

## 2012-13 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DECEMBER 6, 2012

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2012-13 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, December 6, 2012, at 2:01 p.m., as a joint meeting of the two bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 21 academic professional members, 22 civil service members, 127 faculty/academic professional members, and 22 student members. President Kaler presided.

### 1. CENTENNIAL EVENT

#### Private Sector Collaboration

Are profit motives less noble than those guiding traditional funding mechanisms?

Panelists: Gary Balas, Arthur Erdman, J. Michael Oakes, Lynn Zentner

#### Shifting Faculty Demographics

Are tenure and academic freedom at risk?

Panelists: David Bernlohr, Carol Chomsky, Karen Miksch, Jean Quam

### 2. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS

#### Information

#### UNIVERSITY SENATE

Procedure on Hiring Senior Administrators: Senate Committee Involvement

Approved by the: University Senate May 3, 2012

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING**

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Statement *Against* the Proposed “Photo Identification Required for Voting” Amendment to the Constitution of the State of Minnesota

Approved by the: University Senate October 4, 2012

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\* The administration has received and acknowledges the sense of the University Senate.

Resolution Regarding the Voter ID Ballot Amendment

Approved by the: University Senate October 4, 2012

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\* The administration has received and acknowledges the sense of the University Senate.

Bylaw Amendment – Advisory Committee on Athletics Charge

Presented to the: University Senate October 4, 2012

Approved by the: Administration – no action required

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Bylaw Amendment –Committee on Committees Charge  
Approved by the: University Senate October 4, 2012  
Approved by the: Administration – no action required  
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Bylaw Amendment – Senate Consultative Committee Charge  
Approved by the: University Senate October 4, 2012  
Approved by the: Administration – no action required  
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Bylaw Amendment – Decanal service on committees  
Approved by the: University Senate October 4, 2012  
Approved by the: Administration – no action required  
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Rules Amendment – Decanal service on committees  
Approved by the: University Senate October 4, 2012  
Approved by the: Administration – no action required  
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

**3. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**  
**2011-12 Committee on Committee Report on Reviewed Committees**  
**Information for the University Senate**

**FOR INFORMATION:**

The Committee on Committees (ConC) charge was amended in February 2011 to include the following provisions:

- 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.

The ConC reviewed the following committees in 2011-12:

- Disabilities Issues
- Equity, Access, and Diversity
- Information Technologies
- Library

**OVERALL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Given the proliferation of ad hoc committees whose actions overlap with the SCIT charge, ConC recommends that the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) discuss with administration how they are to be coordinated with the Senate governance structure to avoid creating parallel efforts that are not in communication with each other.

2. Recommend that SCC addresses a serious concern about the clarity of how a committee's items, whether for information, discussion, or action, for the Senate agenda are put forward by another committee or by the SCC.
3. Recommend that SCC engage in discussion with those committees whose charges include language about "supporting compliance" as in the areas of equity and access (Disability Issues and EAD) so as to create dialogue about the most effective use of University resources, whether through the efforts of ex officio members whose departments are responsible for compliance, or through effective use of the Senate agenda to initiate policy discussions when large areas of compliance are found to be lacking. Example: recent report on salary equity issues for women. Included in this discussion should be work on how to efficiently ensure that items are brought to committee agendas from across the University.
4. A common thread of concern among some members of three committees was a lack of clarity in one or more of the committee functions: 1) Clear definition of committee responsibility; 2) Whom do they serve? Administrative units with ex officio representatives, faculty, or the University Senate; and 3) How to affect change in practices or policies. These areas of ambiguity suggest that new committee members need more orientation about University governance and specifically about Senate Committee functions, responsibilities, and normal operating procedures.
5. The use of internal subcommittees within a Senate Committee to examine the composition, scope, function, and responsibilities of the committee, as was found in the Library Committee report of February 2010, should occur as a regular self-assessment on a three-year schedule for all committees with the reports going to the ConC and the SCC.

The full report on these committees is available at: [http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/conc/11-12conc\\_report.pdf](http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/conc/11-12conc_report.pdf)

**STACY DOEPNER-HOVE, CHAIR  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

#### **4. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY**

##### **FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF**

Kent Bales  
Professor  
English Languages and Literature  
1936 – 2012

M.A.R. Barker  
Professor  
South Asian Studies  
1929 – 2012

Margery Durham  
Associate Professor  
English Languages and Literature  
1933 - 2012

Norman Fruman

Professor  
English Languages and Literature  
1923 – 2012

William Douglas Kilbourn, Jr.  
Professor  
Law School  
1925 – 2012

Harris C. McClaskey  
Associate Professor  
Library School  
1931 – 2012

V. Rama Murthy  
Professor  
Geology and Geophysics  
1933 – 2012

James Serrin  
Regents Professor  
Mathematics  
1926 – 2012

Gary Tykeson  
Senior Administrative Director  
Medical School  
1937 - 2012

## **STUDENTS**

Brittany L. Christensen  
College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences

Belinda M. Williams Johnson  
College of Education and Human Development

Tanner J. Pap  
College of Liberal Arts

Sheron Sarpong  
College of Liberal Arts

## **5. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Professor Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), stated that SCC has met twice since the last Senate meeting. Topics included a discussion with Norwood Teague and his perception of the University's athletics programs and his aspirations for it, including the challenges involved with filling the new stadium, preparing to have the Vikings move into that space temporarily, and support for student athletes. SCC also talked with Brian Steeves, newly appointed Executive Director and Corporate Secretary to the Board of Regents, regarding the demographic profile of members of the Board and the ways they might engage with constituencies on campus. SCC also met with President Kaler to discuss his plans

for System Academic Administration, which have involved distributing the responsibilities but not eliminating any of the departments and programs.

SCC also discussed the complete report of the Committee on Committees on the reviews they conducted last year. She noted that the Committee will soon be soliciting applications and nominations for committee membership and she urged faculty and academic professionals to consider serving and also to nominate colleagues they know would be strong and engaged members.

The SCC also approved updated versions of the review responsibilities of Senate committees for both Regents' and administrative policies. Nearly every policy has a path for governance review before it is changed. The matrix for review now does more to incorporate the Professional and Administrative Consultative Committee and the Civil Service Consultative Committee on matters having to do with employment and responsibilities on campus that should come under their purview. A goal was also to make the review process efficient without limiting essential consultation.

