

CONSECUTIVE MEETINGS OF:

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
THE FACULTY SENATE**

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 2014

2:30 - 5:00 P.M.

**25 Mondale Hall--Twin Cities Campus
105 Kiehle Hall--Crookston Campus
173 Kirby Plaza--Duluth Campus
7 Humanities and Fine Arts Building--Morris Campus
Room 419--Rochester Campus**

This is a consecutive meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate. There are 266 voting members of the University Senate and 166 voting members of the Faculty Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

**1. 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 November 2013

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Resolution to Implement Lactation Support Action

Approved by the: University Senate October 3, 2013

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING**

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no response required

**2. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
2013-14 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 2013-14:

- Civil Service Consultative Committee
- Faculty Consultative Committee
- P&A Consultative Committee
- Senate Consultative Committee
- Student Senate Consultative Committee

OVERALL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ConC has five overall recommendations that came from this year's review process. These apply to all Senate Committees to greater or lesser degree but ConC wanted to be sure to address them all within this report:

1. The faculty, staff, and students serving on the consultative committees stated that there is a lack of support for serving on these bodies. Faculty members feel that service to the college or to increasing external funding is more valued by their department heads/chairs and deans. For academic professionals and civil service staff, the impression is that service is not valued by supervisors and therefore many times they are not permitted time to attend meetings. Students do not have control over their class schedules, especially as upper classmen, and are not excused from class for committee service. Therefore they have to choose between attending meetings and missing class. All groups could benefit from increased support at all levels.
2. A concern heard from the academic professionals, civil service staff, and students was that many system or Twin Cities campus issues are routed to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), either before being brought to the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) or in place of the SCC consultation. On SCC meeting dates, the FCC meets first and many times items from SCC agendas are first discussed by the faculty. This leads to shortened discussions at SCC as the faculty have already made all their points and sometimes already come to a decision. For other issues, discussions are scheduled only with the FCC, which does not allow staff and students the opportunity to share their recommendations on the topic.
3. The chairs of the four consultative committees are the spokespeople for their classifications on a system-wide basis. For this reason, they are often contacted by the media for a response to an issue on behalf of their representative group. Due to the role that these leaders need to fill, it is recommended that they be provided with media training from University Relations each year.
4. All the consultative committee members seemed unclear about what is included in each of their charges, what duties they are fulfilling, and what duties might need to be updated or deleted. The Committee on Committees (ConC) recommends that each committee review its charge this semester and send any revisions back to ConC by April 7 so that any revisions could be sent to the appropriate Senates for action by the end of the academic year.
5. ConC noted that the FCC leadership has monthly meetings with the President and Provost to discuss items before they reach the full committee or the broader University, but that there is no parallel structure for staff. As many staff concerns center on

employment issues, the recommendation is that both the P&A leadership and the Civil Service leadership schedule monthly meetings with Vice President Kathy Brown to discuss issues of importance to each group. The meeting participants should include the chair, vice chair, past chair, and staff person from the consultative committee along with Vice President Brown and any additional staff members from OHR.

The full report on these committees is available at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/conc/13-14conc_report.pdf

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

**3. PRESENTATION OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO
UNIVERSITY SENATE GOVERNANCE AWARD
Information**

The recipients of the 2014 Outstanding Service to University Senate Governance Award will be announced.

**4. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY
FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF**

V. Elving Anderson
Professor
Epidemiology
1921 – 2014

Donald Baker
Professor
Soil, Water, and Climate
1923 – 2014

Joan Bosard
Principal Administrative Specialist
Pediatrics
1933 – 2013

K. Gerhard Brand
Professor
Microbiology
1922 – 2013

Kathleen O'Donovan
Educational Specialist
Center for Teaching and Learning
1945 – 2013

Gordon McKay
Building and Grounds Worker
Facilities Management
1939 – 2014

Megan Shroat
Research Associate
Psychiatry
1975 – 2014

Charlotte Striebel
Associate Professor
Mathematics
1929 – 2014

**5. MINUTES FOR APRIL 3, 2014
Action by the University Senate
(2 minutes)**

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/140403.pdf>

**BECKY YUST, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

**MOTION A
University Senate Bylaws and Rules Amendments
Action by the University Senate
(5 minutes)**

Agenda Items 6. and 7. are offered as a “Consent Agenda” to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. As amendments to the University Senate Bylaws, motions require either a majority of all voting members of the University Senate (134) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which these motions are being presented.

**6. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENTS
Articles I and II**

MOTION:

To amend Article I and Article II of the University Senate Bylaws, as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~).

The packet of Bylaw amendments is available online at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usenate/docs/140501u_bylaws.pdf

COMMENT:

The proposed Bylaws and Rules amendments are meant to clean up current language and reflect the actual processes that take place within the Senate and its committees. Examples of this are

deleting responsibilities for the Clerk of the Senate or transferring of those responsibilities to the Senate Office, correcting the titles of committees and University policies, formatting the membership language in committee charges so that they use uniform language, and deleting two Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) subcommittees whose functions are done by the full SCC or the SCC leadership.

**WILL DURFEE CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**7. UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENTS
Articles I and II**

MOTION:

To amend Article I and Article II of the University Senate Rules, as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~).

The packet of Rules amendments is available online at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usenate/docs/140501u_rules.pdf

COMMENT:

The proposed Bylaws and Rules amendments are meant to clean up current language and to reflect the actual processes that take place within the Senate and its committees. Examples of this are removing references to the Business and Rules Subcommittee, transferring responsibilities from the Clerk of the Senate to the Senate Office, removing the waiver for Senate committee term limits, updating the process for committee forfeiture due to non-attendance, and updating the language on committee support.

**WILL DURFEE CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

END OF MOTION A

**8. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
(10 minutes)**

**9. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT
(10 minutes)**

Questions to the President should be submitted in writing to the University Senate office no later than Tuesday, April 29, 2014. The President may also choose to take questions from the floor.

10. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

11. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

12. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

**THIS CONCLUDES THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BUSINESS.
THE SUBSEQUENT ITEMS ARE FACULTY SENATE BUSINESS ONLY.**

MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

13. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

Faculty Senate

Statement on National Science Foundation Research Ban

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 2, 2013

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

* The administration believes that it is not necessary to take any administrative action in regard to the Senate Research Committee statement on the National Science Foundation's ban on specific political science research. The ban has already been under discussion nationally and individual citizens working through their Congressional delegates appears to be the most effective way to influence Congress.

University Support for Institutional Training Grant Proposals

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 2, 2013

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

* The administration believes that it is not necessary to take any administrative action in regard to the Senate Research committee statement on University support for Institutional Training Grant Proposals. The University policies already allow for the support of Training Grants and the value of them is highly recognized by the administration as stated in various Senate Committee meetings. The OVPR published F&A rates specifically allow the F&A costs that are for training grants so that is not a restriction. The University budget model allows individual colleges and their faculty to determine what funds should be available to support college activities such as training grants. The University 7-11 tenure statement permits consideration of training grants in tenure decisions and individual departments and colleges specify their own additional tenure considerations in their 7-11 statements. The six specific suggested changes are not necessary because the requested functions are already available. Training grants are already supported by the OVPR and the graduate school but the primary responsibility rests with the disciplines providing the expertise. The Graduate School is already available to help with negotiation and provision of funds. The fellowship office already tracks stipends. F&A rates required in training grants are already acceptable through the office of sponsored projects; no special requests or negotiation is required to send out proposals at these rates. As stated above, the University budget model does not preclude the submission of training grants.

Recommended Guidelines for Evaluating Competitive Faculty Applications for University Funded Sabbatical Supplements

Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 3, 2013

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no response required

* The administration supports developing good practices and fair and transparent procedures for reviewing applications for competitive sabbatical supplements such as those outlined in the recommended

guidelines. The University's administrative policy on *Faculty Development Leaves* already makes it clear that procedures with regard to requests for sabbatical supplement funding are to be established by each college or campus, and, as with all review procedures at the University, such processes must be fair and equitable and in accordance with existing, applicable University policies. The administration encourages campus and collegiate units to review their current guidelines and incorporate, as necessary, recommended good practices from the guidelines adopted by the Faculty Senate.

14. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements
Information for the University 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 [includes A and A-] 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."

COMMENT:

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

ALON MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

SCEP Grading Distribution
 Fall 2013
 Data as of 1/24/2014

Campus	Grades	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
		GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	
UMNCR	3340	2.89	42.49%	1080	2.97	42.59%	3174	3.08	48.24%	460	3.26	57.61%	629	3.21	47.54%	
UMNDL	19205	2.77	35.15%	7357	2.89	34.38%	11926	3	38.19%	4945	3.31	51.49%				
UMNMO	4341	2.92	33.89%	1464	2.97	37.77%	1777	3.09	43.16%	685	3.5	57.96%				
UMNTC	60853	3.11	43.27%	13306	2.99	37.45%	48906	3.21	46.25%	19137	3.21	46.27%	6032	3.29	51.87%	

University of Minnesota, Crookston

Academic Group	Grades	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
		GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	
Acad Aff	3340	2.89	42.49%	1080	2.97	42.59%	3174	3.08	48.24%	460	3.26	57.61%				

University of Minnesota, Duluth

Academic Group	Grades	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
		GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	
Bus/Econ	780	2.61	19.62%	1369	2.82	27.98%	3102	2.72	24.02%	958	2.98	29.23%				
DMED													24	2.56	33.33%	
Ed/Hum Srv	2374	2.96	40.35%	1441	2.94	37.96%	2806	3.16	47.58%	1443	3.62	66.04%	46	3.46	73.91%	
Fine Arts	2947	3.16	56.50%	549	3.28	53.19%	480	3.36	59.58%	553	3.53	78.30%	15	3.88	86.67%	
Lib Arts	5441	2.85	29.37%	993	3.03	36.56%	2869	3.06	38.83%	672	3.28	48.81%	151	3.21	47.02%	
Pharmacy	81	3.2	53.09%				48	3.1	43.75%							
Sci/Eng	6045	2.49	23.33%	2898	2.76	30.26%	2332	2.95	34.91%	1294	3.17	41.27%	390	3.21	44.36%	
UMD-Acad A	1537	3.45	60.05%	107	3.37	62.62%	285	3.81	84.21%	16	3.73	87.50%				

University of Minnesota, Morris

Academic Group	Grades	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
		GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	
Acad Aff	225	3.31	53.78%	47	3.1	55.32%	120	3.87	41.67%							
Div Educ	357	3.72	38.38%	192	3.3	44.27%	109	3.7	55.96%	323	3.71	61.30%				
Humanities	1759	3.09	36.04%	344	3.22	48.84%	466	3.31	56.65%	94	3.64	65.96%				
Sci/Math	1158	2.68	25.39%	562	2.82	32.03%	327	2.94	33.03%	179	3.21	43.58%				
Social Sci	842	2.87	33.85%	319	2.82	29.47%	755	2.91	37.62%	85	3.5	67.06%				

University of Minnesota, Rochester

	1000Level	2000Level	3000Level	4000Level	5000Level
UMR Chance	1384 2.87 22.69%	468 3.01 26.92%	564 3.49 54.43%	234 3.58 39.32%	

