institute	CBS/CFANS
Frank J. Symons	Educational Psychology	CEHD
Stephen Smith	CNES	CLA
Valerie Tiberius	Philosophy	CLA
John Robert Warren	Sociology	CLA
Carl Elliott	Bioethics	Medical School
Deborah Levison	Public Affairs	Public Affairs
Mark A. Pereira	Epidemiology and Community Health	Public Health
Chris H. Kim	Electrical and Computer Engineering	CSE

7. STUDENT SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENTS Student Committee on Committees Membership

Action

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 5(H) of the University Senate Bylaws and Article VI, Section 5(C) of the Student Senate Bylaws as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~). As an amendment to the Student Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Student Senate (20) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Student Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

...

5. University Senate Committee Charges

...

H. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

...

Senate Committee on Committees

The Senate Committee on Committees appoints members of certain committees of the University Senate and advises the Senate Consultative Committee on the committee structure of the University Senate.

Membership

The Senate Committee on Committees shall be composed of at least 13 and no more than 15 elected tenured or tenure-track faculty members of the Faculty Committee on Committees, at least 2 and no more than 4 elected academic professional members of the Faculty Committee on Committees, 6 ~~5~~ elected undergraduate ~~undergraduate~~ students of the Student Committee on Committees, ~~and one elected graduate/professional student of the Student Committee on Committees.~~

The chair of the Faculty Committee on Committees shall serve as the chair of the Senate Committee on Committees.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To forward annually to the University Senate for approval names of faculty members, academic professionals, undergraduate students, graduate/professional students, and chairs it recommends for appointment to those committees of the University Senate specified in the Bylaws of the University Senate. The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various campuses and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the faculty/academic professional, undergraduate student or graduate/professional student member currently is serving; 3) the principle of rotation of committee assignments; 4) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student and graduate/professional student members; and 5) expressions of interest in committee service offered by faculty, academic professionals, undergraduate students and graduate/professional students. In

addition, the committee shall select senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the University Senate and its committees. The committee also shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, sex, and academic rank in constituting committees.

- b. To meet during the fall semester with committee chairs, on a rotating basis determined by the committee, to review with each committee chair the charge to the committee and how well it has been functioning, and pursuant to these discussions, to make recommendations to the Senate Consultative Committee about any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership which it deems appropriate.
- c. To review and forward as appropriate to the University Senate any proposed changes to the charge, membership, or ex officio members for committees of the University Senate prior to approval from the University Senate.

...

ARTICLE VI. COMMITTEES OF THE STUDENT SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Student Senate)

...

5. Student Senate Committee Charges

...

C. STUDENT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Student Committee on Committees appoints students members of certain committees of the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Student Senate, and advises the Student Consultative Committee on the committee structure of the Student Senate.

Membership

The Senate Committee on Committees shall be composed of ~~6~~ 5 elected ~~undergraduate~~ students and ~~one elected graduate/professional student~~.

~~Of the undergraduate student members, 3 shall be elected from the Twin Cities campus, and one each from the Crookston, Duluth, and Morris campuses. The Twin Cities undergraduate members shall be elected by the Twin Cities undergraduate Student Senate members from among their number. The graduate/professional student shall be elected by the graduate and professional Student Senate members from among their number. Crookston, Duluth, and Morris members shall be elected by their campus assemblies. Elections shall be held during spring semester. Any student committee position that cannot be filled by October 1 will become a Student Senate at large position and may be filled by the Student Consultative Committee on an interim basis until the next general election.~~

Of the 5 student members, three shall be elected by the Student Consultative Committee from among their members. Of these three members, at least one must be from the Twin Cities and at least one must be from a coordinate campus. This election will take place at the May Student Consultative Committee meeting. The remaining two members shall be elected from among the student senators by the Student Senate at their final meeting of the academic year. One seat is designated for a coordinate campus student senator and the second seat is designated for a Twin

Cities student senator. If quorum is not present at the final Student Senate meeting, nominations will be sought and the election will be conducted by the Student Consultative Committee.