Lastly, Professor Kohlstedt reported that vice chair Michael Hancher, secretary Gary Engstrand, and she attended a Council on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) meeting with governance leaders from other campuses just last week. It was an opportunity to consider current issues on the campuses, including the recent expansion of the Big Ten, and also to compare governance capacities and practices. She said that she was struck by the increasing commercialization of campuses, less evident here at Minnesota than at some peer institutions, as research universities face declining revenues and relentlessly increasing expenses. The governance leaders in attendance emphasized the importance of having shared governance on creative decision-making at the outset of new initiatives and changing policies. Emphasizing such engagement will remain a commitment on SCC this year.

## **6. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 4, 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/121004sen.pdf>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK  
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

### **DISCUSSION:**

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

**APPROVED**

## **7. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

President Kaler said that much has happened since the October meeting of the University Senate. Brian Herman will be joining the University in January as the new Vice President for Research, replacing Tim Mulcahy who retires later this month after a very successful run in this position.

An announcement will be made tomorrow regarding the Vice President for Equity and Diversity. He realizes that this has been a long search, but he is pleased to bring this new leader on board to help advance this important area of the University. At the end of this month Senior Vice President Robert Jones is also leaving the University. With him goes years of wisdom as well as a deep and broad portfolio. A task force recommendation was to eliminate the Office of System Academic Administration and realign units starting January 1. These changes build on the strong foundation that has been established, and it also has cost savings involved.

These changes continue a remarkable change in senior leadership in the last 18 months. He looks forward to fresh eyes, ideas, and questions while realizing that decades of institutional memory are also being lost. He asked the University Senate to proactively engage the new leaders and share its institutional history.

He then reported that the University of Minnesota Foundation and the Minnesota Medical Foundation are about to merge pending final approval by their boards. This transition will allow the University to speak with a single voice to its donor community and seamlessly address opportunities for philanthropy. A new leader will then be sought for this single organization.

As he discussed today with the Senate Consultative Committee and the two athletic advisory committees, the Big Ten is expanding to 14 members with the addition of Rutgers and Maryland.

President Kaler has been continuing his regular faculty lunches, department visits, and met with the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA) and other graduate and professional students. This last meeting was important as an open dialogue is needed with graduate and professional students to be able to work together to address concerns and move their educational pathway forward.

Last month he also had the opportunity to meet a special alumnus, Brian Kobilka, who is a 1977 Duluth graduate and who was awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry this year. He is very proud of this graduate and the University of Minnesota Duluth.

Next week when the Regents meet he will be proposing a capital request which will largely request HEAPR funds for system-wide renovations and energy efficiency upgrades. The relationship with the legislature may change as a consequence of the recent election but it is important to remember that the outcome of the election did not generate any new funds for the state budget. This means that discussions about allocation of funds will be robust as the December state budget forecast predicts a deficit. This is coupled with the federal fiscal cliff and the impact that it will have on state tax revenues and state aid.

Jason Rohloff from Government Relations will be working with the legislators to educate them about the University. President Kaler invited all senators to attend the Legislative Briefing on Wednesday, January 23 at 6:00 pm. He hopes that faculty and staff will be vigorous advocates along with student families on the issue of capping undergraduate tuition.

The Regents will also be examining the entrepreneurial leave policy next week, which he supports and is scheduled on the Faculty Senate agenda. This provides an opportunity for faculty to spread their wings while maintaining fidelity to the University.

President Kaler hoped that senators would root for the Gopher Women's Volleyball team who are playing the NCAA Sweet 16 tournament, which is the team's fourth straight appearance. The University of Minnesota Duluth's football coach, Bob Nielson, is a finalist for the national coach of the year and Morris' football team has its best record in six years. Lastly, the Gopher football team will play in Houston on December 28 against Texas Tech, and tickets are still available.

In closing he noted that as finals begin and the holidays start, this is a stressful time for students, faculty, and staff. He encouraged everyone to reacquaint themselves with campus resources that are available and wished senators a safe, wonderful, and happy holiday season.

## **8. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT**

**NONE**

## **9. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

## **10. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS**

**NONE**

## **11. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT**

The University Senate adjourned at 3:47 pm.

## **12. 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

Rules Amendment – Decanal service on committees  
Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 4, 2012  
Approved by the: Administration – no action required  
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Rules Amendment – Finance and Planning Committee ex officio membership  
Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 4, 2012  
Approved by the: Administration – no action required  
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Bylaw Amendment – Decanal service in the Faculty Senate  
Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 12, 2012  
Approved by the: Administration – no action required

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Bylaw Amendment – Decanal service on committees

Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 12, 2012

Approved by the: Administration – no action required

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Bylaw Amendment – Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics Charge

Presented to the: Faculty Senate October 4, 2012

Approved by the: Administration – no action required

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

### **13. CLERK OF THE SENATE REPORT Electronic Vote Results Information for the Faculty Senate**

#### **FOR INFORMATION:**

Following the October 4, 2012, Faculty Senate meeting, an electronic vote was taken to approve two proposed Senate Bylaw amendments concerning decanal service in the Faculty Senate and on Faculty Senate committees. At the end of the three working day voting period, 102 votes in favor, 2 opposed, and no abstentions were received; 84 affirmative votes were required. These amendments were approved.

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK  
FACULTY SENATE**

### **14. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Professor Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), began her report by recognizing Gary Engstrand for his 25 years of service in the Senate and to the Faculty and Senate Consultative Committees, along with other Senate committees. She then presented him with a plaque and the Faculty Senate gave him a standing ovation.

She then noted that since October, the Faculty Consultative Committee has met nine times and spoken with a number of administrators, including Vice President and Chief Information Officer Scott Studham, Norwood Teague, Provost Hanson, and President Kaler. FCC has also met with committee chairs, including those who serve as ex officio members of the FCC, to follow the issues that they are addressing.

FCC continues to discuss the progress being made with regard to gender equity in faculty salaries and is assured by Provost Hanson that colleges are moving forward. FCC has also initiated a new practice by inviting her, when possible, to present a 5-10 minute report and respond to questions at the Faculty Senate in a matter parallel to that of the President to the University Senate. She is inaugurating that participation today.

The committee has discussed decanal reviews because there are five significant deans being reviewed this year. A subcommittee under Professor James Pacala discussed the survey being used and thought it was adequate but expressed concern about how individual identities would be masked in small departments. The Provost assured FCC that the Human Resources staff would



be alerted to the issue and address it. There will also be ongoing discussions about the timing of reviews and the way to report outcomes.