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Academic Group	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range
AHCS	160	3.52	51.25%	1514	3.25	45.57%	164	3.45	57.93%	534	2.79	20.79%	212	3.57	35.38%
CBS	2479	2.91	25.45%	19	3.33	84.21%	1630	2.94	32.64%	1400	2.98	36.43%	52	3.25	51.92%
CCE	62	3.39	56.45%	733	3.1	33.56%	535	3.26	49.35%	802	3.31	52.37%	57	3.28	47.37%
CDES	1006	3.16	39.76%	1048	3.24	53.44%	1430	3.31	48.18%	939	3.29	42.17%	88	3.43	60.23%
CFANS	2530	3.18	46.09%	414	3.63	70.53%	2433	3.22	48.05%	1193	3.3	45.68%	133	3.45	63.91%
CLA	24875	3.23	44.17%	6499	2.81	29.24%	23370	3.24	50.10%	3828	3.22	48.54%	1751	3.39	62.31%
CSE	17197	2.78	33.27%	1290	2.95	32.17%	4132	2.91	32.14%	4668	3.04	38.86%	2018	3.13	39.15%
CSOM	670	3.21	34.03%	67	3.18	31.34%	5969	3.15	29.23%	1969	3.41	48.20%	644	3.17	40.99%
Dent				649	3.31	53.93%	117	3.14	30.77%	71	3.77	16.90%			
EHD	6893	3.37	64.30%				4469	3.39	55.20%	1789	3.33	51.20%	814	3.62	78.38%
Grad Schl				53	3.69	22.64%									
Health Sci	485	3.78	84.33%				118	3.51	66.95%	107	3.5	61.68%	15	3.21	60.00%
HSPA	169	3.54	71.01%	26	3.03	46.15%	1829	3.09	46.20%	276	3.36	51.09%	55	3.49	58.18%
Med	422	3.49	48.10%	157	3.66	81.53%	580	3.52	63.97%	1185	3.65	78.65%	156	3.97	6.41%
Nursing	108	3.87	59.26%				117	3.11	44.44%	56	3.47	76.79%	33	3.76	81.82%
Pharmacy	704	3.52	65.77%				807	3.28	55.51%						
Pub Health	1195	3.39	61.26%	173	3.85	93.06%	482	3.64	74.48%	66	3.39	56.06%			
SRVPAA	58	3.48	60.34%	44	3.6	45.45%	151	3.75	77.48%	20	3.8	60.00%			
Ugrd Ed Ad	403	3.82	65.51%												
VMed	53	3.8	88.68%	152	2.62	22.37%									

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A-range and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed. Pct A-range includes both A and A- grades.

**15. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
(5 minutes)**

**16. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS UPDATE
(5 minutes)**

**17. PROVOST'S REPORT
(10 minutes)**

**18. QUESTIONS TO THE PROVOST
(10 minutes)**

Questions to the Provost should be submitted in writing to the University Senate office no later than Tuesday, April 29, 2014. The Provost may also choose to take questions from the floor.

**19. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Approval of Faculty Senate Officers
Action by the Faculty Senate
(2 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following officers for 2014-15 as recommended by the chair of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee:

Clerk – Professor Becky Yust
Parliamentarian – Professor Allan Erbsen
Faculty Senate Vice Chair – To be named

**WILL DURFEE, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**20. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Slate of Faculty Candidates
Action by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation and UMD Faculty Senators
(2 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following people to serve on the Committee on Committees for a term of 2014-17. A simple majority is required for approval.

JAY HATCH: Associate Professor of Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, College of Education and Human Development.

NELSON RHODUS: Professor of Diagnostic and Biological Sciences, School of Dentistry.

JERRY LUCKHARDT: Associate Professor of Music, College of Liberal Arts.

FANG YU: Associate Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing.

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>

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

**MOTION B
Faculty Senate Bylaws and Rules Amendments
Action by the Faculty Senate
(5 minutes)**

Agenda Items 21. and 22. are offered as a “Consent Agenda” to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. As amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, motions require either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (84) 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 these motions are being presented.

**21. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENTS
Articles III and IV**

MOTION:

To amend Article III and Article IV of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~).

The packet of Bylaw amendments is available online at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsenate/docs/140501fac_bylaws.pdf

COMMENT:

The proposed Bylaws and Rules amendments are meant to clean up current language and reflect the actual processes that take place within the Senate and its committees. Examples of this are deleting responsibilities for the Clerk of the Senate or transferring of those responsibilities to the Senate Office, correcting the titles of committees and University policies, formatting the membership language in committee charges so that they use uniform language, and deleting two Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) subcommittees whose functions are done by the full SCC or the SCC leadership.

WILL DURFEE CHAIR

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**22. FACULTY SENATE RULES AMENDMENTS
Articles III and IV**

MOTION:

To amend Article III and Article IV of the Faculty Senate Rules, as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~).

The packet of Rules amendments is available online at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsenate/docs/140501fac_rules.pdf

COMMENT:

The proposed Bylaws and Rules amendments are meant to clean up current language and to reflect the actual processes that take place within the Senate and its committees. Examples of this are removing references to the Business and Rules Subcommittee, transferring responsibilities from the Clerk of the Senate to the Senate Office, removing the waiver for Senate committee term limits, updating the process for committee forfeiture due to non-attendance, and updating the language on committee support.

**WILL DURFEE CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

END OF MOTION A

**23. LIBRARY COMMITTEE
Administrative Policy on Open Access to Scholarly Articles
Administrative Procedure on Open Access to Scholarly Articles: Archiving or Waiving
Action
(10 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following policy.

Open Access to Scholarly Articles

POLICY STATEMENT

As a publicly funded land-grant institution, the University of Minnesota is committed to ensuring the greatest possible scholarly and public access to the research and scholarship produced by the University community. In addition to securing the public benefit of such access, this policy is intended to serve faculty interests by promoting greater reach and impact for articles, simplifying authors' retention of distribution rights, and aiding preservation.

Each faculty member grants to the University of Minnesota a shared, limited, right to make available his or her scholarly articles and to reproduce, display, and distribute those articles for the purpose of open access. More specifically, each faculty member grants to the University of Minnesota a nonexclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free, worldwide license to exercise such rights under copyright as are necessary to achieve the goals of open access, dissemination, and

preservation, provided that the articles are not sold for profit, and to authorize others to do the same.

The author retains copyright ownership, unless that author chooses to transfer rights to other parties, such as a publisher. The University retains only the limited rights outlined above.

The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty as defined in the Board of Regents Policy: Copyright, except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the author entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy.

The Provost or Provost's designate will waive application of the license for a particular article or delay access for a specified period of time upon express direction by a faculty member. Grant of such a waiver is mandatory, not at the discretion of any person or group. Waiver requests must be made in writing, or via a system (such as an online form) that may be made available for this specific purpose.

The Office of the Provost will be responsible for interpreting this policy, resolving any dispute concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the faculty from time to time. The policy will be reviewed after three years and a report presented to the faculty.

REASON FOR POLICY

The University's threefold mission of research and discovery, teaching and learning, and outreach and public service, includes a commitment to "making the knowledge and resources created and preserved at the University accessible to the citizens of the state, the nation, and the world." <http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/history-mission/index.html> The Regent's Policy on Copyright also "encourages faculty and students to exercise their interests in ownership and use of their copyrighted works in a manner that provides the greatest possible scholarly and public access to their work."

PROCEDURES

- *Open Access to Scholarly Articles: Archiving or Waiving*

FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS

There are no forms associated with this policy.

ADDITIONAL CONTACTS

Subject	Contact	Phone	Fax/Email
Primary Contact(s)	Nancy Sims	612-624-1851	nasims@umn.edu

DEFINITIONS

Faculty

The Board of Regents Policy: Copyright states: "*Faculty* shall mean members of the faculty as defined by Board of Regents Policy: Employee Group Definitions, along with individuals who are not so defined but who are University employees holding faculty-like appointments (namely, University employees who teach or conduct research at the University with a level of responsibility and self-direction similar to that exercised and enjoyed by faculty in a similar

activity). Postdoctoral fellows, researchers, and scholars shall have the same ownership rights as faculty and are covered under this policy.”

Nonexclusive

Rights granted to the University under this policy are also retained by the author, *and* can be granted by the author to third parties.

Not Sold for Profit

Precludes for-profit sales, but could enable the bookstore, for example, to sell printed copies for the cost of reproduction.

Scholarly articles

“Scholarly articles” is intentionally not clearly bounded, due to the wide varieties of scholarly activity undertaken across many disciplines. Since both technologies and processes of publishing are evolving rapidly, examples of items that would be included and excluded from consideration will be maintained in the FAQ. Concerns about whether the policy applies to a particular work may be mitigated by the provision that the policy will be waived for any work at the request of the author.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Faculty and "faculty-like" employees

Manage the copyright in works they own under Board of Regents Policy: Copyright.

Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Interpret policy as necessary, resolve disputes as necessary, review policy regularly and recommend policy changes as necessary.

University Libraries

Implement services to support article processing and to communicate with authors about disposition of particular works as described in the attached *Procedures* document.

APPENDICES

There are no appendices associated with this policy.

FAQ

- [Open Access to Scholarly Articles FAQ](#)

RELATED INFORMATION

- Board of Regents Policy: [Copyright](#)
- Administrative Policy: [Copyright Ownership](#)

HISTORY

Text to be added

Administrative Procedure Open Access to Scholarly Articles: Archiving or Waiving

Self-Archiving Options

Authors affected by the policy may take action individually to make their work available to the public via the University Digital Conservancy or other non-profit open-access repositories. Examples of non-profit open-access repositories that would qualify under this policy include, but are not limited to: ArXiv.org, PubMedCentral (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/>).

However, authors affected by the policy are not required to take individual action to make their works available in a non-profit open-access repository. They may alternatively take advantage of the active support services provided by the University Libraries.

Automated Archiving Procedures

The University Libraries, at the direction of the Provost's Office, will provide active support services such as identification of eligible articles and communications with Faculty members about their options for achieving public access via the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy or other non-profit open-access repositories. This process will include communication with authors, including multiple opportunities for authors to choose *not* to share their works by requesting an automatic waiver.

Waiver Procedures

Any affected author may opt-out of the requirements of the Administrative Policy: Open Access to Scholarly Articles for a particular article at any time, for any reason.

The Provost's Office will make available contact information, an online form, and/or other options of communication for authors who wish to waive application of the license to a particular article.

Frequently Asked Questions document available at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsenate/docs/scholarly_articles_faq.pdf

COMMENT:

The Senate Library Committee (SLC) asks for your endorsement of the proposed policy, which will allow it to move forward for review at the University level.

The proposed policy was developed by a Subcommittee on Open Access established by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), and has been the principal focus of the SLC over the last three years. The proposed policy was endorsed unanimously last year by both the FCC and the SLC. You may view the proposed policy and the Frequently Asked Questions—which have been revised to respond to questions raised at the Senate's March meeting—at www.academic.umn.edu/provost/policies/openaccess/.

Open access literature and research are freely available, online, for anyone to read. The proposed policy allows the University of Minnesota to establish a system where future faculty articles will, with the author's approval, be collected and made freely available to anyone online.