Student vacancies shall be filled in accordance with the preceding procedures for the balance of any unexpired term ~~until the next general election.~~

The Student Committee on Committees shall elect its chair from amongst its members for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To forward annually to the Student Senate for approval names of undergraduate students, graduate/professional students, and chairs it recommends for appointment to those committees of the Student Senate specified in the Bylaws of the Student Senate. The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various campuses and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the undergraduate student or graduate/professional student member currently is serving; 3) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student and graduate/professional student members, and the presidents of the respective student associations; and 4) expressions of interest in committee service offered by undergraduate students and graduate/professional students. In addition, the committee shall select student senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Student Senate and the committees and shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, gender, and class rank in constituting committees.
- b. To solicit annually from ~~each newly elected member of the Student Senate~~ all students a list of Senate committees ~~on which the senator is serving or in which the student has an interest in serving.~~
- c. To review periodically the committees of the Student Senate and recommend to the Student Consultative Committee any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership which it deems appropriate.
- d. To review and forward as appropriate to the Student Senate any proposed changes to the charge, membership, or ex officio members for committees of the Student Senate prior to approval from the Student Senate.
- e. To recommend to the Senate Committee on Committees, the Faculty Committee on Committees, the Student Consultative Committee, and the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

...

COMMENT:

The Student Committee on Committees (SCOC), met in March to discuss the annual student committee appointment process as some committee chairs were asking for student committee member appointments to be made in spring or early September, instead of late October-mid November. This would allow all student members to attend the first committee meeting in the fall when planning for the year takes place.

When discussing this issue, SCOC members also discussed the membership/attendance issues that prohibit the functioning of the body or the implementation of an earlier appointment process. For this year, only Twin Cities undergraduates and the Morris representative have been appointed. This has been a pattern for the committee for over five years. Also, the Twin Cities members were not elected until October of this year as there was not quorum at the final Student Senate meeting of the previous academic year.

As most of the work of the committee should be scheduled in September so all students are appointed to Senate committees by the time these committees begin meeting, this timeline is difficult to follow when most SCOC members are not appointed/elected in the spring.

Therefore members are proposing that the membership of SCOC be more closely tied to that of the Student Consultative Committee (SSCC) and that appointments of the final SCOC members not wait until fall semester as is the current practice. The proposal also allows SSCC to elect nominated student senators if quorum does not exist at the final Student Senate meeting in the spring.

**JONATHAN COLEMAN, MEMBER
STUDENT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was not approved with only 16 votes in favor and none opposed.

NOT APPROVED

**8. RESOLUTION ON EXCUSED ABSENCE FOR ELECTION DAY VOTING
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on Excused Absence for Election Day Voting

The University of Minnesota Student Senate recommends to the President that the University revise its policy⁴ regarding legitimate absences to include voting in local, state, or national elections as a legitimate absence for which students will not be penalized.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Student Affairs (SCSA) moves the above resolution for the Student Senate. The SCSA believes that voting is a basic right guaranteed to voting-age students at the University of Minnesota; and many students encounter difficulties in scheduling time for voting due to constraints including commuting, and academic and extracurricular commitments.

The Minnesota Public Interest Research Group reports that not having sufficient time to vote is the top reason students give for failing to vote. Revising the University's policy would help ensure students have the time to exercise this basic civil duty and would increase the number of students participating in the democratic process.

⁴ <http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/MAKEUPWORK.html>

Moreover, Minnesota State Statute Section 204C.04⁵ gives every employee who is eligible to vote the right to “be absent from work for the time necessary to appear at the employee's polling place, cast a ballot, and return to work on the day of that election, without penalty or deduction from salary or wages because of the absence.” The SCSA believes students should be accorded a similar right to vote without risk of academic penalty.