FCC has also appointed subcommittee to review college constitutions to determine the patterns of governance participation with a report anticipated in the spring. FCC has also had thoughtful discussions about the proposed entrepreneurial leaves and it supports this new initiative.

## **15. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS UPDATE**

Professor George Sheets, one of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons along with Professor Brian Buhr, serve as a conduit for exchanging information between faculty and the legislature. Their duty is to interact with higher education committees, share the faculty perspective, and monitor developments that affect the University. At times this means that they will call on faculty colleagues to testify at the legislature. He invited all faculty to communicate suggestions to him now and throughout the session.

Professor Buhr noted that his experience involves working with the Faculty Consultative Committee, faculty from extension and the research and outreach centers, K-12 schools, and MnSCU system.

## **16. PROVOST'S REPORT**

Provost Karen Hanson thanked the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to listen to the discussions at today's centennial event and meet at regular intervals to provide updates from her office and solicit suggestions.

One major topic is the reorganizations of the infrastructure support for digital initiatives at the University. For the Twin Cities campus an RFP has been issued and the deadline is approaching to submit proposals. She hopes that all units are thinking about programmatic efforts to enhance teaching efforts using digital technologies.

Faculty are expressing interest in informal ways in the MOOC efforts taking place at other institutions and whether the University will be participating. The University is trying to support these efforts and interested faculty should contact Professor Chris Cramer, Faculty Liaison for the year. Faculty input will be key as the ground is shifting quickly in these areas. On a related note, the Carnegie Foundation is looking at the notion of a credit hour in a different way and rethinking whether it should be defined by seat time or time spent studying versus a competency-based notion. It is important that Minnesota remain a leader in education by being attentive to these changes.

The University is also reconfiguring many support services for teaching and learning. The Center for Teaching and Learning will soon report to the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. She would like to know what faculty need most from this center. Copyright permissions have been moved to the University Libraries to facilitate the work in open source permissions and publishing. There is a willingness from the University to invest in new initiatives.

Provost Hanson reminded faculty about the importance of nominating colleagues for awards, both nationally and internationally.

As has already been announced, some of the administrative reorganization affects the provost's office. Departments moving under her umbrella include international programs, public

engagement, and extension. A few centers that currently report to her will be moving to the Vice President for Research. She wants to solicit input on how these transitions can best be done and how these offices can best serve the University and its academic mission.

As was previously mentioned, decanal reviews are underway and suggestions about how these reviews are conducted are welcome to shape changes for next year. Her office continues to review and make process adjustments as the reconfiguration of the Graduate School is carried out in colleges.

The CIC has welcomed colleagues at Maryland and Rutgers into the organization. She would like units to address how these connections might be meaningful and which collaborations need to be fostered. Faculty input will be needed to reshape this organization.

Provost Hanson then noted that federal regulations continue to vex administrations at all institutions. The Association of American Universities (AAU) has been having a robust discussion about how to convince the government to streamline these regulations so that they are less burdensome and costly to the institutions.

Lastly she noted that the search has begun for the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and the Director of Northrop has been hired. She wants to ensure that when Northrop reopens, it has heavy academic programming scheduled.

Q: What is the role for faculty advice in the decanal review and reappointment process?

A: Every administrator's letter of appointment, including that of deans, notes that service is at the pleasure of the appointing officer. Deans currently have formal reviews, involving faculty input, every three years but this timeline is up for review as well. Annual reviews also take place and there can be a non-reappointment at that time, but the formal review allows for wider input into the direction of the unit and its leader.

Q: He has noticed that the review of department heads and chairs has not been done and these individuals continue. Why are these reviews not being done and if done, are they substantial and have value when making decisions?

A: Some of these reviews have been delayed due to the transition in her office but they are now on track.

Q: One challenge with decanal reviews is matching the review of an individual as the manager of a college with the review of a college and whether it is achieving its goals. Many times the review asks how well someone communicates, but faculty have the feeling that if the college is doing well, then these other concerns are not addressed. As there are two parts to the review, can the report that is generated address both questions?

A: The survey instrument could be redesigned so that the appropriate questions are asked of each segment providing responses.

## **17. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

## **18. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS**

## MOTION:

To approve changes to the Administrative Policy on Faculty Development Leaves as follows:



### ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

# Faculty Development Leaves

#### Policy Contents

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

**Effective Date:** March, 2006

**Last Updated:** , 2012

#### Responsible University Officer:

- Vice President for Human Resources

#### Policy Owner:

- Director, Human Resources Policy Development

#### Policy Contact:

See [Contacts Section](#).

---

## POLICY STATEMENT

Eligible faculty members may request development leaves to spend time away from the University in order to focus more intently on significant work already in progress or pursue new studies, investigations, research, scholarly writing or artistic projects. Leaves may also be used for curriculum development and other improvements to teaching. Senior leaders, returning to the faculty, may choose to request a development leave to refresh and increase expertise in teaching and research in their discipline following a significant period of administrative service. While development leaves for entrepreneurial work may typically involve ventures related to the development of University intellectual property (IP), other types of activities that can demonstrate substantial institutional benefit or that constitute an innovative and collaborative project relating to the public good are also eligible for consideration.

Faculty are provided the following types of leaves, based on their faculty appointment and other eligibility requirements:

- Tenured faculty – single semester, ~~and sabbatical~~ and entrepreneurial leaves
  - Tenure-track faculty – single semester and entrepreneurial leaves
  - Contract faculty members – single semester and sabbatical leaves
  - Tenured faculty members returning to a faculty role following the conclusion of a senior leadership appointment – single semester and sabbatical leaves
- Temporary, visiting, adjunct or clinical faculty from outside the University and faculty covered by a collective bargaining agreement are not eligible for these development leaves.

### Single Semester Leaves

#### Allocation of Leaves

The senior vice president for academic affairs and provost determines the number of single semester leaves and the allocation among colleges/campuses. Up to four percent of the regular faculty at the probationary rank of instructor or probationary and tenured ranks of assistant

professor, associate professor, or professor can be authorized for single semester leaves. Competition for these leaves takes place at departmental and collegiate levels. Contract faculty holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at the discretion of the department head/chair and dean may be granted single semester leaves.