The proposed policy recognizes the public benefit of broad and open access to works often available only to the privileged few; this is the same recognition that motivated the founding of America's great public libraries in the century past. The Open Access Policy is a strong statement that the University of Minnesota recognizes the obligation to the public it undertook at its founding as a publicly-funded, land-grant institution, with a mandate to 'mak[e] the

knowledge and resources created and preserved at the University accessible to the citizens of the state, the nation, and the world'.¹

Briefly, this is what the proposed policy does. It gives the University a limited and shared license to make the scholarly articles of its faculty available to the greater world. It limits the University's license to the goals of open access, i.e., dissemination, and preservation of faculty articles. It automatically grants a waiver to any author who does not want his or her work to be made available under the policy.

Here is what the proposed policy does not do. It does not allow the University to sell faculty articles for profit under any circumstance, and it does not prevent authors from exercising their copyright ownership in whatever way they see fit (including any publication agreements they may see fit to sign). It does not require faculty to publish in open access journals, but simply allows the University to make faculty articles openly available through an open-access system or open-access repository, such as the University's Digital Conservancy (<http://conservancy.umn.edu/>).

The proposed policy was modeled on policies created and adopted by the faculty at Harvard University, MIT, and Duke. Similar policies have been adopted by the faculty of a number of other state universities, including the University of California, Rutgers, the Universities of Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. Other faculties have also adopted similar policies, including Princeton, Brandeis, Bryn Mawr, Bucknell, Case Western, Emory, Rice, Oberlin, and Wellesley, as well as several schools and divisions within Columbia and Stanford.

In summary, the proposed policy has been carefully drafted by the Subcommittee on Open Access and has gone through a number of reviews. Endorsement by the Faculty Senate allows the proposed policy to move forward for review at the University level. Specifically, if the Faculty Senate votes to approve this proposed policy, it will move to the University's Policy Advisory Committee in early summer, and then on to the President's Policy Committee (PPC) next fall. Upon approval by the PPC, the policy would enter a thirty-day review period, during which time members of the University community can submit comments and questions. If no major concerns or revisions are needed based on the comments, the policy would take effect as of January 1, 2015. If comments suggest revisions are needed, the policy would be revised to address concerns raised and resubmitted to the PPC for final approval.

¹Mission Statement of the University of Minnesota, <http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/history-mission/>

**JENNIFER ALEXANDER, CHAIR
LIBRARY COMMITTEE**

**24. AMENDMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY:
GRADING AND TRANSCRIPTS**

**Action
(5 minutes)**

MOTION:

To amend the Administrative Policy on Grading and Transcripts as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

Administrative Policy on Grading and Transcripts

...

E. Other Transcript Symbols

1. Auditing a course.

- a. There will be a symbol V, visitor, indicating registration as an auditor or visitor, which will carry no credit and no grade.
- b. Students auditing a course are required to pay full tuition but do not take exams and are not required to do homework. An auditor is entered on the class roster (grade report), is counted as filling a seat in a controlled entry course, and is counted in an instructor's student contact hours.
- c. Students may not sit in on a course without registering for it.
- d. A student will be allowed to take a previously audited class for a grade.

2. Withdrawing from a course.

- a. There will be a symbol W, withdrawal, entered upon a student's record when the student officially withdraws from a course in accordance with procedures established by the student's college or campus. The W will be entered on the transcript irrespective of the student's academic standing in that course if the student withdraws from the course during the third through eighth week of class (Crookston Twin Cities) or the third through ~~ninth tenth~~ week of class (Morris, Rochester, and Twin Cities) or during the second or third weeks of summer sessions.
 - b. If a student officially withdraws from a course during the first two weeks of classes, there will be no record of that course registration entered on the student's transcript.
 - c. One-time late withdrawal: Each student may, once during his or her undergraduate enrollment, withdraw from a course without college approval, and receive the transcript symbol W, after the deadline for withdrawal and at any time up to and including the last day of instruction for that course. A student may not withdraw after completing the final examination or equivalent for a course.
 - d. Except as provided in the preceding section, withdrawal after the deadlines will require approval of the college and may not be granted solely because a student is failing the course; there must be extenuating non-academic circumstances justifying late withdrawal.
3. **Continuation course.** There will be a symbol X, indicating a student may continue in a continuation course in which a grade cannot be determined until the full sequence of courses is completed. The instructor will submit a grade for each X when the student has completed the sequence.
4. **Course in progress.** There will be a symbol K, assigned by an instructor to indicate the course is still in progress and that a grade cannot be assigned at the present time.

...

COMMENT:

This policy amendment moves the course drop deadline at Morris, Rochester, and the Twin Cities to the 10th week of classes. This change will allow students to receive feedback on work in the course and have more grade data available when making the decision to drop a course. This policy amendment was approved by the Educational Policy Committee on April 9, 2014.

**ALON MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**25. AMENDMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY:
MAKEUP WORK FOR LEGITIMATE ABSENCES**

**Action
(10 minutes)**

MOTION:

To amend the Administrative Policy: Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

POLICY STATEMENT

1. Students will not be penalized for absence during the semester due to unavoidable or legitimate circumstances. Such circumstances include illness of the student or his or her dependent, participation in intercollegiate athletic events ~~(see the Administrative Policy: *Intercollegiate Athletic Events during Study Day and Finals Weeks: Twin Cities*, which prohibits intercollegiate athletic competition during study day and finals week except under certain circumstances)~~, subpoenas, jury duty, military service, bereavement, and religious observances. Such circumstances also include activities sponsored by the University if identified by the senior academic officer for the campus or his or her designee as the basis for excused absences. Such circumstances do not include voting in local, state, or national elections. ~~Instructors are expected to accommodate students who wish to participate in party activities sponsored by Board of Regents resolution (See <http://www.tuinn.edu/regents/minutes/2005/december/bsand.pdf>).~~
- ~~2.3~~ 2.2 The instructor has the right to request verification for absences.
- ~~3.4~~ 3.3 It is the responsibility of students to plan their schedules to avoid excessive conflict with course requirements.
- ~~4.6~~ 4.5 A student must notify instructors of circumstances identified in (1) as soon as possible and provide documentation if requested by the instructor. In the event that the University declares a pandemic emergency (e.g., flu), the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost or designee may waive the requirement that students are required to have documentation from a physician health care provider for illness.
5. If a student is absent due to circumstances identified in (1) and has complied with the notification requirement, the instructor may not penalize the student and must provide reasonable and timely accommodation or opportunity to make up exams or other course requirements that have an impact on the course grade.
- ~~4.6~~ 4.6 The instructor has primary responsibility to decide if an absence is due to unavoidable or legitimate circumstances. If a student believes he or she has been wrongly denied the opportunity to make up work due to disagreement with the instructor about the legitimacy or unavoidability of an absence, the student should pursue his or her complaint using the usual process for appeals of student grievances. Chairs and deans who have questions about what constitutes an excusable bereavement absence, religious observance, or eligible dependent illness should consult with the campus chief academic officer for resolution of the disagreement. In accordance with the policy, final authority rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.
- ~~5.7~~ 5.7 Instructors are expected to accommodate students who wish to participate in party activities sponsored by Board of Regents resolution (See <http://www.tuinn.edu/regents/minutes/2005/december/bsand.pdf>).
- ~~6.8~~ 6.8 This policy applies to all course requirements, including any final examination.
- ~~7.9~~ 7.9 Colleges and academic units may establish specific criteria for notice and completion of work to implement this policy.

REASON FOR POLICY

It is in both the University's and the student's interest to outline some academic protections for students when they miss class for legitimate reasons. This policy places parameters around what is a legitimate absence, and reinforces the responsibilities of the instructor and the student.;

PROCEDURES

There are no procedures related to this policy.

FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS

There are no forms related to this policy.

APPENDICES

There are no appendices related to this policy.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

- *Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences FAQ*

DEFINITIONS

There are no definitions related to this policy.

RESPONSIBILITIES

~~There are no specified responsibilities related to this policy.~~

Instructor

Provide reasonable and timely accommodation for makeup work for legitimate absences
Maintain consistency in how this policy is applied to all students enrolled in the course

Student

Plan schedules to avoid excessive conflict with course requirements
Notify instructors of circumstances related to absences as soon as possible
Provide documentation of absence, if requested by the instructor

RELATED INFORMATION

- Administrative Policy: *Teaching and Learning: Student Responsibilities*, at <http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/STUDENTRESP.html>
- Administrative Policy: *Teaching and Learning: Instructor Responsibilities*, at <http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/INSTRUCTORRESP.html>
- Administrative Policy: *Intercollegiate Athletic Events during Study Day and Finals Weeks: Twin Cities*, which prohibits intercollegiate athletic competition during study day and finals week except under certain circumstances
- Board of Regents resolution, December 9, 2005, "Approval of a resolution related to Events and Classes on Precinct Caucus Night, [See pp.147-8] at <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/141976>

Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences FAQ

1. What is appropriate “verification for absences”?

The instructor "has the right to request verification of absences." That verification can take many different forms (e.g., accident report, note from a doctor, dentist, or other health care provider, jury service notice, obituary notice). The instructor does not have to request verification of absence.

2. How does this policy address students who participate in team events that are not intercollegiate athletic events?

Teams that wish to be officially excused from class can seek permission from the Provost. Students who have not been officially excused from class must get permission, in advance, from the instructor to miss class and make up the work. Instructors are not compelled to accommodate students who miss class for participation in athletic events or other university-sponsored events that are not intercollegiate events.

3. How does this policy address students participating in educational experiences, such as a student government conference, where the student is representing the University of Minnesota?

Under these circumstances, the instructor has the discretion about whether to allow a student to miss a class session and to make arrangements for any makeup work. The instructor is **permitted** to do so, but is not **obligated** to do so.

4. What if course requirements that have an impact on the course grade (such as participation in classroom discussions) cannot be made up?

If a student has a legitimate absence and has missed a component of the course (e.g., small group discussion, in-class participation) that cannot be made up in exactly the same manner, the instructor may substitute another activity or assignment for the missed components. For example, some instructors have substituted participation in a blog or on-line discussion for class participation, or assigned a reflective essay. It would be up to the instructor to determine an appropriate substitution, based upon the nature of the course. If no substitution can be devised for a student who has a legitimate absence, the missing component(s) cannot be factored into determining that student's final grade for the course.

5. Can the format of a makeup exam be different than that of the regular exam (e.g., open-ended vs. closed-ended questions)?

Yes. The structure of makeup exams may differ from the format of the regularly scheduled exam, and is at the instructor's discretion. The instructor has flexibility with the nature of makeup exams. The key point is that an instructor has provided the opportunity for makeup work due to legitimate excuses.

6. Can a makeup assignment be different than the original assignment?

Yes. The course instructor may determine that the nature of the makeup assignment will differ from the original assignment. In some cases, it would not be possible for a student to complete the original assignment (e.g., to review a theatre production which the student was unable to attend), and the instructor may determine an acceptable substitute assignment. The key point is that the instructor has provided an opportunity for makeup work due to legitimate excuses.

7. How many excused absences is too many for one course?

This is at the instructor's discretion. Instructors are most knowledgeable about the needs of the course and how much time away is too much for a student to be able to complete the

course successfully. Instructors are not obligated to accommodate a student who has missed so much of a course that making arrangements for makeup work would not be reasonable.

8. The policy mentions "bereavement." For what relationships would bereavement apply in this policy?

This is also at the instructor's discretion. The death of a close family member is usually included in the absences related to bereavement circumstances. In addition, there may be other circumstances when a student is affected by the death of a person who was close to the student, and was not a relative (for example, the death of a roommate or friend). The student is responsible for explaining the circumstances and requesting to be able to make up the work.