**SILVIA CANELON, CO-CHAIR
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**JOYCE HOLL, CO-CHAIR
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A senator said that it is important that the student voice is heard during this election due to the two amendments on the ballot.

Another senator noted that attendance is part of the grade in many classes so students will be penalized unless voting is changed to a legitimate absence.

A senator agreed that voting should be a legitimate absence, but knows that it will be abused by some students which is why it is unlikely to be approved by the administration.

Another senator noted that the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) discussed this resolution yesterday and took no action as there is no way to verify that a student has voted or how much time voting took. Instead it will forward a statement to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) that encourages faculty to allow students to miss class to vote. However, students need to be responsible and inform faculty in advance.

A senator said that the University should provide time off to vote and students should email their professors in advance to provide notice.

Another senator noted that many faculty assume that students are irresponsible and will abuse the system, however most students are committed to the process and casting a vote in person.

A senator said that access to voting takes longer than the 10 minutes to cast a vote due to travel time to and from the polls and the time needed to wait in line. Students should be able to request a half day off of classes to vote as there are already many other obstacles that students face. The University should also work to creatively solve abuse issues and not just perpetuate the status quo.

Another senator agreed with the resolution but is unsure how to regulate usage.

A senator stated that abuse should be a concern, but the majority of students who want to vote should not be punished because a few abuse the opportunity. The University should be encouraging higher student voting rates by allowing voting as a legitimate absence.

Another senator noted that prior notice to the professor should be a requirement of the legitimate absence.

A senator stated that students should be recognized as responsible citizens who typically have a

⁵ <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=204c.04>

low turnout rate.

Another senator noted that students should not be disenfranchised by University policy

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

APPROVED

**9. RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE REAL FOOD CHALLENGE
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE REAL FOOD CHALLENGE

Because the University of Minnesota has led the way in educating the public on the ways in which it understand food systems, the Student Senate believes that the administration of the University of Minnesota should consider the feasibility of signing on to the *Real Food Campus Commitment* through the Real Food Challenge (<http://realfoodchallenge.org/commitment>).

As per the *Campus Commitment*, the Student Senate believes that the University of Minnesota should:

- “Commit to annually increasing procurement of ‘real food’ – defined as local/community-based, fair, ecologically sound, and/or humane ... so as to meet or exceed 20% of food purchases by 2020.”
- “Commit to establishing a transparent reporting system ... to assess food procurement and commit to compiling these assessment results in an *annual progress report*.”
- “Commit to forming a *food systems working group* ... responsible for developing and coordinating the implementation of an official *real food policy* and *multi-year action plan*.”
- “Commit to making the *real food policy*, *multi-year action plan* and *annual progress reports* publicly available online and through the Real Food Challenge.”
- “Commit to increasing awareness about ecologically sustainable, humane and socially equitable food systems on campus through co-curricular activities, cafeteria-based education and other appropriate means.”

**JOSHUA PRESTON, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Joshua Preston, Student Senate Chair, noted that Morris approved this resolution a few weeks ago and is now looking for Student Senate support. The resolution asks that sustainable food be used on campus and, if the University is unable to commit, then it explain the reasons for noncompliance.

Q: Does this resolution address food quality or fat content?

A: No but if approved, that conversation can also begin.

Q: Who will be responsible for ensuring that the 20 percent is attained?

A: Dining services on each campus.

A senator stated that 20 percent of the University's food might already come from within the radius in the resolution, but students do not know. This resolution will ask dining services to provide this information and explain reasons why it is below the 20 percent.

Another senator said that this resolution encourages the University to take a step forward with its food service.

A senator noted that while there is support for local foods, organic food is not always healthier for people and the cost can be an issue for implementation.

Another senator suggested that the resolution be amended to just pertain to dining services and not other types of food service on campus.

Joshua Preston said that this resolution only asks the President to investigate if 20 percent is feasible for the University.