### **Basis of Award and Eligibility**

Single semester leaves for regular faculty are awarded on the basis of years of service and results of the review of the proposal within the department and college, subject to final approval by the dean. The president may also grant this leave, in consultation with the appropriate dean, to a senior leader resuming a faculty role at the conclusion of a significant amount of time in a senior leadership position. Single semester leaves for contract faculty are awarded on the basis of years of service, results of the review of the proposal within the department and college and availability of funds. Both the department head/chair and the dean must approve the leave,

Probationary and contract faculty are eligible for a single semester leave after two academic or fiscal years of service in a University faculty appointment of 67 percent time or greater. Tenured faculty are eligible for a single semester leave after four academic or fiscal years of service in an appointment of 67 percent time or greater. Subsequent single semester leaves may be taken following four additional eligible years of service, in a University faculty appointment of 67 percent time or greater. Refer to Procedures, Determination of Years of Service For A Single Semester Leave.

### **Salary and Benefits During Leave**

A single semester leave is at full salary and benefits. For a senior leader returning to the faculty, the salary will be at the faculty salary rate. The salary and benefits paid during a single semester leave are not to be regarded as additional compensation for services already rendered, but as contemporaneous compensation for services rendered by the faculty member in developing professional knowledge and skill for subsequent service to students and the University.

### **Obligations**

- a. Faculty members granted single semester leaves must return to University service immediately following the leave for a period of time at least equal to the period of the leave and at the percentage of appointment held during the leave. A delay to return to service may be granted by the dean, with concurrence of the department head/chair, for a period without pay, not longer than the period of the leave.
- b. Faculty members who do not return or return for only a portion of the time due and have not been granted a written waiver by the appropriate senior vice president must reimburse the University for all or a prorated amount of the salary, retirement contributions, and value of benefits received during the leave. For senior leaders, refer to the Administrative Policy: *Senior Leader Compensation and Separation*.
- c. Contract faculty members receiving a notice of non-renewal during the period of the single semester leave will be provided a written waiver at the time of notice. The contract faculty member is not required to return to the unit for a period at least equal to the period of leave and is not required to reimburse the University for the amount of salary, retirement contributions, and all other fringe benefits received during the leave.

### **Reporting**

Faculty members must file with their department and college a summary report addressing the results of the work done while on leave. The report is to be submitted within three months of their return from leave.

## **Sabbatical Leaves**

### **Length of Leave**

A sabbatical leave may be granted for one or two semesters for faculty on an academic year appointment, five and one-half months, or eleven months for faculty on a fiscal year appointment. A leave of more than one semester normally is taken in consecutive (fall, spring) terms. For choosing to take a sabbatical leave of one semester only, the privilege to the second semester (or second half of the year) is waived.

### **Basis of Award and Eligibility**

Sabbatical leaves for tenured faculty are awarded on the basis of years of service and review within the department and college, subject to approval by the dean. The president may also grant this leave, in consultation with the appropriate dean, to a senior leader resuming a faculty role at the conclusion of a significant amount of time in a senior leadership position. Sabbatical leaves for contract faculty are awarded on the basis of service, review within the department and college, and availability of funds. Both the department head/chair and the dean must approve the leave,

Although worthy sabbatical leaves may not be denied for administrative convenience, deans may delay and restructure them for up to one year in order to relieve constraints upon department or unit budgets or to ensure that key courses remain available to students. Such delay reduces by the same time the period of eligibility for a subsequent sabbatical leave.

A tenured faculty member is entitled to the privilege of a sabbatical leave of up to one year after six academic years of service. A senior leader resuming a faculty role may be granted a sabbatical leave. A contract faculty member may be awarded a sabbatical leave of up to one year after six academic years of service. Refer to Procedures, Determination of Years of Service For A Sabbatical Leave.

### **Accrual of Credit**

No more than six years of credit may accrue toward a sabbatical leave. Credit toward a sabbatical leave is accrued during continuous years of service. Such credit is for the purpose of a sabbatical leave and cannot be cashed out or traded for other benefits.

### **Income and Benefits During Leave**

#### **a. Salary and Benefits**

Sabbatical leaves are compensated at one-half salary and full benefits. The salary during the leave is based upon the faculty member's regular University salary at the time the leave is initiated. For a senior leader returning to the faculty, the salary will be at the faculty salary rate. The salary and benefits paid during a sabbatical leave are not to be regarded as additional compensation for services already rendered but as contemporaneous compensation for services rendered by the faculty member in developing professional knowledge and skill for subsequent service to students and the University.

#### **b. Income Augmentation**

Faculty members on sabbatical leave may augment their sabbatical income up to the level of their regular University salary, provided that the activities yielding the additional compensation are consistent with the purpose of the sabbatical leave. Permission must be obtained from the department head/chair and dean. In establishing the level of permissible sabbatical income, University-approved consulting activities in which the faculty member has been engaged, that do not conflict with the purposes of the leave, will not be considered when calculating the permissible level of income augmentation.

Expenses related to the purposes of the leave may also be taken into account in determining the level of permissible income. Faculty members are encouraged to seek funding from non-University sources to cover the portion of salary not provided under this leave.

c. **Faculty Sabbatical Supplement Program**

The Faculty Sabbatical Supplement Program provides supplemental funds to colleges to support sabbaticals for recommended tenured faculty. The program provides additional income for tenured faculty who seek to enhance their ability in scholarship, creative work, teaching, or service to the community. Tenured faculty taking a sabbatical leave for nine months or longer may compete for supplementary funding, with review by the department head/chair and dean. Upon the advice of the dean, the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost grants supplementary funding. The senior vice president for academic affairs and provost funds two-thirds of the supplemental pool and the colleges fund one-third. Availability of funds and the distribution of those funds are generally announced around December/January.

For sabbatical leaves of one or two semesters (or five & a half or eleven months) for those on fiscal-year appointments, tenured faculty may request supplemental funds to cover an additional 30 percent of their recurring base salary (not including fringe), not to exceed \$30,000. Procedures with regard to these requests are to be established by each college or campus. The dean is to provide the office of the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost an annual report of the faculty granted supplementary funds to support sabbatical leaves.