9. Is attending wedding, particularly an out-of-town wedding, considered as an excused absence?

Attending a wedding is not in itself an automatically excused absence. Being part of a wedding party, or you yourself getting married, is not automatically an excused absence. The consideration of wedding attendance as a legitimate absence for which makeup work would be accommodated is at the instructor's discretion.

10. What options does a student have if the student believes he or she has been wrongly denied the opportunity to make up work due to disagreement with the instructor about the legitimacy or unavoidability of an absence?

The student can seek advice from his or her academic adviser about options. As one option, students may bring their concerns to the appropriate department head or director of undergraduate studies. Students may also choose to consult with the Student Conflict Resolution Center (SCRC) for advice and guidance. The SCRC assists students with resolving problems, and an ombudsperson in the SCRC can provide confidential guidance about possible options. See <http://www.sos.umn.edu/index.html> for SCRC contact information.

11. Is there an official list of religious observance related to legitimate absences?

For questions about religious observances in general, as well as questions related to religious observances around bereavement or weddings or other events, the Office for Equity and Diversity can provide helpful guidance.

COMMENT:

The proposed changes are clarifying, not policy changes, in response to questions that have come in over the years and as part of the three-year comprehensive review of the policy. Additional FAQs have been added in response to repeat questions that are asked. This policy amendment was approved by the Educational Policy Committee on April 9, 2014.

**ALON MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**26. AMENDMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY:
EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

**Action
(20 minutes)**

MOTION:

To amend the Administrative Policy: Evaluation of Teaching as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

Administrative Policy: Evaluation of Teaching: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester

POLICY STATEMENT

Overview

Evaluation of teaching provides information (1) to help improve teaching, (2) to be used for faculty tenure decisions and salary and promotion decisions based on merit, and (3) to assist students in course selection. This policy establishes standards and processes for three methods of evaluating teaching: peer review, student rating, and student-release ~~questions~~ items for the campuses of Crookston, Morris, Rochester, and the Twin Cities.

The policy includes provisions for use of common student-rating items, which is one means of making judgments on teaching effectiveness University-wide and allows calculation of statistical norms. While student rating of teaching is important, it should not be used in isolation; student-rating data alone do not have the precision necessary to distinguish among instructors who receive similar ratings. Student rating data may be used with other types of information to identify very good instructors who deserve rewards as well as instructors who may need assistance in improving their classroom effectiveness. When used for salary, promotion, and tenure decisions, these data must be used in conjunction with other relevant metrics.

A. General Provisions for Evaluation of Teaching

1. The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation. This policy therefore applies to all who deliver instruction regardless of academic rank or appointment status. Certain provisions govern only tenured and tenure-track faculty. Unless provisions are explicitly limited to tenured and tenure-track faculty or to tenure decisions, they apply to all faculty and instructional staff. This policy applies to teaching assistants who deliver instruction.
2. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, the required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must follow Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*.
3. Personnel decisions (e.g., merit and salary reviews, promotion, tenure for tenure-track faculty) for all faculty and instructional staff whose salary is based in any part on teaching will include review, by appropriate department, college, and University officers, of all numeric data from the rating forms from their courses. All student rating data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data. Data and information from student ratings will not be used in isolation from peer evaluation of instruction.
4. Teaching-evaluation information used for personnel decisions remains private data, as required by State of Minnesota law at the time this policy is adopted. Teaching-evaluation information that pertains to a course and not a specific individual will be released to assist students in course selection. The results must be shared with the instructor being reviewed. Access to information on a specific instructor must be restricted to those responsible for decisions on reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary adjustments.
5. The academic unit must maintain an appropriate record of the instructor's contributions to the teaching mission of the University. The instructor must have the opportunity to update the documentation regularly. It is the responsibility of the academic unit to retain appropriate portions of this material, including cumulative summaries of student ratings of the instructor's courses. Each unit has the responsibility to maintain the material in the file as private data and as required by University policy and applicable law.

- ~~6. Department and college administrators should be evaluated in part on the extent to which they effectively implement this policy and should be held accountable for timely assessment of the evaluative materials assembled for each instructor.~~
7. Instructors must always be allowed to respond to student rating results by adding written comments to their files that are communicated to individuals responsible for personnel decisions.
8. Academic unit heads have the responsibility to encourage instructors to conduct early- and mid-semester course evaluations for the purpose of improving teaching.
9. Responsibility for implementing this policy rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences, and deans and department heads, all of whom must convey clearly to instructors the emphasis being placed on teaching in decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and merit-pay increases.
- 10.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

1. Peer review process.

- a. Every academic unit will have a documented process for peer review of every instructor's teaching efforts and contributions to teaching, both for purposes of promotion decisions and for teaching-based salary increases. The academic unit should evaluate instructors in ways appropriate to the discipline, and include consideration of activities outside the classroom such as facilitating student research, advising students, and other activities related to students' educational programs.
- b. The peer-review process must include consideration of any additional materials identified by the instructor as relevant to the evaluation. Instructors are encouraged to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during his/her evaluation.

2. Faculty peer review.

- a. Faculty peers evaluate tenured and tenure-track faculty. Academic units should refer to Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, Administrative Policy: *Faculty Compensation*, and Administrative Procedure: *Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* for information on how they should structure these reviews.
- b. Both faculty and instructional staff may participate in the evaluation of all instructors who are not tenured or tenure-track faculty.
3. For peer review for teaching-related merit pay increases for all instructors, the faculty or instructional staff, as appropriate, in each unit must decide whether they want to conduct the teaching assessment themselves or delegate that responsibility to their dean or head or chair, or to an advisory group within the unit or college
4. For all instructors, peer review should include assessment of the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, general contributions to departmental teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions. Best practices might include a review of the following:
 - a. an appropriately cumulative listing of courses taught by the instructor
 - b. a comprehensive syllabus for each course
 - c. course objectives and expected learner outcomes
 - d. examples of exams, assignments and handouts prepared by the instructor
 - e. development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications on discipline-specific teaching techniques
 - f. assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline)
 - g. a listing of undergraduate and graduate students undertaking independent study under the supervision of the instructor

- h. a survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction
- i. direct assessment of an instructor's classroom performance
- j. dissertations and theses supervised by the instructor
- k. teaching awards received by the instructor
- l. other activities that pertain to the teaching mission of the unit (e.g. participation in teaching-related committee work or curriculum development, publication of textbooks or study guides, participation in educational development programs, conferences, and workshops, etc.)
- m. the instructor's articulation of his or her teaching philosophy, and accomplishments
- n.

C. Student Rating of Teaching

1. Every course with a University course number will be rated by the use of student rating forms every time it is offered, except that thesis-only credits, directed or independent study, and internships will not be rated using such forms. For courses with one instructor but multiple components (e.g., lab, lecture, recitation, etc.), departments have the discretion to evaluate the components separately. For courses with multiple components, each taught by a different instructor, each component should be evaluated separately.
2. The standard student rating form described in this policy will be used except that:
 - a. In courses with more than two instructors, departments and/or colleges that wish to use alternative evaluation procedures must seek written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.
 - b. Academic units in which student evaluation procedures must meet national accreditation standards may use alternative evaluation procedures with written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.
 - c. A department that wishes to use an alternative form for a course must receive written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.
3. The student rating forms will be anonymous and must be provided to all students present when the evaluation is conducted, or to all students enrolled in the class if it is offered online. Students who have withdrawn from the course may not participate in the evaluation of that course. Instructors may not provide incentives for completion of the rating form.
4. ~~Instructors may require students to participate in course ratings but any system of student rating~~ Rating forms, whether paper or electronic, must include an opt-out provision allowing students to decline to respond to questions. This provision applies to all courses at the University, including any that are covered by a different rating protocol.
5. Students must be told that their ratings will be used in making personnel decisions.
 - a. The instructions for students written on the student rating forms should stress the three purposes of the form: evaluation of instructors, improvement of teaching, and assistance to future students in selecting courses. ~~(the "student release" items)~~. The instructions should also explain why demographic data are being collected.
 - b. Directions given on student evaluation questionnaires will include the following statement:

"Your responses to this questionnaire are important because they will be used in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions for your instructor. Your thoughtful written comments are especially requested, and may help your instructor improve future course offerings. The results of this evaluation (including the evaluation forms) will not be returned to the instructor until after the final grades are submitted for this course."

6. If a paper form is used, student-rating forms must be administered during a regular class period during the last two weeks of the term and in a class period that all students are expected to attend.
7. If a paper form is used, administering student evaluations will be the responsibility of each academic unit. The instructor may give instructions about filling out the forms, but the evaluations will be handed out, completed, and collected without the instructor being present, although another faculty member or a staff member may be present to supervise the process. Once collected, evaluations will be put in a sealed envelope or box. A student may be asked to hand out and collect the forms. Each instructional unit will develop its own practices for ensuring that the completed forms are delivered promptly and without changes to the appropriate ~~data-processing~~ office and are handled appropriately as private data under Minnesota law. The instructor must not ~~touch or~~ see completed forms until after his or her grades are turned in.
- ~~8. Department heads will be provided with information on the appropriate interpretation and use of student rating data in making personnel decisions and are responsible for distributing it to all individuals involved in personnel decisions based on teaching. Responsibility for providing this information to department heads rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the chancellors, and the deans. Training for new department heads/chairs and for deans should include this information. Faculty, department heads, and committees should also be provided with guidelines on how to interpret open-ended student comments.~~
9. The ~~faculty governance body~~ dean or chancellor of each college or campus, in consultation with the faculty, will determine whether and how written comments on student evaluation forms may be used in personnel decisions. In units where all written comments on students' evaluations are sent to the chair and/or to reviewing-bodies and are included in the file, unfairly prejudicial comments will be withheld from the file upon request of the instructor concerned and accordingly will not be part of annual or other reviews. The decision whether particular comments are unfairly prejudicial will be made by the chair, a senior faculty member designated through a process determined by the department, or a standing or ad-hoc committee. This provision is intended to cover ~~scurrilous~~ offensive, racist, sexist, homophobic, and other personal comments, and is not intended to exclude from the file negative comments directly related to the course.
10. Standard student rating form provisions
 - a. The student rating form will contain the following items:
 1. The instructor was well prepared for class.
 2. The instructor presented the subject matter clearly.
 3. The instructor provided feedback intended to improve my course performance.
 4. The instructor treated me with respect.
 5. I would recommend this instructor to other students.
 6. I have a deeper understanding of the subject matter as a result of this course.
 7. My interest in the subject matter was stimulated by this course.
 8. Instructional technology employed in this course was effective.
 9. The grading standards for this course were clear.
 10. I would recommend this course to other students.
 11. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend working on homework, readings, and projects for this course?
 - 0-2 hours per week
 - 3-5 hours per week
 - 6-9 hours per week
 - 10-14 hours per week
 - 15 or more hours per week

- b. Responses to course-related items 6-11 will be made available to students to provide information about the course.
- c. Items 1-10 will have the following scale attached to it on the form that is provided to students. Item eight will also have a "not applicable" option:
 - 6 - Strongly agree
 - 5 - Agree
 - 4 - Somewhat agree
 - 3 - Somewhat disagree
 - 2 - Disagree
 - 1 - Strongly disagree
- d. The form will also include the following open-ended questions:
 - 1. What did the instructor do that most helped your learning?
 - 2. ~~What could you have done to be a better learner?~~ What suggestions do you have for improving the course?
 - 3. ~~Additional comments.~~
- e. The following question will also be included on the student rating form: "How would you rate the physical environment in which you take this class, ~~especially the classroom facilities, including the effect of the environment on your ability to see, hear, concentrate, and participate?~~"

The question will have the following scale attached to it:

- 0 – Not Applicable
- 1 - Very Poor
- 2
- 3
- 4 - Satisfactory
- 5
- 6
- 7 – Exceptional

The data from this question will be linked to specific building and room numbers and the summary data by room number will be used ~~provided to the chief academic officer and appropriate classroom management office on each campus~~ to help guide decisions on facilities resource allocation. ~~(Variants of this question should be developed for classes that use multiple rooms, for field study class, for on-line classes, and for other classes that differ from the lecture in one room format.)~~

- f. The rating form will ask for information on the student's major, GPA and class year, whether or not the course is in the student's major, and whether the course is required or elective for the student, because these factors are known ~~shown in prior research~~ to have an effect on student evaluations.
 - g. There will be a request, marked optional, for information on the student's age, gender, and race or ethnicity because that information can be useful to an instructor in understanding how different groups respond to his/her teaching. An instructor or academic unit may request analysis of data by age, gender, or race or ethnicity, but the analysis will not be released if there are fewer than five students in the class in a requested category.
11. Supplemental items questions.