A senator then noted that Rochester currently has no dining services, so this resolution would not pertain to the campus at this time.

Another senator stated that this resolution raises valid questions and asks the University to focus on the concept versus the details. The University should be providing more locally-grown and healthier food for students who eat on campus.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was not approved due to a lack of quorum.

NOT APPROVED

10. RESOLUTION ON STUDENT ADVISING Action

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on Academic Advising

The Student Senate recommends that the President and the Board of Regents consider the data gathered by the University of Minnesota Duluth Task Force on Advising to help them implement standardized advising expectations and procedures for student advising on all campuses.

COMMENT:

The University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) Task Force on Advising was charged with the responsibility of analyzing the current advising process at UMD and then putting forth recommendations as to what would be the best way to resolve the issues. This process took place from October 30, 2009 to March 10, 2010. The research was extensive and comprehensive. Because this is a developing issue on the Duluth campus it was brought to the Student Senate to find out if it was an issue on other campuses as well. The following statements are not all of the

material gathered from the task force but rather a few highlights that should be taken into consideration:

- Advising goals are not clearly articulated nor assessed to determine how well they support students' transition to college, degree progress, attainment of education and career goals, and satisfaction.
- Some students perceive their advisors as not caring about their individual progress and educational goals.
- Some students do not take full advantage of their advisee-advisor relationship or are ill prepared to benefit from meetings with their advisors.
- Some faculty may not invest time and effort in their advising role because it is not valued within tenure, promotion, and merit reviews, or because of lack of time, given other responsibilities, to devote to advising.
- Expectations for collaboration are not clearly communicated from administration.
- Institutional expectations of advising are not explicit.
- A significant percentage of students report dissatisfaction with advising indicating that it does not meet their expectations.
- Primary advisor tools (e.g. APAS and Graduation Planner) lack data integrity due to inaccuracies in PCAS and ECAS

**HARRISON DEFRIES, MEMBER
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Harrison Defries, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) member from Duluth, stated that this resolution is asking the administration and Regents to be aware of the student concern with advising. As advising is not tied to tenure, some faculty do not take it seriously which is a problem for the students who are assigned to that advisor. Duluth has collected extensive data on this issue, which should be presented to the administration for their consideration.

A senator noted that Rochester has student success coaches and a required course that helps students plan their entire four years. Students meet with success coaches at least once each semester, and more regularly if needed. Progress is closely monitored due to the small student population. While this is not an issue at Rochester, they would support the resolution if there is an issue at the other campuses.

Q: What changes are being suggested by the resolution?

A: Duluth collected data for one year and offered a number of options for improvement. One simple solution was to update the website for APAS and the graduation planner. Another was to incorporate advising in faculty reviews for tenure.

Q: When was the proposal previously presented?

A: The topic was discussed at the April Student Senate meeting and at the last two SSCC meetings.

Q: Is the Student Senate required to bring an item to a meeting first for discussion before action is taken?

A: No.

Q: Can the Duluth materials be distributed for review?

A: There is a large binder of paper materials, but the executive summary should be available electronically and can be distributed.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was not approved due to a lack of quorum.

NOT APPROVED

11. APPOINTMENT OF 2012-13 STUDENT SENATE MENTORS

FOR INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

DISCUSSION:

Hannah Bode, Sophie Wallerstedt, and Evan Vogel agreed to serve as 2012-13 Student Senate Mentors.

12. ELECTION OF 2012-13 STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR Election by 2012-13 Senators Only

Adam Matula, a student senator from the College of Science and Engineering, was elected Student Senate Chair.

13. ELECTION OF TWO 2012-13 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBERS Election by 2012-13 Senators Only [One coordinate campus senator and one Twin Cities senator]

Ben Baglio, a student senator from Morris, and Anna Beek, a student senator from the Graduate School, were nominated for these positions.