### **Obligations**

- a. Faculty members granted sabbatical leaves must return to University service immediately following the leave for a period of time at least equal to the period of the leave, and at the percentage of appointment held during the leave. A delay to return to service may be granted by the dean, with concurrence of the department head/chair, for a period without pay, not longer than the period of the leave.
- b. Faculty members who do not return or return for only a portion of the time due and have not been granted a written waiver by the appropriate senior vice president must reimburse the University for all or a prorated amount of the salary, retirement contributions, and value of benefits received during the leave. For senior leaders, refer to the Administrative policy: *Senior Leader Compensation and Separation*.
- c. Contract faculty members receiving a notice of nonrenewal during the period of the sabbatical leave will be provided a written waiver at the time of notice. The contract faculty member is not required to return to the unit for a period at least equal to the period of leave and is not required to reimburse the University for the amount of salary, retirement contributions, and all other fringe benefits received during the leave.

### **Reporting**

Faculty members are to file with their department and college a summary report addressing the results of the work done while on leave. The report is to be submitted within three months of their return from leave.

### **Entrepreneurial Leaves**

Entrepreneurial leaves may be granted to tenured or tenure-track faculty. While this leave may typically involve ventures related to the development of University intellectual property (IP), other types of activities that can demonstrate substantial institutional benefit or that constitute an innovative and collaborative project relating to the public good are also eligible for consideration.

### **Basis of Award and Eligibility**

Entrepreneurial leaves for faculty are awarded on the basis of years of service and results of the review of the proposal within the department and college, subject to administrative approval.

Tenured faculty may be eligible for an entrepreneurial leave after four academic or fiscal years of service in a University faculty appointment of 67 percent time or greater, upon recommendation of the department head/chair and final approval of the dean. Under special circumstances, tenure-track faculty may be eligible for an entrepreneurial leave after four academic or fiscal years of service in a University faculty appointment of 67 percent time or greater. This leave requires the recommendation of the department head/chair and the dean with final approval of the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost.

Subsequent entrepreneurial leaves may be taken following four additional eligible years of service in a University faculty appointment of 67 percent time or greater, subject to administrative approval.

### **Length and Percentage of Leave**

An entrepreneurial leave may be a) a leave up to 50 percent time or b) a leave at 100 percent time. This leave may be granted for up to one year, with an extension of up to six months under special circumstances.

### **Salary and Benefits During Leave**

An entrepreneurial leave up to 50 percent time is at no salary for the percent of leave and full benefits. A leave of 100 percent time is at no salary with the department providing a taxable lump sum amount that may be used to help offset the cost of the University contribution to medical, dental, basic life and retirement plan contributions. The lump sum amount is equal to the value of the fringe benefit rate in effect as of the date the leave begins, multiplied by the individual's base salary. Neither the University subsidized benefits nor the lump sum amount is to be regarded as additional compensation for services already rendered, but as contemporaneous compensation for services rendered by the faculty member in furthering a culture of innovation and entrepreneurialism in service to the University.

### **Obligations**

- a. Faculty members granted entrepreneurial leaves must return to University service immediately following the leave for a period of time at least equal to the period of the leave and at the percentage of appointment at the time the leave commenced. A delay to return to service may be granted by the dean, with concurrence of the department head/chair, for a period without pay, not longer than the period of the leave.
- b. Faculty members who do not return or return for only a portion of the time due and have not been granted a written waiver by the appropriate senior vice president must reimburse the University for all or a pro-rated amount of the retirement contributions and value of benefits received or the lump-sum payment received during the leave.

### **Progress Updates**

During the course of their entrepreneurial leave, faculty members are expected to initiate monthly activity and progress discussions with their department head/chair. When University IP is involved, a representative from the Office of Technology Commercialization is to be included in these discussions.

### **Overall Frequency of Leaves**

The use of sabbaticals and other leaves (including, but not limited to, single-semester leaves, entrepreneurial leaves, those from foundations, leaves without pay, etc.) should not affect adversely the delivery of instruction or the functioning of a unit. Over a seven-year period,

faculty members may not be on leave for a total of more than three years, all leaves combined. Exceptions may be granted by deans and chancellors for additional leave time in rare circumstances (e.g. service to a federal granting agency).

### **Conflict Resolution**

Faculty members who are dissatisfied with decisions made under single semester, or sabbatical or entrepreneurial leave policy may contact the Office for Conflict Resolution and submit the disagreement for processing under the options provided in Board of Regents Policy: *Conflict Resolution Process for Employees*. In addition to the remedies provided by policy, other possible remedies may include granting the leave in question and subtracting the period of time during which the leave was inappropriately denied from the eligibility period for a future sabbatical leave.

---

### **REASON FOR POLICY**

This policy implements Board of Regents Policy: *Employee Compensation and Recognition*. Faculty development leaves are provided by the University as an opportunity for faculty to acquire new skills and knowledge, to enhance the communication of knowledge to students and society, to apply current knowledge to new applications, and to prepare senior leaders for their return to the faculty following a significant period of administrative service. The entrepreneurial leave would also increase the potential for successful translation and commercialization of research and increase public engagement and industry relationships. ~~They~~ These leaves benefit individuals, the students, the University, the citizens of the state, and all who are affected by the teaching, research, and outreach mission of the University.

During recent years, rapid changes in the nature and number of tasks to be carried out by faculty members in their teaching, research, creative, and outreach activities have made it all the more necessary for them to acquire these new skills and knowledge in order to discharge their duties in the best manner possible. Development leaves aid in attracting and retaining faculty dedicated to teaching, research, and service/outreach; and ensure the future vitality and quality of the University.

---

### **DISCUSSION:**

Professor Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), began by noting that these policy changes are coming to the Faculty Senate under New Business because it just went through the President's Policy Committee yesterday. The significant change relates to a new entrepreneurial leave policy that the President announced he was working on last spring. The goal was to create a way for faculty who wanted to take a leave that would involve "ventures related to the development of University intellectual property (IP)" and "other types of activities that can demonstrate substantial institutional benefit or that constitute an innovative and collaborative project relating to the public good." While sabbatical and single semester leaves emphasize scholarship and teaching innovation, entrepreneurial leaves emphasis activities where the faculty member will actually work for some other entity but get benefit support from the University because that work will bring some significant benefit to the University.

The policy language has taken several months because the FCC, working with the Faculty Affairs and Research Committees, wanted to be sure that this leave would be open to all faculty, because it was quite possible to envision opportunities for those in the humanities and social sciences to work with agencies, with non-profit organizations, or other entities where the results might be better collaborations, new collaborative grant applications, or other outcomes that would benefit students as well. The language in place now allows for that possibility as well.