~~In addition to the questions required by the preceding sections of this policy, the University will establish a website with supplemental questions for the student rating process. Supplemental questions from the website may be selected by the instructor or by the academic unit for inclusion on the form, following procedures established by the~~

~~Office of the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Provision will also be made for instructors or departments colleges and departments, should they choose, to add a reasonable number of custom items from a vetted item bank. that are not included in the bank.~~ In addition, instructors may ask students to answer supplemental items in the open-ended section of the standard rating form, on a separate sheet, or online.

12. Use of data from supplemental ~~questions~~ items.

~~If the instructor selects supplemental items, the results are to be used solely for improving teaching and the results will go solely to the instructor.~~

If supplemental items are selected by a department or college, that unit will develop and make available to instructors a written policy that defines which data from the supplemental items will be used (1) for improvement of teaching, (2) for personnel decisions, and (3) for improving courses or programs. Units must consult with the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost's office on such supplemental items and how they will be used. Data used solely for teaching improvement will be provided only to the instructor. Data to be used for personnel decisions will be available to individuals charged with reviewing instructor performance. Data to be used for course and program improvement will be available to curriculum committees and similar bodies only in aggregated form and will not be identified with individual instructors. In all instances, the data will be provided to the instructor.

13. ~~Each campus will determine which office is responsible for processing student rating data. Each campus administration~~ The Office of Measurement Services will provide the instructor and the unit chair/head with a summary of the data. This summary will include appropriate statistical characterization of the responses to each question and, where a statistically meaningful database exists, comparison to the responses for the same question on a campus, college, department, and program basis. ~~To make comparative analysis more meaningful, there will also be comparisons on the basis of class type (e.g., large lecture, small discussion, laboratory, upper or lower division, elective, needed to meet university or major requirements). As resources permit, other types of statistical processing and comparisons may be added at the request of faculty or instructional units.~~

14. The original completed student-rating forms will be returned to the instructor, with the student demographic information removed. Information from electronic forms will be made available to the instructor.

~~D. Student Release Questions~~

~~The student rating form will also include the following questions, the responses to which will, with the consent of the instructor, be made available to students. The responses to these questions must not be used in any reappointment, promotion, salary, or (for tenure track faculty) tenure decisions without the permission of the instructor.~~

~~Changes in these questions require the joint approval of the Student Senate and the Faculty Senate.~~

~~Each semester an appropriate University administrator should send a message to every instructor who is receiving data from a course evaluation with a request to make the release questions available to students.~~

~~Instructors are permitted to release the results of the student release questions at any time.~~

~~These questions were selected by the Student Senate to provide future students with information about the course.~~

~~Approximately how many hours per week do you spend working on homework, readings, and projects for this course?~~

- ~~•— 0-2 hours per week~~
- ~~•— 3-5 hours per week~~
- ~~•— 6-9 hours per week~~
- ~~•— 10-14 hours per week~~
- ~~•— 15 or more hours per week~~

~~Compared to other courses at this level, the amount I have learned in this course is~~

- ~~• less.~~
- ~~• about the same.~~
- ~~• more.~~
- ~~• I have not taken other courses at this level.~~

~~Compared to other courses at this level, the difficulty of this course is~~

- ~~• less.~~
- ~~• about the same.~~
- ~~• more.~~
- ~~• I have not taken other courses at this level.~~

~~I would recommend this course to other students.~~

- ~~• Yes~~
- ~~• No~~

~~I would recommend this instructor to other students.~~

- ~~• Yes~~
- ~~• No~~

~~Rate your instructor in terms of the following characteristics.~~

~~_____ Agree _____ Somewhat Agree _____ Somewhat Disagree _____ Disagree _____ Not Applicable~~

~~6. Is approachable _____~~

~~7. Makes effective use of course readings _____~~

~~8. Creates worthwhile assignments _____~~

~~9. Has a reasonable grading system _____~~

Exclusions

This policy is not applicable to the Duluth campus.

REASON FOR POLICY

Teaching evaluations that are consistently administered across colleges and campuses by will provide formal feedback on courses and instruction.

...

DEFINITIONS

Common student-rating questions

Questions common to all evaluations completed by students that assess instructor preparedness, presentation, feedback, respectfulness, student understanding as a result of the course, and interest in the subject as a result of the course. The form also includes open-ended questions on the learning experience. The physical environment of the course is also assessed on the student rating form.

...

COMMENT:

Goals of revision:

- Respond to increased student requests for information that may aid in course selection by releasing course related information from the SRT that does not violate Minnesota state data privacy law.
- Revise the SRT by eliminating items that have been problematic, adding new items, and incorporating selected items from the current student release survey.

Changes to the Student Rating of Teaching form:

- Eliminate the student release survey in its current form.
- Retain six core items from the current SRT that are frequently used in personnel reviews and for promotion and tenure files.
- Revise the SRT to incorporate selected items from the student release survey.
- Identify a subset of SRT items that will be released to students without violating the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act.
- Include a new item on instructional technology (if applicable to the course).
- Revise the question about the physical learning environment.

Other changes to this policy:

- New: Deans or chancellors, in consultation with the faculty, determine whether and how written comments on student evaluation forms may be used in personnel decisions.
Old: College and campus governance bodies determined how written comments were used.
Issue: Faculty at different ranks may have different perspectives on the use of written comments. The decision on whether and how to use written comments should rest with the dean or chancellor.
- Eliminate unnecessary language related to policy compliance.
- Eliminate language related to the supplemental item bank. Previous language suggested that departments and instructors can add questions from the supplemental bank although technical limitations have made that impossible in the past. The University is implementing a new online course evaluation system that will allow colleges to add supplemental items in the future. The revised language makes clear that requests for supplemental items must be supported by the appropriate college office.

These policy amendments were approved by the Educational Policy Committee on March 26, 2014, and the Faculty Consultative Committee on April 17, 2014.

**ALON MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

27. SHIELD AMENDMENT TO THE MINNESOTA GOVERNMENT DATA PRACTICES ACT

**Action
(15 minutes)**

MOTION:

To amend the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

SHIELD AMENDMENT TO THE MINNESOTA GOVERNMENT DATA PRACTICES ACT

Preamble:

Faculty at the University of Minnesota support transparency and accountability in government and recognize as public employees that much of the work we do at the University is open and available to the members of the public if they make a request via the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act. In addition, faculty want to ensure that the public are getting access to research and creative works that are responsibly ready for dissemination. That is, work that has gone through the appropriate rigorous review. We are thus concerned that attempts to target faculty members' unfinished work may lead to incomplete and misleading information, stifle

creativity, and even dissuade faculty from pursuing important, yet potentially controversial, topics. For example, in other states, a variety of research has been subject to open records requests, including: research notes, email communication between co-authors, manuscripts in progress, and confidential information collected pursuant to an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved human subjects proposal. While reaffirming faculty, staff, and administration commitment to openness, those of us who teach and conduct research at the University of Minnesota are concerned that if these types of requests were granted in Minnesota, it would have a chilling effect on creative and cutting edge scholarship and teaching at the University. Several states, including New Jersey, Ohio, and Utah, shield unfinished creative and scholarly research. We request that the Minnesota Data Practices Act be amended to shield human subject information protected by an IRB approved protocol, as well as unfinished research, creative works, and scholarly communications. Our intent is to balance the public right to know with academic freedom, protection of research subjects, and scholarly integrity.

University members recognize the need to balance openness with the need to ensure that faculty members do not shy away from potentially controversial topics that they believe are important because **someone might make a Government Data Practices Act**. In addition, making public unfinished work can be misleading. It is undesirable to impact affect public debate and decision-making with information that turns out to be wrong, **insufficient**, or inaccurate. Finally, university researchers go through a variety of institutional review boards and the proposals contain, **for example**, information that identifies a human subject who has been promised confidentiality or **contain** other sensitive information that could put the health and safety of human and animal research subjects, and researchers, **and the public** at risk. Balancing openness with the potential harm to research subjects is also an impetus for the proposed amendment.

Nothing in this proposal would shield unethical research practices—there are internal and external mechanisms in place to review and investigate research ethics, misappropriation of funds, fraud, etc. In instances where malfeasance is an issue, documents can be obtained through a variety of means. Rather, the concern the proposed amendment addresses is the **use of Government Data Practices Act** requests intended to harass a scholar or to shut down a line of inquiry.

The goal is to (1) protect the integrity of scholarship, protect research subjects from harm, and protect academic freedom, and (2) protect openness in government.

Draft of proposed language to amend the Minnesota Data Practices Act:

The following data of an institution within the state system of higher education, which have been developed, discovered, created, disclosed to, or received by or on behalf of faculty, staff, or students of the institution are shielded:

- (i) unpublished notes and information relating to research, including, but not limited to, items under institutional review;
- (ii) unpublished notes and information related to a sponsor or sponsored research;
- (iii) confidential information contained in research proposals, including unfunded grant proposals;
- (iv) creative works in progress;
- (v) unpublished manuscripts; and
- (vi) scholarly correspondence.

Nothing in this section is intended to shield unethical or fraudulent practices.

Unanimously approved March 7, 2014, by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.

**CARL FLINK, CO-CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

**KAREN MIKSCH, CO-CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

28. RESOLUTION ON FACULTY CAREGIVER SUPPORT

**Action
(15 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Resolution on Faculty Caregiver Support

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs is concerned that the University's support for faculty caregivers--particularly faculty parents but also faculty who are caregivers for dependent adults--is lacking in important ways that can result in disproportionate burdens and potential challenges in recruiting and retaining an excellent and diverse faculty. We are mindful of research that shows significant career disadvantages for women faculty with children--particularly in STEM disciplines where they are already underrepresented. Accordingly, we urge the administration to take the following actions:

1. Where applicable, address the shortage of on-campus or near-campus childcare. Faculty parents need to know that they have available nearby high-quality childcare available on a regular schedule. Faculty parents also need access to drop-in emergency and short-notice childcare that includes off-hour options to support a variety of cases, including participation in occasional early-morning or late-evening activities, care for sick children or for children during school breaks and holidays, and other non-regularly scheduled uses. The committee encourages the administration to explore the full range of alternatives, including extending the services available through the UMN Child Development Center (which currently suffers from long waiting lists and limited flexibility) and exploring partnerships with commercial child care firms. The research and commentary available to the committee suggests that on-campus care is extremely important, especially to mothers of young children, and we urge that the possibility of sites on campus be given emphasis.