14. ELECTION OF 2012-13 TWIN CITIES MEMBERS OF THE STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE Election by 2012-13 Twin Cities Senators Only [One Twin Cities undergraduate senator and one Twin Cities graduate/professional senator]

Katherine Saphner, a student senator from the College of Liberal Arts, was elected as the Twin Cities undergraduate member of the Student Senate Nominating Committee.

15. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

16. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

**APPENDIX A
ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS, 2011-12**

FACULTY

The Faculty Senate met 5 times during 2011-12.

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Abosch, Aviva	2	2
Allen, Sharon	2	2
Anderson, Kristin	3	1
Arnold, Bill	3	2
Avery, Patricia	3	2
Bache, Robert	4	1
Bakdash, Bashar	5	0
Barnes, Randal	5	0
Bebeau, Muriel	5	0
Beeman, William	4	1
Belani, Kumar	4	0
Ben-Ner, Avner	5	0
Bitterman, Peter	4	0
Bohjanen, Paul	4	1
Bond, Daniel	3	0
Boulger, James	3	0
Bradeen, James	2	3
Braun, Bruce	4	1
Breen, Sheri	5	0
Brown, Robert	2	3
Brunner, C. Cryss	5	0
Buhlmann, Phil	5	0
Burns, Matthew	4	0
Campbell, Colin	4	1
Campbell, Stephen	3	0
Caraway, Teri	4	0
Chervany, Norman	4	0
Chomsky, Carol	5	0
Church, Tim	4	1
Churchill, Julie	3	2
Cleary, Paul	5	0
Cloyd, James	4	1
Cody, Claudia (res.1/12)	0	1
Cohen, Gary	5	0
Cohen, Jerry	4	1
Connett, John	4	0
Coulter, Jeffrey	4	1
Cramer, Christopher	5	0
D'Amato, Anthony	2	2
Davies, Rebecca	4	1
Davis, Dana	5	0
Deane, Bradley	0	5
Dee, Jayne Hager (res. 1/12)	2	0
DiCostanzo, Alfredo	1	2
Duke, Gordon	5	0

Durfee, William	3	2
Eells, Linda (res. 1/12)	2	0
Ehlke, Nancy	5	0
Elliott, Sean	4	1
Ericksen, Janet	5	0
Federico, Christopher	5	0
Gewirtz, Abigail	3	2
Grant, Malaika (apptd 2/12)	2	1
Gulliver, Robert	3	2
Gundel, Jeanette	2	2
Gupta, Angela	3	2
Gupta, Kalpna	3	1
Hamamoto, Darryl	3	2
Hartley, Debra (apptd 10/11)	3	1
Heimdahl, Mats	2	0
Hellerstedt, Wendy	3	0
Hertz, Marshall (fm. 3/12)	0	0
Hogquist, Kristin	3	2
Hollister, David	4	1
Horgan, Brian	2	3
Hunter, David (res. 2/12)	0	0
Ingbar, David	3	0
Jacobs, Walt	4	0
Jara, Cynthia	5	0
Jasper, Daniel	3	2
Kalambokidis, Laura	4	1
Kaler, Eric	5	0
Kaminsky, Amy	3	2
Kannan, Mathur	2	3
Kelekar, Ameeta (apptd 10/11)	3	1
Kirkpatrick, David	5	0
Kohlstedt, Sally Gregory	5	0
Konstan, Joseph	5	0
Kotlyar, Michael	5	0
Kudrle, Robert	3	2
Kulacki, Frank	3	1
Labuz, Joseph	4	1
Largaespada, David (res. 1/12)	2	0
Leitner, Helga	3	0
Lilyard, Caroline	4	1
Liu, Donald	3	0
Looman, Wendy	5	0
Low, Walter	1	2
Lytle, Leslie	4	1
Mann, Traci	4	0
Marczak, Mary	2	3
Marden, Albert	3	2
Marsolek, Chad	5	0
Martenson, Diana	5	0
May, Elaine Tyler	4	0
McComas, Jennifer	2	2
McCormick, Richard	5	0
McCulloch, Jan	4	1
McGuire, Lisa	3	2