She then noted that the conditions of this grant are somewhat different in that the faculty member is paid by the outside entity, although the leave does allow for benefit support. Most other elements are roughly the same with a requirement for reporting and the standard leave conditions that require a return to the University and a limit on the frequency of leaves.

A senator noted that he supports this policy and the change to the total amount of faculty leave. The policy amendment allows for three years of leave in a seven year period but allows for a waiver for good cause.

Another senator approved of the policy but noted that the title 'entrepreneurial leave' is a poor word choice as this type of leave is not always about making a profit.

Professor Kohlstedt noted that some faculty agreed that the word choice was not completely accurate, but that there was no better option to mark this leave as distinct from the other two.

Q: When would this leave first be available?

A: If approved by the Regents next week, it could be implemented by fall 2013.

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

**APPROVED**

## **19. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert  
Abstractor**

## **2012-13 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**DECEMBER 6, 2012**

### **STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2**

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2012-13 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, December 6, 2012, at 11:33 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 34 student members. Chair Adam Matula presided.

#### **1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information**

Amendments to the Student Conduct Code

Approved by the: Student Senate April 5, 2012

Approved by the: Administration October 2012

Approved by the: Board of Regents October 11, 2012

Resolution Regarding the Voter ID Ballot Amendment

Approved by the: Student Senate October 4, 2012

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\* The administration has received and acknowledges the sense of the Student Senate.

Bylaw Amendments – Decanal service on committees

Approved by the: Student Senate October 4, 2012

Approved by the: Administration - no action required

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

Rules Amendments – Decanal service on committees

Approved by the: Student Senate October 4, 2012

Approved by the: Administration - no action required

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

#### **2. 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, Chair of the P&A Senate, said the P&A Senate met on November 2 and will meet again tomorrow. In December it will be discussing changes to a 2009 advocacy document that has been revised, seeking candidates for the open 2012-13 chair-elect position as Kimberly Simon has left the University, reviewing an initial proposal to restructure P&A Senate units with the dissolution of System Academic Administration, and will be considering slight modifications to its mission statement. The P&A Senate will also be speaking with Vice President Studham and President Kaler. The P&A Consultative Committee (PACC) met with President Kaler and Vice President Brown in October and sent a follow-up letter to both on Monday to ask for continued discussions on topics concerning P&A employees. PACC also signed onto a statement from the Committee on Committees dealing with tele-presence at Senate committee meetings by coordinate campus members.

**3. 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 three times per year.

**Discussion:**

No report.

**4. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE  
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT  
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT**

Adam Matula, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that SSCC discussed a light rail fare-free zone at its December meeting. Other items from that meeting will appear later on today's agenda. The Higher Education Services Office Student Advisory Committee (SAC) met yesterday and heard the latest budget forecast for the state. Lastly the Minnesota Student Legislative Coalition (MSLC) has finalized its platform for this legislative session and includes pushing for legislation on medical amnesty.

**5. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES**

**Crookston** – Adam Switzer noted that finals begin in two weeks.

**Duluth** – Brandon Breuer stated that UMDSA has been focused on lobbying and cultural diversity support as well as preparing for finals.

**Morris** – Evan Vogel said that MCSA started ‘what’s your beef with Morris?’ to elicit items of displeasures to the Morris students. It also funded a round dance and has been receiving reports on green revolving funds. Its finals begin next week.

**Rochester** – Joe Inhofer noted that RSA approved the MSLC lobby platform.

**Graduate and Professional Student Assembly** – Nicole Conti reported that GAPSA recently had a listening session with President Kaler to address concerns of graduate students, including fess and tuition hikes, professional opportunities and employability, adviser relations, funding equity, and opportunities for development both professionally and academically. GAPSA is considering taking action on the light rail fare-free zone and medical amnesty. It is working with Boynton and the Mental Health center in making mental health and wellness services more effective and accessible. Lastly GAPSA is using the results of its survey to assess the desired role of GAPSA by the student population so that the revised restructuring can more effectively integrate the different graduate schools into the process.

**Minnesota Student Association** - Conrad Zbikowski said that MSA approved a resolution for a smoke-free campus and will be acting on medical amnesty and a light rail fare-free zone soon. It is also starting work on this year’s renter’s survey.

## **6. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 4, 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/121004stu.pdf>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK**  
**UNIVERSITY SENATE**

### **DISCUSSION:**

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

**APPROVED**

## **7. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE** **Discussion**

Bill Otto, from State and Government Relations, joined the meeting to provide a legislative update. To frame the conversation for the state, he provided an overview of the federal fiscal cliff. As of this morning, Congress is talking with the President. Comments being made include 1) that this issue cannot be fixed without increasing revenue and doing something with entitlements and 2) that Congress can change the rules. Speaker Boehner said today that Democrats want to increase taxes on the upper income individuals and deal with entitlements in 2014 while Republicans want the opposite: postpone tax cuts and deal with entitlement programs before the end of the year. Speaker Boehner can either try to broker a deal between the moderate members of the Democrats and Republicans, or strike a deal with the conservative members of his caucus, which would have enough votes. While he would likely have better luck working with the moderates, that move could cost him his position as Speaker.

When asked what this means to the University, Bill Otto said that last week President Kaler sent a letter to all 10 members of Congress from the state outlining what would happen if the fiscal cliff is not averted. While there would be a greater impact on research funding, Bill Otto provided the following impacts to educational funding: \$3.4 million work study cut which equals 92 positions, \$2.7 million would be cut from secondary education opportunity grants which is a \$500 grant for 421 students between the five campuses, and a \$332,000 cut to the TRIO program which equals 300 students.

This next month at the federal level will greatly shape what happens in January at the state level, as federal cuts would affect many state departments with non-defense discretionary spending. As of yesterday, the state is facing a \$1.1 billion deficit for 2014-15, which means that the first item on the agenda is to balance the budget.

The University has submitted a creative request which includes \$14.2 million this year in funding for a tuition freeze for two years for undergraduate residents, \$36 million in research support for four areas under MnDRIVE, and \$1.5 million to go towards loan forgiveness for Academic Health Center professionals in clinical settings who serve in an underrepresented area of the state. The current funding from the state is \$545 million which is the amount that the University received in 1998. This year's request, if fully-funded, would return the University to the 2001 funding level.