2. Raise awareness of unit-level practices that may adversely affect faculty caregivers. Our review identified a range of issues and practices, including scheduling important meetings and events (seminars, faculty meetings, recruiting meetings, etc.) in the early morning, late afternoon, or evening. We are particularly concerned about the potential prejudicial effect on tenure and promotion of a faculty caregiver of the unspoken assumptions that failure to attend evening or early morning events may reflect a lack of seriousness and commitment rather than simply restrictions on available time. We are similarly concerned that not all faculty members voting on tenure cases have internalized the concept that extending the probationary period means just that. There is not an expectation that the faculty member must attain a higher level of performance or impact to meet the tenure criteria. In addition, work done during the extension period is counted as part of the cumulative body of work assessed for promotion and tenure. Of particular importance is ensuring that unit heads are well-trained and well-mentored on the University's goals and policies supporting faculty caregivers, and on how they can structure department activities and evaluation to support them.

3. Raise awareness of the availability of special contracts for faculty who have a temporary need to reduce their appointment. The university's flexibility in this area is significantly greater than most faculty are aware of. These possibilities should be better-promoted to allow those who have a temporary need to reduce their appointment below full-time to do so appropriately, rather than face the stress and uncertainty that otherwise may result. Questions about fringe benefits while holding such appointments would have to be addressed, as would options (if available) to move from (for example) 50% time to 100% time. We believe, however, that such appointments, if available more generally than by special arrangements, could, for example, make the University more attractive to faculty members with children who it wishes to recruit (or to faculty members who may be thinking about having children).

4. Provide clear guidance on mechanisms to permit financial support to offset additional expenses of faculty caregivers' professional activities. It is in the University's interest to support the professional development and advancement of its faculty. Accordingly, the University has policies and procedures under which University-managed funds -- including sponsored and non-sponsored funds -- can be used to support faculty travel to conferences and meetings, research travel, academic visits, and other professional activities. For faculty caregivers, such travel has additional burdens associated with alternative caregiving or in some cases co-travel (e.g., with a nursing child). Faculty members and units need clear guidance on how and when such additional expenses can be paid for by University-managed funds, and on how units can make such support available without adverse tax consequences for the University or for the traveling faculty member. To the extent that current policies do not permit such support, SCFA recommends that the administration revise such policies to explicitly permit such support, both at unit expense and through sponsored research funding, to the greatest extent possible.

Approved March 11, 2014

COMMENT:

SCFA presents this resolution after several rounds of consultation, including discussions with the Women's Faculty Cabinet, with AF&T, and with various faculty members and administrators who are concerned about our ability to recruit, retain, and develop our best faculty in the absence of greater support for faculty caregivers. SCFA recognizes that most of the recommendations made in this resolution have broad impact beyond faculty positions, and strongly encourages the administration to look for comprehensive solutions that address the full range of faculty, staff, and students to whom this issues apply.

SCFA notes that since passing this resolution we have been informed that the pending federal Omnibus Guidance will likely contain provisions explicitly allowing expenditure of sponsored funds to support, e.g., childcare needed to permit travel essential to a grant (e.g., to present work at a professional meeting). With the endorsement of the Senate, we will work with the Provost's office, Human Resources, Research, and other offices as needed to advance policies and procedures needed to support these recommendations.

**JOSEPH KONSTAN, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

29. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

30. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 2014

11:30 A.M. - 1:30 P.M.

**25 Mondale Hall--Twin Cities Campus
105 Kiehle Hall--Crookston Campus
173 Kirby Plaza--Duluth Campus
7 Humanities and Fine Arts Building--Morris Campus
Room 419--Rochester Campus**

This is a meeting of the Student Senate. There are 55 voting members of the Student Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

Resolution on Campus Open Spaces

Approved by the: Student Senate March 6, 2014

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING**

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

Resolution on Affordable Education

Approved by the: Student Senate December 5, 2013

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

* The University of Minnesota is deeply committed to affordability and accessibility for students from all economic backgrounds. We have strived to keep down the cost of tuition and the cost of attendance, and we continually work with Minnesota's Legislature, the Governor, and generous donors to partner with us to support our affordability and financial aid efforts. The University is also actively committed to reducing administrative costs, thereby operating more efficiently and effectively. The University supports and applauds the efforts of the Student Senate to limit the cost of attendance for undergraduate and graduate students, and welcomes student advocacy at the Legislature as we all seek to hold down the cost of a University education while ensuring its excellence.

Resolution on Professional School Student Tuition Structure

Approved by the: Student Senate December 5, 2013

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

* Each year in the budget process, the professional schools/programs propose tuition rates for the following year based on a variety of factors, including comparison to peer institutions; overall cost of attendance; student debt loads; incentives to student behavior inherent in their particular tuition model; student demand; programmatic cost structures; and revenue increases necessary to sustain quality. The dependence on tuition revenue to fund operations differs by school, with tuition representing only 7% of the Medical School's total revenues in FY13. The other professional schools are more dependent on tuition, with Veterinary Medicine at 18.5%,

Dentistry at 29%, Pharmacy at 40%, and Law at 63%. The tuition guarantee model implemented in the Medical School reduces flexibility for collegiate management to address budget challenges because it “locks” a tuition rate in for a cohort. The School can increase tuition rates for each incoming class, but that is constrained by the variables identified above and may not allow the school to achieve necessary revenue goals. This lack of flexibility, combined with a higher dependence on tuition, makes a tuition guarantee model riskier for the other professional schools. It removes a tool they may need to access if there are shocks to their budget, such as unexpected decreases in enrollment/student credit hours, reductions to sponsored grant activity, or a reduction in state appropriation. Veterinary Medicine, also somewhat less dependent on tuition overall, has implemented some changes in its tuition model in recent years to address cost concerns. Beginning in FY14, the school reduced tuition for the 9th/final semester clinical year training by 25% for both resident and nonresident students, and the School’s proposal for the upcoming 2014-15 school year includes a tuition freeze for all Veterinary Medicine students, both resident and non-resident. Regarding residency status, this decision is not determined by individual schools or programs, but rather by the Resident Classification and Reciprocity Office for the entire University. This is to ensure consistency in application of residency status.

Resolution on providing Gender-Neutral Housing at each campus

Approved by the: Student Senate December 5, 2013

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

* University of Minnesota System Housing and Residential Life policies are implemented on an individual campus basis. Pilot programs for gender neutral housing are being developed on some University campuses, which will assist in determining next steps for the implementation of programmatic options. The administration will share the Student Senate’s resolution with all system campuses.

Resolution on Conflict Minerals: buying and selling of conflict-free electronics

Approved by the: Student Senate December 5, 2013

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

* University of Minnesota Purchasing Services will be surveying electronic suppliers to ascertain how thoroughly they trace and audit their supply chains to determine country of origin. We will also put a question in future RFP's that addresses this issue. After receipt of the information the University will determine the plan moving forward.

Resolution Supporting the Exemption of State Student Loan Programs from the Federal Preferred Lender Requirements

Approved by the: Student Senate March 6, 2014

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

* The University administration concurs with this resolution. The administration has been talking with federal officials about appropriate statutory language that would allow such a change

Resolution Supporting the Affordable College Textbook Act

Approved by the: Student Senate March 6, 2014

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

* The University administration is fully supportive of providing students with access to low cost, high quality educational content. Recognizing the critical role that faculty play in making the decision as to which educational materials to use in their courses, the U of M has developed several initiatives to address affordable educational resources: 1) The Open Textbook Library (open.umn.edu), led by the College of Education and Human Development in collaboration with the U of M Libraries, promotes the identification, peer review, and adoption of open education resources. In 2012-13, ten CEHD faculty chose to adopt open textbooks, saving their students approximately \$100,000. 2) The U of M Libraries, working with the University Bookstore, the Copyright permissions center, OIT, and faculty, have saved students significant money by ensuring that materials the University is already licensed (or where a fair use claim can be made) can be included at no additional charge as part of student digital course packs. In the 2012-13 pilot, nine CEHD faculty saved students over \$14,000 by using digital course packs. 3) The U of M Bookstore has been a national leader in pursuing lower cost solutions including negotiating volume e-textbook agreements with major publishers, and providing large numbers of low cost textbook rentals. Finally, the University is also partnering with other educational institutions at the state and national level to explore lower cost options for educational content.

Resolution on Preferred Name Policies

Approved by the: Student Senate March 6, 2014
Approved by the: Administration – no action required*
Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

* The University administration supports the Resolution on Preferred Name passed by the Student Senate. Use of students' preferred name in the classroom and on campus is essential to a safe, inclusive environment at the University of Minnesota, and resources should be dedicated to ensuring preferred name appears on class lists and grade rosters in the student system. The Name Change Request form will continue to serve as a way for student to request a change in their legal name, which will then be updated in the University's student record database. Preferred name can be created/changed through the One Stop "Personal Information" Quick Link.

2. CLERK OF THE SENATE REPORT

Electronic Vote Results

Information

FOR INFORMATION:

Following the March 6, 2014, Student Senate meeting, an electronic vote was taken to pass two proposed Faculty Senate Bylaw amendments. At the end of the voting period, Item 7, Proportional Representation for Twin Cities colleges, 40 votes in favor, 4 opposed, and 5 abstentions were received. This amendment was approved. Item 8, Election of Graduate/Professional SSCC members, 44 votes in favor, 1 opposed, and 4 abstentions were received. This amendment was approved.

BECKY YUST, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE

3. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
2013-14 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 2013-14:

- Civil Service Consultative Committee
- Faculty Consultative Committee
- P&A Consultative Committee
- Senate Consultative Committee
- Student Senate Consultative Committee

OVERALL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ConC has five overall recommendations that came from this year's review process. These apply to all Senate Committees to greater or lesser degree but ConC wanted to be sure to address them all within this report:

1. The faculty, staff, and students serving on the consultative committees stated that there is a lack of support for serving on these bodies. Faculty members feel that service to the college or to increasing external funding is more valued by their department heads/chairs and deans. For academic professionals and civil service staff, the impression is that service is not valued by supervisors and therefore many times they are not permitted time to attend meetings. Students do not have control over their class schedules, especially as upper classmen, and are not excused from class for committee service. Therefore they have to choose between attending meetings and missing class. All groups could benefit from increased support at all levels.
2. A concern heard from the academic professionals, civil service staff, and students was that many system or Twin Cities campus issues are routed to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), either before being brought to the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) or in place of the SCC consultation. On SCC meeting dates, the FCC meets first and many times items from SCC agendas are first discussed by the faculty. This leads to shortened discussions at SCC as the faculty have already made all their points and sometimes already come to a decision. For other issues, discussions are scheduled only with the FCC, which does not allow staff and students the opportunity to share their recommendations on the topic.
3. The chairs of the four consultative committees are the spokespeople for their classifications on a system-wide basis. For this reason, they are often contacted by the

media for a response to an issue on behalf of their representative group. Due to the role that these leaders need to fill, it is recommended that they be provided with media training from University Relations each year.