McLoon, Linda	4	1
Mescher, Matthew	4	0
Miller, Cara	3	1
Minicucci, Larissa (res. 2/12)	0	0
Montgomery, Rebecca	4	1
Morrell, Peter	5	0
Morris, Leslie	3	2
Morrison, Fred	3	0
Murtaugh, Michael	2	1
Ng, Peh	5	0
Orr, Harry	4	1
Osterholm, Michael	4	1
Ostrow, Steven	3	2
Pacala, James	3	0
Page, Michelle	5	0
Pearson, Kathryn	5	0
Peden-McAlpine, Cynthia	3	1
Peterson, Sabrina	4	1
Poch, Robert	3	2
Pogoff, Lisa	5	0
Porter, Mary	0	5
Prell, Riv-Ellen	1	4
Pyles, Lee	2	1
Rabinowitz, Paula	3	2
Ramachandran, Gurumurthy	2	2
Rayburn, Judy	1	4
Reinders, Anke	5	0
Rhodus, Nelson	4	1
Ricketts, Richard	4	1
Robinson, Julia	4	1
Rodman, Gilbert	4	0
Rodriguez, Michael	4	1
Rose-Hellekant, Teresa (apptd 10/11)	3	1
Rowekamp, Jenise	5	0
Ruden, Paul	5	0
Sarafoglou, Kyriakie	4	0
Schottel, Janet	5	0
Schuster, Joseph	5	0
Sell, George	4	1
Shank, JB	4	1
Shier, Thomas	4	1
Shimizu, Yoji	4	1
Sick, Brian	4	1
Siepmann, Ilja	5	0
Simon, Terrence	5	0
Singh, Ashok (apptd 3/12)	2	0
Smith, Cheryl	4	1
Stelson, Kim	3	1
Strock, Jeffrey	3	2
Stromberg, Bert	4	1
Taussig, Karen-Sue	4	0
Thorpe, Suzanne	5	0
Tims, Albert	5	0
van Ryn, Michelle	4	1

VandenBosch, Kathryn (res. 1/12)	2	0
Vercellotti, Gregory	3	1
Wakefield, Ray	5	0
Waldfoegel, Joel	4	1
Wambach, Cathrine	4	1
Watson, Christopher	3	1
Watson, Peter (apptd 10/11)	2	1
Wells, Carol	4	1
Wolfe, Thomas (apptd. 10/11)	3	0

STUDENTS

The Student Senate met 5 times during 2011-12.

(fm. = forfeiture of membership for nonattendance)

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Aasness, Alisha	0	4
Apungu, Elizabeth (apptd 12/11, fm, 4/12)	0	1
Baglio, Ben (apptd 4/12)	1	0
Bartholomew, Angela	2	3
Beek, Anna (apptd 3/12)	2	0
Bode, Hannah	2	3
Brakke, Noah (res. 2/12)	0	1
Brumm, Catherine (apptd. 12/11)	1	2
Carlson, Claire (fm. 1/12)	0	0
Coleman, Jonathan	5	0
Collins, Olivia	2	2
Combs, Emily (apptd. 11/11)	4	0
Conti, Nicole (apptd 3/12)	1	0
Cornish, James (apptd 2/12, fm. 4/12)	0	0
Dai, Ziran (apptd 12/11)	2	1
Defries, Harrison	5	0
DeLand, Lauren	2	0
Doherty, Del (fm. 1/12)	1	0
Dorumsgaard, Cody	4	1
Dullinger, Jackie	1	2
Eisenschenk, Kendra (apptd 12/11)	2	2
Fredericks, Matt (apptd 12/11)	2	1
Ha, Kevin (fm. 1/12)	1	0
Hanson, Mark (apptd 12/11)	4	0
Heyduk, Courtnee (apptd 1/12)	5	0
Hoffmann, Melody (fm. 1/12)	0	0
Howell, Monica	4	1
Huibregtse, Lucas (apptd 12/11, fm. 3/12)	0	0
Inhofer, Joe (apptd 3/12)	3	0
Judd, Chris	5	0
Kakach, Dustin	4	1
Kaul, Charles (apptd 12/11, fm. 3/12)	0	0
Khan, Kanza (res. 1/12)	1	1