When the University speaks to the legislature, they are asked what it is doing to provide additional resources to supplement funding from the state. Last year President Kaler created an operational excellence initiative to make things better. This program will save \$28 million in the next biennium which allows funds to be reallocated to academic and research support.

Q: In two of the last three biennial requests, University funding from the state has decreased. What is different in this request to reverse this trend?

A: The deficit in this biennium is much less for the state which could positively impact the University's request.

Q: Why were graduate and professional students excluded from the proposed tuition freeze?

A: The tuition freeze applies only to undergraduates simply because of cost. If it is funded, extending it to graduate students will be considered.

Q: How are research initiatives chosen for the request and who is involved in these decisions?

A: The Vice President for Research and campus researchers developed the MnDRIVE initiative based on the request for assistance in these areas from the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce and the Minnesota Business Partnership. The four areas in this initiative then have public and private interest to drive success.

Q: Is the tuition freeze final or might it still change?

A: A tuition freeze was approved by the Regents and is included in the request to the state.

Q: If the tuition freeze is approved for two years, will students be subjected to an exponential increase in the following biennium?

A: The cost to freeze tuition for one year is \$14.2 million. If approved, this amount will be added to the University's base budget going forward which will prevent any exponential increase.

Q: How can graduate students, with specific knowledge about these areas, help support funding for MnDRIVE? Are their specific legislators that could be targeted?

A: The University has a robust grassroots advocacy operation, including lobbying efforts from two student groups. Information is available at: <http://supporttheu.umn.edu>. He suggested that all students go to the capitol as most legislators welcome direct communications from students. As for specific legislators to target, he suggested Phyllis Kahn, who represents the University district and has a Ph.D., and representatives from the Rochester and Duluth areas.

A student noted that a tuition freeze should be considered for graduate and professionals students as well, since there is less scholarship and grant support. This forces these students to use more loans, for which forgiveness is becoming more competitive with a smaller pool of funds.

Q: Related to accountability from the University in this request, has concern been raised that either rewarding a certain number of degrees and increasing four and six-year graduate rates will have a negative impact on the quality of education? Would these incentives inspire making graduation easier to achieve?

A: The accountability for the University is tied to three of five areas, so it does put additional pressure on increasing either of these rates or making the processes easier.

In closing Bill Otto noted that more information about the request is available at: <http://govrelations.umn.edu>.

## **8. MEDICAL AMNESTY**

### **Discussion**

Adam Matula, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said David Golden, from Boynton Health Service and Chair of the Social Concerns Committee, met with SSCC in November to discuss this issue. So that each campus does not have to work to develop a local solution, he felt that the best option would be to change state law, as has been done recently in other states. He asked SSCC members to ask if each student association/assembly would be interested in working on this issue together.

Q: What is medical amnesty?

A: If enacted as state law, it provides legal leniency to someone who is seeking medical assistance for someone else when one or both parties might be in violation of state law regarding alcohol or drugs. It is meant as a means to not dissuade someone from seeking medical assistance for someone else in need.

Q: How does this relate to Good Samaritan laws?

A: In other states, the Good Samaritan law was amended to include a provision for medical amnesty. That would be the intention with this proposal.

A senator noted that Twin Cities students sometimes go to Boynton Health Service, but then leave before being treated for fear of legal action being taken against them.

Senators from Morris and Rochester support efforts to change state law.

## **9. RESOLUTION ON OPEN ACCESS TEXTBOOKS**

### **Action**

Recent data suggests that as many as 7 of 10 University of Minnesota students indicate that high textbook costs prevent them from purchasing all of the textbooks required for their academic career. Many textbooks currently used may not be fully adapted to the specific content of the course in which they are used and could benefit from adaption, which is difficult in the status quo because of the lack of flexibility in book licenses. This body has considered three primary points in making a recommendation on this topic:

- (1) Open-access, e-books have the potential to save students money, reduce weight carried by students, and increase the relevance of materials to their coursework.
- (2) In many cases print copies of electronic books can be obtained for little additional cost.
- (3) The University of Minnesota has invested in a platform for the review and evaluation of Open Textbooks by faculty members at open.umn.edu.

The Student Senate believes students stand to benefit greatly from increased adoption of open source textbooks in U of M classes, and believes that high quality information should be made available to as many individuals as possible.

Therefore the Student Senate encourages the University administration to continue to evaluate Open-access textbooks and encourages faculty to fully consider open-access resources for their classes.

**ADAM MATULA, CHAIR**  
**STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

### **DISCUSSION:**

**Q:** Does this resolution fulfill the requirements that GAPSA initially proposed to the Student Senate Consultative Committee?

**A:** This language is similar to what was approved by GAPSA.

A senator said that while she supports this language, she still has reservations about how she would implement this as a graduate instructor.

Another senator said that he is comfortable with the flexibility noted in this resolution but would like to know if there are any reservations regarding its implementation.

**Q:** How can content be adapted as noted in the beginning of this resolution?

**A:** When using an open-access textbook, an instructor is able to modify the contents, such as reordering content, modifying problem sets, or adding additional content. This allows for a textbook to be more easily tailored to the content in the course.

A senator then noted that the School of Pharmacy likes open access textbooks, however, if a textbook is only available in an electronic format, then the instructor needs to be considerate of

the costs to obtain the computer platforms to view these textbooks. Any resolution on open-access textbooks should include a request to lower software costs for students.

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

**APPROVED**

## **10. TOBACCO-FREE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS**

### **Discussion by the Twin Cities Campus Student Delegation**

Timothy Bell and Megan Schnobrich, senior health advocates from Boynton Health Services (BHS), and Ferd Schlapper, Director of Boynton Health Service, joined the meeting to discuss a proposal for a tobacco-free Twin Cities campus as part of creating a healthier campus environment. They walked the senators through a video and presentation to provide information. They are looking for feedback and input from major stakeholders on campus and are gathering support before presenting the proposal to the President to consider implementation.

**Q:** Have any other institutions in metropolitan areas implemented a tobacco-free campus? How are issues related to a metropolitan area being addressed?

**A:** Many of the 825 institutions that are smoke-free and 608 institutions that are tobacco-free are in metropolitan areas, including Michigan, the Indiana system, and the California system. Ground work has been laid by these other institutions to show that this proposal can be effective. It was noted that no institution has reversed its tobacco-free status once implemented. There are 49 institutions in Minnesota.