4. All the consultative committee members seemed unclear about what is included in each of their charges, what duties they are fulfilling, and what duties might need to be updated or deleted. The Committee on Committees (ConC) recommends that each committee review its charge this semester and send any revisions back to ConC by April 7 so that any revisions could be sent to the appropriate Senates for action by the end of the academic year.
5. ConC noted that the FCC leadership has monthly meetings with the President and Provost to discuss items before they reach the full committee or the broader University, but that there is no parallel structure for staff. As many staff concerns center on employment issues, the recommendation is that both the P&A leadership and the Civil Service leadership schedule monthly meetings with Vice President Kathy Brown to discuss issues of importance to each group. The meeting participants should include the chair, vice chair, past chair, and staff person from the consultative committee along with Vice President Brown and any additional staff members from OHR.

The full report on these committees is available at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/conc/13-14conc_report.pdf

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

**4. P&A SENATE UPDATE
(5 minutes)**

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 employees 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.

**5. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(5 minutes)**

**6. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES
(5 minutes)**

7. MINUTES FOR MARCH 6, 2014

**Action
(2 minutes)**

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssenate/minutes/140306stu.pdf>

**BECKY YUST, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

8. STUDENT SENATE STIPENDS

**Action
(5 minutes)**

FOR INFORMATION:

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

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

MOTION:

The Student Senate Stipend Review Committee has reviewed the performance of the following stipend-receiving students: Prahith Chakka, SSCC/Student Senate Chair, and Ben Baglio, SSCC/Student Senate Vice Chair. The recommendation from the committee is that:

- Prahith Chakka receive \$350.00 of the \$500.00 spring semester portion of his stipend
- Ben Baglio receive \$125.00 of the \$125.00 spring semester portion of his stipend

COMMENT:

The Student Senate Stipend Review Committee reviewed the performance of both individuals. The full stipend was approved for Ben Baglio while a reduced stipend was approved for Prahith Chakka.

**RYAN OLSON, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE STIPEND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**MOTION A
Student Senate Bylaws and Rules Amendments**

**Action
(5 minutes)**

Agenda Items 9. and 10. are offered as a “Consent Agenda” to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. As amendments to the Student Senate Bylaws, motions require either a majority of all voting members of the Student Senate (28) 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 these motions are being presented.

**9. STUDENT SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENTS
Articles V and VI**

MOTION:

To amend Article V and Article VI of the Student Senate Bylaws, as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~).

The packet of Bylaw amendments is available online at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssenate/docs/140501stu_bylaws.pdf

COMMENT:

The proposed Bylaws and Rules amendments are meant to clean up current language and reflect the actual processes that take place within the Senate and its committees. Examples of this are deleting responsibilities for the Clerk of the Senate or transferring of those responsibilities to the Senate Office, correcting the titles of committees and University policies, and formatting the membership language in committee charges so that they use uniform language. Similar language changes will be made by the University and Faculty Senates this afternoon. Therefore these changes are meant to keep the governing documents for the three bodies aligned.

**WILL DURFEE CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**10. STUDENT SENATE RULES AMENDMENTS
Articles V and VI**

MOTION:

To amend Article V and Article VI of the Student Senate Rules, as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~).

The packet of Rules amendments is available online at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssenate/docs/140501stu_rules.pdf

COMMENT:

The proposed Bylaws and Rules amendments are meant to clean up current language and to reflect the actual processes that take place within the Senate and its committees. Examples of this are transferring responsibilities from the Clerk of the Senate to the Senate Office, removing the waiver for Senate committee term limits, updating the process for committee forfeiture due to non-attendance, and updating the language on committee support. Similar language changes will

be made by the University and Faculty Senates this afternoon. Therefore these changes are meant to keep the governing documents for the three bodies aligned.

**WILL DURFEE CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

END OF MOTION A

**11. RESOLUTION ON THE RELEASE AND PUBLICATION OF OLD COURSE
SYLLABI FOR REGISTRATION PURPOSES**

**Action
(10 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on the Release and Publication of old course syllabi for registration purposes

WHEREAS Information found in the Course Guide on Onestop is often lackluster, vague, or unavailable, and

WHEREAS Students have indicated their displeasure about the lack of information when registering for courses, and

WHEREAS Access to previous syllabi can provide superior insight to the expectations, workload, and demands of the courses, and

WHEREAS A lack of adequate access to information regarding the structure, assessment, or pace of available courses makes it difficult to schedule a course load that aligns with students' learning styles and interests, and

WHEREAS For professors, the lack of an ability to benchmark their course syllabi with other faculty members causes discrepancies in the material and rigor between different sections of the same course, and

WHEREAS There is already a mechanism to upload syllabi to the Course Guide on OneStop, and

WHEREAS The University of Michigan, Stanford University, Clemson University, the University of Georgia, The University of Maryland, and Yale University all transparently utilize the capacity for an online syllabi archive, therefore be it

RESOLVED That the Twin Cities Student Delegation/Student Senate supports the release and publishing of old course syllabi by professors for all courses in the University of Minnesota's Course Guide on OneStop.

VALKYRIE JENSEN, SENATOR

**12. AMENDMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY:
EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

Action

(30 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the Administrative Policy: Evaluation of Teaching as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

Administrative Policy: Evaluation of Teaching: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester

POLICY STATEMENT

Overview

Evaluation of teaching provides information (1) to help improve teaching, (2) to be used for faculty tenure decisions and salary and promotion decisions based on merit, and (3) to assist students in course selection. This policy establishes standards and processes for three methods of evaluating teaching: peer review, student rating, and student-release ~~questions~~ items for the campuses of Crookston, Morris, Rochester, and the Twin Cities.

The policy includes provisions for use of common student-rating items, which is one means of making judgments on teaching effectiveness University-wide and allows calculation of statistical norms. While student rating of teaching is important, it should not be used in isolation; student-rating data alone do not have the precision necessary to distinguish among instructors who receive similar ratings. Student rating data may be used with other types of information to identify very good instructors who deserve rewards as well as instructors who may need assistance in improving their classroom effectiveness. When used for salary, promotion, and tenure decisions, these data must be used in conjunction with other relevant metrics.

A. General Provisions for Evaluation of Teaching

1. The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation. This policy therefore applies to all who deliver instruction regardless of academic rank or appointment status. Certain provisions govern only tenured and tenure-track faculty. Unless provisions are explicitly limited to tenured and tenure-track faculty or to tenure decisions, they apply to all faculty and instructional staff. This policy applies to teaching assistants who deliver instruction.
2. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, the required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must follow Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*.
3. Personnel decisions (e.g., merit and salary reviews, promotion, tenure for tenure-track faculty) for all faculty and instructional staff whose salary is based in any part on teaching will include review, by appropriate department, college, and University officers, of all numeric data from the rating forms from their courses. All student rating data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data. Data and information from student ratings will not be used in isolation from peer evaluation of instruction.
4. Teaching-evaluation information used for personnel decisions remains private data, as required by State of Minnesota law at the time this policy is adopted. Teaching-evaluation information that pertains to a course and not a specific individual will be released to assist students in course selection. The results must be shared with the instructor being reviewed. Access to information on a specific instructor must be restricted to those responsible for decisions on reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary adjustments.
5. The academic unit must maintain an appropriate record of the instructor's contributions to the teaching mission of the University. The instructor must have the opportunity to update the documentation regularly. It is the responsibility of the academic unit to retain

appropriate portions of this material, including cumulative summaries of student ratings of the instructor's courses. Each unit has the responsibility to maintain the material in the file as private data and as required by University policy and applicable law.

- ~~6. Department and college administrators should be evaluated in part on the extent to which they effectively implement this policy and should be held accountable for timely assessment of the evaluative materials assembled for each instructor.~~
7. Instructors must always be allowed to respond to student rating results by adding written comments to their files that are communicated to individuals responsible for personnel decisions.
8. Academic unit heads have the responsibility to encourage instructors to conduct early- and mid-semester course evaluations for the purpose of improving teaching.
9. Responsibility for implementing this policy rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences, and deans and department heads, all of whom must convey clearly to instructors the emphasis being placed on teaching in decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and merit-pay increases.
- 10.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

1. Peer review process.

- a. Every academic unit will have a documented process for peer review of every instructor's teaching efforts and contributions to teaching, both for purposes of promotion decisions and for teaching-based salary increases. The academic unit should evaluate instructors in ways appropriate to the discipline, and include consideration of activities outside the classroom such as facilitating student research, advising students, and other activities related to students' educational programs.
- b. The peer-review process must include consideration of any additional materials identified by the instructor as relevant to the evaluation. Instructors are encouraged to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during his/her evaluation.

2. Faculty peer review.

- a. Faculty peers evaluate tenured and tenure-track faculty. Academic units should refer to Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, Administrative Policy: *Faculty Compensation*, and Administrative Procedure: *Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* for information on how they should structure these reviews.
 - b. Both faculty and instructional staff may participate in the evaluation of all instructors who are not tenured or tenure-track faculty.
3. For peer review for teaching-related merit pay increases for all instructors, the faculty or instructional staff, as appropriate, in each unit must decide whether they want to conduct the teaching assessment themselves or delegate that responsibility to their dean or head or chair, or to an advisory group within the unit or college
 4. For all instructors, peer review should include assessment of the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, general contributions to departmental teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions. Best practices might include a review of the following:
 - a. an appropriately cumulative listing of courses taught by the instructor
 - b. a comprehensive syllabus for each course
 - c. course objectives and expected learner outcomes
 - d. examples of exams, assignments and handouts prepared by the instructor
 - e. development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications on discipline-specific teaching techniques

- f. assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline)
- g. a listing of undergraduate and graduate students undertaking independent study under the supervision of the instructor
- h. a survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction
- i. direct assessment of an instructor's classroom performance
- j. dissertations and theses supervised by the instructor
- k. teaching awards received by the instructor
- l. other activities that pertain to the teaching mission of the unit (e.g. participation in teaching-related committee work or curriculum development, publication of textbooks or study guides, participation in educational development programs, conferences, and workshops, etc.)
- m. the instructor's articulation of his or her teaching philosophy, and accomplishments
- n.

C. Student Rating of Teaching

1. Every course with a University course number will be rated by the use of student rating forms every time it is offered, except that thesis-only credits, directed or independent study, and internships will not be rated using such forms. For courses with one instructor but multiple components (e.g., lab, lecture, recitation, etc.), departments have the discretion to evaluate the components separately. For courses with multiple components, each taught by a different instructor, each component should be evaluated separately.
2. The standard student rating form described in this policy will be used except that:
 - a. In courses with more than two instructors, departments and/or colleges that wish to use alternative evaluation procedures must seek written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.
 - b. Academic units in which student evaluation procedures must meet national accreditation standards may use alternative evaluation procedures with written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.
 - c. A department that wishes to use an alternative form for a course must receive written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.
3. The student rating forms will be anonymous and must be provided to all students present when the evaluation is conducted, or to all students enrolled in the class if it is offered online. Students who have withdrawn from the course may not participate in the evaluation of that course. Instructors may not provide incentives for completion of the rating form.
4. ~~Instructors may require students to participate in course ratings but any system of student rating~~ Rating forms, whether paper or electronic, must include an opt-out provision allowing students to decline to respond to questions. This provision applies to all courses at the University, including any that are covered by a different rating protocol.
5. Students must be told that their ratings will be used in making personnel decisions.
 - a. The instructions for students written on the student rating forms should stress the three purposes of the form: evaluation of instructors, improvement of teaching, and assistance to future students in selecting courses. ~~(the "student release" items)~~. The instructions should also explain why demographic data are being collected.
 - b. Directions given on student evaluation questionnaires will include the following statement:

"Your responses to this questionnaire are important because they will be used in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions for your instructor. Your thoughtful written comments are especially requested, and may help your instructor improve future course offerings. The results of this evaluation (including the evaluation

forms) will not be returned to the instructor until after the final grades are submitted for this course."