Kraft, David (apptd 12/11)	3	1
Matula, Adam (res. 2/12)	2	0
McDaniel, Benjamin (apptd 11/11)	2	0
McNally, Andrew (apptd 11/11)	1	2
Mohn, Becky	4	1
Monke-Lundberg, Isaac	3	2
Morris, Jonathan (apptd 12/11)	1	2
Naistat, David	1	3
Olson, Kyle	5	0
Park, Sharin (res. 12/11)	2	0
Preston, Joshua	4	1
Rensch, Hayden (apptd 12/11)	4	0
Roban, Phil (apptd 12/11)	3	1
Robinson, Jaycob (fm. 1/12)	1	0
Rounthwaite, Adair (fm. 2/12)	0	2
Rybak, Lindsay (fm. 1/12)	1	0
Saphner, Katharine	5	0
Schreiner, Joshua (fm. 1/12)	0	0
Schuster, Damien (fm. 1/12)	0	0
Sellner, Wesley	3	1
Showalter, Andy (fm. 4/12)	3	0
Singh, Amit	4	1
Strand, Zachary (fm. 1/12)	0	0
Timm, Andrew (apptd 12/11)	2	2
Vincent, Jared (fm. 1/12)	0	0
Vogel, Evan (apptd 12/11)	3	0
Wallerstedt, Sophie	5	0
Warner, Nathan (res. 2/12)	0	1

ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

The University Senate met 5 times during 2011-12.

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Anderson, Neil D.	4	1
Craig, William	1	4
DeZelar-Tiedman, Christine	5	0
Dilworth, Stephanie	5	0
Doerr, Susan	4	0
Enrici, Pamela	5	0
Fulda, Henry	5	0
Gilbert, Scott	4	1
Grimes, Stacey	5	0
Hagen, Ann	5	0
Hearn, Stephen	5	0
Jamsen, Kirsten	4	1
Jetter, Mary	4	1
Kucera, Jean	5	0
Kurtti, Erling	5	0
Murdoch, Cynthia	5	0

Pearthree, Steven	5	0
Schulz, Cathy	5	0
Seifert, Laura	2	3
Shamliyan, Tatyana	5	0
Simon, Kimberly	5	0
Trautman, Travis	5	0
Waldemar, Sarah	3	2
Wareham, Roger	5	0
Weber-Paxton, Sheryl	5	0

CIVIL SERVICE

The University Senate met 5 times during 2011-12.

(fm. = forfeiture of membership for nonattendance)

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Barsness, Josette	4	1
Cable-Morrison, Susan	4	0
Cavalier, Don	5	0
DeVriendt, Rod	4	1
Engebretson, Brent	5	0
Fedie, Elizabeth (res. 2/12)	0	0
Flynn, Everett (res. 4/12)	2	0
Frank-Quick, Alison	4	0
Hussain, Rahfat	5	0
Kurland, Jeffrey	3	0
Lantz, Caryn	5	0
Mason, Lisa	4	1
Nielsen, Carol	5	0
Nyberg, Dennis	5	0
O'Neill, Bill	3	2
Olson, Amy L.	5	0
Paton, John	5	0
Roth, Patricia	4	1
Schneider, Vicki (apptd 1/12)	2	0
Seeger, Paula	5	0
Stevens, Chris	3	2
Tool, Joanie	0	5
Van Eps, Sharon	4	1
Wagner, Susan	5	0
Wallace, Terri	5	0
Willhite, Gary	3	2