**Q:** This campus includes many types of workers. How are their issues being addressed?

**A:** There are cessation resources available free-of-charge to faculty and staff. A tobacco-free campus saves resources by reducing health care costs. Temporary employees, such as construction workers, also need to be considered. The new light rail line will be smoke-free so one concern is that riders will use the University as a stop to get off and smoke if this is the only stop where it is allowed.

**Q:** Most smokers do not know about the free cessation services that Boynton offers. Why haven't these services been promoted more before asking for a campus ban?

**A:** Boynton has data on awareness of the services that it offers and ways in which these services are promoted. There is no value in hiding services, so efforts are made to promote awareness and eligibility as well as access. This is an ongoing component of education at Boynton, promoting all services and their availability, and a department focus on health communication, promotion, and outreach. They are always looking for feedback on how this could be done better. However, current research shows that Boynton is an important support system for people trying to quit, but it is not as effective as price, community standards, and convenience of being able to smoke on campus.

A student felt that a complete ban would appear to polarize smokers. It would be helpful to see data from smokers that a campus ban would help them quit.

Another senator said that there is a concern that the Morris campus will follow suit if this change is made at the Twin Cities campus, as it is already in place at Crookston and Duluth. A campus ban feels paternalistic.



Q: One reason to implement a ban is to reduce litter on campus, but the exact opposite happened when a smoking ban was implemented at Duluth. How will this be presented in the Twin Cities?

A: Duluth took a different approach to creating a smoke-free campus as there was no community dialogue before it was implemented and smoking receptacles were simply removed from campus.

A senator said that people should be able to do as they choose when their actions only affect their own bodies. He does not feel that it is the responsibility of the University to change social norms and he feels that this is a slippery slope.

Timothy Bell noted that smoking affects many other people who are subjected to second-hand smoke without making the decision to smoke.

Q: Is there data available to show the impacts on health from outside smokers? Without this data, it is hard to believe in this rationale for enacting a campus ban. Non-smokers do have the option to move away from the smoker. With the lack of enforcement on campus, how will smokers actually be affected?

A: Outdoor smoking will be handled the same way as indoor smoking. If someone is smoking in a building, the police are not called. Instead a request is made to have the smoker stop. Peer mediation will be needed to promote a ban. As for research, there is data that non-smokers are affected outdoors. If someone can smell smoke, then that person has been exposed to second-hand smoke and the Surgeon General has noted that there is no safe level of exposure. Students are self-reporting that the number one place they are being exposed to second-hand smoke is outdoors and they would prefer not to be. If implementation is done correctly, there is a 95 percent compliance rate immediately. A 99 percent compliance rate is achieved by approaching people who are smoking and asking them to stop. The last one percent are treated through campus process for violating a University policy. Many other outdoor, public spaces have and are going smoke-free. This is not meant to take away someone's right to smoke, but it allows the University to limit where it can be done and protect the health of non-smokers.

A senator likened the right to smoke to the right to bear arms. When entering a property, a person needs to abide by the rules determined by the property owner including a ban on arms.

Q: Addiction is real and makes it difficult for many people to quit. Therefore, if a ban is enacted, what will be done about smoke shops around campus?

A: There is a similar situation with alcohol and the bars and stores which sell it close to campus. The University works with the businesses to try and improve the detrimental impact on students. It requires a collaboration and partnership as the University has no authority in these areas.

Q: In the past few days students have received an email from Boynton regarding a survey on tobacco use and exposure. It noted that there was a chance to win a \$100 gift card. What are the marketing budgets for the fresh air campaign and nicotine cessation programs?

A: Marketing figures were not brought today but could be provided. The fresh air campaign is self-funded through savings on health care claim costs and less clean-up on campus. Boynton Health Services is addressing the most pressing issues impacting student success, of which tobacco is one. Boynton's philosophy is not to impose health services on students but instead to state what services are offered at what times. They are trying to best meet student needs and respond to stakeholders on campus who have asked that this issue be addressed. This policy has been recommended by the Student Health Advisory Committee (SHAC) and the fresh air campaign is being led by the Health Ambassadors.

A senator said that the University's mission statement is meant to create a safe and welcoming environment. There are many students who use tobacco products as a remedy for anxiety and stressful situations. This policy would discriminate against these students and force them to leave campus. It has been noted that there is no safe level of exposure to second-hand smoke, but outside someone can step away from the smoker and no longer be affected. It also seems impossible to accurately measure toxicity outside as this smoke can quickly dissipate. Smoking also cannot be compared to guns or alcohol because there are laws regulating these items and no enforcement.

Another senator speculated that prospective students might be deterred from coming to the Twin Cities campus if that student is a smoker already and knows that this action is prohibited on campus. These students will not feel as accepted. He did not understand why smoke-free tobacco products were part of the ban as they do not affect anyone besides the user.

A senator reiterated that education needs to be ramped up first to avoid a negative impact on campus.

Ferd Schlapper asked senators to separate opinion from fact. While strong opinions are being expressed here, there is strong data and research which supports the opposite. Institutions which have already instituted a ban did measure recruitment before and after, and found that there was no reduction in recruitment by being smoke-free. Instead those institutions found that it was an advantage. There is no research supporting the claim that there is a difference between indoor and outdoor smoke exposure, which is why changes are being made by the government in many public spaces and these changes have been upheld by the courts.

He said that the opinions being expressed today are the points being made by big tobacco to stop these efforts. When the overwhelming majority of students do not smoke and do not want to be exposed, and current smokers want to quit, he does not see why the University would side with big tobacco to allow a small minority of smokers to continue to affect the majority. As for research on anxiety, big tobacco promotes that usage reduces stress. Instead, the research shows that smokers have a five times greater rate of depressive disorders and suicide and a 15 times greater rate of anxiety disorders than non-smokers.

Q: As a student who attended the Duluth campus in 2008-09, she was initially opposed to this concept when it was first discussed on this campus due to how it was implemented at the Duluth campus. However, after more discussions, she is becoming more supportive of a smoke-free campus. While it will not lead to 100 percent prevention on campus, it does support a healthier lifestyle. What is the rationale for proposing a tobacco-free campus which only affects the user?

A: There are over 600 institutions which are tobacco-free and 200 institutions which are only smoke-free. Either one would be a great step for this campus. He would suggest that dialogue continue on campus on this topic.

## **11. OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

## **12. NEW BUSINESS**

**NONE**

### **13. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:21 pm.

**Rebecca Hippert  
Abstractor**