6. If a paper form is used, student-rating forms must be administered during a regular class period during the last two weeks of the term and in a class period that all students are expected to attend.
7. If a paper form is used, administering student evaluations will be the responsibility of each academic unit. The instructor may give instructions about filling out the forms, but the evaluations will be handed out, completed, and collected without the instructor being present, although another faculty member or a staff member may be present to supervise the process. Once collected, evaluations will be put in a sealed envelope or box. A student may be asked to hand out and collect the forms. Each instructional unit will develop its own practices for ensuring that the completed forms are delivered promptly and without changes to the appropriate data-processing office and are handled appropriately as private data under Minnesota law. The instructor must not touch or see completed forms until after his or her grades are turned in.
- ~~8. Department heads will be provided with information on the appropriate interpretation and use of student rating data in making personnel decisions and are responsible for distributing it to all individuals involved in personnel decisions based on teaching. Responsibility for providing this information to department heads rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the chancellors, and the deans. Training for new department heads/chairs and for deans should include this information. Faculty, department heads, and committees should also be provided with guidelines on how to interpret open-ended student comments.~~
9. The ~~faculty governance body~~ dean or chancellor of each college or campus, in consultation with the faculty, will determine whether and how written comments on student evaluation forms may be used in personnel decisions. In units where all written comments on students' evaluations are sent to the chair and/or to reviewing-bodies and are included in the file, unfairly prejudicial comments will be withheld from the file upon request of the instructor concerned and accordingly will not be part of annual or other reviews. The decision whether particular comments are unfairly prejudicial will be made by the chair, a senior faculty member designated through a process determined by the department, or a standing or ad-hoc committee. This provision is intended to cover scurrilous offensive, racist, sexist, homophobic, and other personal comments, and is not intended to exclude from the file negative comments directly related to the course.
10. Standard student rating form provisions
 - a. The student rating form will contain the following items:
 1. The instructor was well prepared for class.
 2. The instructor presented the subject matter clearly.
 3. The instructor provided feedback intended to improve my course performance.
 4. The instructor treated me with respect.
 5. I would recommend this instructor to other students.
 6. I have a deeper understanding of the subject matter as a result of this course.
 7. My interest in the subject matter was stimulated by this course.
 8. Instructional technology employed in this course was effective.
 9. The grading standards for this course were clear.
 10. I would recommend this course to other students.
 11. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend working on homework, readings, and projects for this course?

- 0-2 hours per week
- 3-5 hours per week
- 6-9 hours per week
- 10-14 hours per week
- 15 or more hours per week

b. Responses to course-related items 6-11 will be made available to students to provide information about the course.

c. Items 1-10 will have the following scale attached to it on the form that is provided to students. Item eight will also have a “not applicable” option:

6 - Strongly agree

5 - Agree

4 - Somewhat agree

3 - Somewhat disagree

2 - Disagree

1 - Strongly disagree

d. The form will also include the following open-ended questions:

1. What did the instructor do that most helped your learning?

~~2. What could you have done to be a better learner? What suggestions do you have for improving the course?~~

~~3. Additional comments.~~

e. The following question will also be included on the student rating form: “How would you rate the physical environment in which you take this class, ~~especially the classroom facilities, including the effect of the environment on your ability to see, hear, concentrate, and participate?~~”

The question will have the following scale attached to it:

0 – Not Applicable

1 - Very Poor

2

3

4 - Satisfactory

5

6

7 – Exceptional

The data from this question will be linked to specific building and room numbers and the summary data by room number will be used ~~provided to the chief~~

~~academic officer and appropriate classroom management office on each campus to help guide decisions on facilities resource allocation. (Variants of this question should be developed for classes that use multiple rooms, for field study class, for on-line classes, and for other classes that differ from the lecture in one room format.)~~

- f. The rating form will ask for information on the student's major, GPA and class year, whether or not the course is in the student's major, and whether the course is required or elective for the student, because these factors are known ~~shown in prior research~~ to have an effect on student evaluations.
- g. There will be a request, marked optional, for information on the student's age, gender, and race or ethnicity because that information can be useful to an instructor in understanding how different groups respond to his/her teaching. An instructor or academic unit may request analysis of data by age, gender, or race or ethnicity, but the analysis will not be released if there are fewer than five students in the class in a requested category.

11. Supplemental items questions.

~~In addition to the questions required by the preceding sections of this policy, the University will establish a website with supplemental questions for the student rating process. Supplemental questions from the website may be selected by the instructor or by the academic unit for inclusion on the form, following procedures established by the Office of the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Provision will also be made for instructors or departments colleges and departments, should they choose, to add a reasonable number of custom items from a vetted item bank. that are not included in the bank.~~ In addition, instructors may ask students to answer supplemental items in the open-ended section of the standard rating form, on a separate sheet, or online.

12. Use of data from supplemental questions items.

~~If the instructor selects supplemental items, the results are to be used solely for improving teaching and the results will go solely to the instructor.~~

If supplemental items are selected by a department or college, that unit will develop and make available to instructors a written policy that defines which data from the supplemental items will be used (1) for improvement of teaching, (2) for personnel decisions, and (3) for improving courses or programs. Units must consult with the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost's office on such supplemental items and how they will be used. Data used solely for teaching improvement will be provided only to the instructor. Data to be used for personnel decisions will be available to individuals charged with reviewing instructor performance. Data to be used for course and program improvement will be available to curriculum committees and similar bodies only in aggregated form and will not be identified with individual instructors. In all instances, the data will be provided to the instructor.

13. ~~Each campus will determine which office is responsible for processing student rating data. Each campus administration~~ The Office of Measurement Services will provide the instructor and the unit chair/head with a summary of the data. This summary will include appropriate statistical characterization of the responses to each question and, where a statistically meaningful database exists, comparison to the responses for the same question on a campus, college, department, and program basis. ~~To make comparative analysis more meaningful, there will also be comparisons on the basis of class type (e.g., large lecture, small discussion, laboratory, upper or lower division, elective, needed to meet university or major requirements). As resources permit, other types of statistical processing and comparisons may be added at the request of faculty or instructional units.~~

14. The original completed student-rating forms will be returned to the instructor, with the student demographic information removed. Information from electronic forms will be made available to the instructor.

~~D. Student Release Questions~~

~~The student rating form will also include the following questions, the responses to which will, with the consent of the instructor, be made available to students. The responses to these questions must not be used in any reappointment, promotion, salary, or (for tenure-track faculty) tenure decisions without the permission of the instructor.~~

~~Changes in these questions require the joint approval of the Student Senate and the Faculty Senate.~~

~~Each semester an appropriate University administrator should send a message to every instructor who is receiving data from a course evaluation with a request to make the release questions available to students.~~

~~Instructors are permitted to release the results of the student release questions at any time.~~

~~These questions were selected by the Student Senate to provide future students with information about the course.~~

~~Approximately how many hours per week do you spend working on homework, readings, and projects for this course?~~

- ~~• 0-2 hours per week~~
- ~~• 3-5 hours per week~~
- ~~• 6-9 hours per week~~
- ~~• 10-14 hours per week~~
- ~~• 15 or more hours per week~~

~~Compared to other courses at this level, the amount I have learned in this course is~~

- ~~• less.~~
- ~~• about the same.~~
- ~~• more.~~
- ~~• I have not taken other courses at this level.~~

~~Compared to other courses at this level, the difficulty of this course is~~

- ~~• less.~~
- ~~• about the same.~~
- ~~• more.~~
- ~~• I have not taken other courses at this level.~~

~~I would recommend this course to other students.~~

- ~~• Yes~~
- ~~• No~~

~~I would recommend this instructor to other students.~~

- ~~• Yes~~
- ~~• No~~

~~Rate your instructor in terms of the following characteristics.~~

~~_____ Agree Somewhat Agree _____ Somewhat Disagree Disagree _____ Not Applicable~~

~~6. Is approachable _____~~

~~7. Makes effective use of course readings _____~~

~~8. Creates worthwhile assignments _____~~

~~9. Has a reasonable grading system _____~~

Exclusions

This policy is not applicable to the Duluth campus.

REASON FOR POLICY

Teaching evaluations that are consistently administered across colleges and campuses by will provide formal feedback on courses and instruction.

...

DEFINITIONS

Common student-rating questions

Questions common to all evaluations completed by students that assess instructor preparedness, presentation, feedback, respectfulness, student understanding as a result of the course, and interest in the subject as a result of the course. The form also includes open-ended questions on the learning experience. The physical environment of the course is also assessed on the student rating form.

...

COMMENT:

Goals of revision:

- Respond to increased student requests for information that may aid in course selection by releasing course related information from the SRT that does not violate Minnesota state data privacy law.
- Revise the SRT by eliminating items that have been problematic, adding new items, and incorporating selected items from the current student release survey.

Changes to the Student Rating of Teaching form:

- Eliminate the student release survey in its current form.
- Retain six core items from the current SRT that are frequently used in personnel reviews and for promotion and tenure files.
- Revise the SRT to incorporate selected items from the student release survey.
- Identify a subset of SRT items that will be released to students without violating the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act.
- Include a new item on instructional technology (if applicable to the course).
- Revise the question about the physical learning environment.

Other changes to this policy:

- New: Deans or chancellors, in consultation with the faculty, determine whether and how written comments on student evaluation forms may be used in personnel decisions.
Old: College and campus governance bodies determined how written comments were used.
Issue: Faculty at different ranks may have different perspectives on the use of written comments. The decision on whether and how to use written comments should rest with the dean or chancellor.
- Eliminate unnecessary language related to policy compliance.
- Eliminate language related to the supplemental item bank. Previous language suggested that departments and instructors can add questions from the supplemental bank although technical limitations have made that impossible in the past. The University is implementing a new online course evaluation system that will allow colleges to add supplemental items in the future. The revised language makes clear that requests for supplemental items must be supported by the appropriate college office.

**ALON MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**13. ELECTION OF 2014-15 STUDENT SENATE/
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR
Election by 2014-15 Senators Only
(20 minutes)**

**14. ELECTION OF TWO 2014-15 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBERS
Election by 2014-15 Senators Only
[One system campus senator and one Twin Cities senator]
(10 minutes)**

**15. ELECTION OF 2014-15 TWIN CITIES MEMBERS OF THE
STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Election by 2014-15 Twin Cities Senators Only
[One Twin Cities undergraduate senator and
one Twin Cities graduate/professional senator]
(10 minutes)**

**16. ELECTION OF 2014-15 TWO GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS
OF THE STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Election by 2014-15 Twin Cities Graduate/Professional Senators Only
(10 minutes)**

17. OLD BUSINESS

18. NEW BUSINESS

19. ADJOURNMENT