

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy**

**Wednesday, October 25, 2000**

**1:00 – 3:00**

**The Morrill Room**

**Morrill Hall**

- Present: Wilbert Ahern (chair), Prince Amattoey, Shawn Curley, Khaled Dajani, Gordon Hirsch, Emily Hoover, Frank Kulacki, Geri Malandra, (Naomi Scheman for) Christine Maziar, Kathleen Newell, Marsha Odom, Mary Ellen Shaw, Thomas Soulen, Rachel Sullivan, Craig Swan
- Regrets: Carol Miller, Richard Skaggs, Rita Snider, Steven Sperber
- Absent: Steve Fitzgerald, Charles Henderson, Karen Seashore
- Guests: Professor Kent Bales (Joint Committee on Academic Appointments), Vice President Carol Carrier (Human Resources); Tina Rovic, Christen Christopherson (General College Student Services); Professor W. Andrew Collins, Dr. Jan Smith (Bush Foundation faculty development proposal); Tracy Smith (Office of the General Counsel)

[In these minutes: academic appointments; the K grade; web advising; Bush Foundation proposal; class notes policy]

**1. Academic Appointments**

Professor Ahern convened the meeting at 1:05 and began by welcoming the new Committee members (Professor Curley and students Prince Amattoey and Khaled Dajani). He then noted that the first item of business, academic appointments, was a subject taken up at the last meeting but not finished. This subject may be on the Senate docket in November, and while there is no action item before the Committee at this time (the docket item will come from FCC), SCEP could take a position on the issues. He reminded Committee members that they had received a copy of the email from Professor Morrison outlining his understanding of the principal issues that remained unresolved (a copy of which constitutes the next paragraphs in these minutes); he asked Vice President Carrier for a status report.

"I was supposed to receive a copy of the most recent revision yesterday, but it didn't come. I'll try to find out where it is.

I'm not very optimistic right now. They [the deans] seem to want to mask the degree to which non-faculty are teaching. The document originally called for special reporting if the number of non-faculty was more than 25% of the regular faculty (i.e., no more than 1 P&A for every 4 professors); then it became 25% of the total faculty (i.e., no more than 1 P&A for

---

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

every 3 professors); now he wants to apply FTE's to this, permitting even more P&A's. We need to come down on this hard at the pre-meeting on Friday.

"The critical issues seem to be these:

"Group A

"A.1. How do we ensure that there is adequate faculty to support the major and graduate and research programs of the unit? The idea was to have an explicit plan describing the kind of courses that these individuals can teach, e.g., only 1-000 level, etc. There is concern that faculty size is shrinking and that faculty lines are being shifted to this kind of position.

"A.2. If there is such a plan, will it be at the college or departmental level? The deans want it collegiate, but the faculty want departmental. A college-wide might show acceptable collegiate averages, leaving departments that are widely askew. This problem arises in CLA, where in the foreign languages P&A may outnumber faculty 3:1, but there are few if any P&A in the social sciences, so the overall average percentage may be small. I think the faculty wants to press for departmental plans, at least from departments in which there are significant numbers of P&A instructors (teaching specialists).

"A.3. The participation of P&A staff in the educational policy decisions of the departments is also an issue. (Today, at a lunch with some of the faculty Senators, I heard some stories about two departments in which the regular faculty were outnumbered by the non-regular faculty, and in which academic values and concerns were minimized by that majority. Is this a concern?)

"A.4. What titles may these people use? I know Kent Bales is concerned about this issue. May they have "courtesy titles" as professors or adjunct professors?

"Group B

"B.1. What protections are being given to long-term P&A staff in terms of (1) fringe benefits, (2) retirement benefits, etc.?"

Dr. Carrier distributed another version of the proposed academic appointment guidelines, noting that an hour should be noted on each version because it changes that quickly. This version did not have minor changes recommended by the Twin Cities deans earlier in the week but in general the deans are now comfortable with the guidelines. She met last week with the Academic Staff Advisory Committee and had a good discussion; one issue outstanding for them is what to do with individuals who teach in continuing education. That issue has not been looked at, Dr. Carrier said, and is an open question.

Dr. Carrier also distributed a one-page summary of modifications that have been made to the original draft guidelines. She reviewed briefly the changes. The language describing the college plan is different from what it was before; the collegiate plan for the use of non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty is to be based on principles the college wishes to apply to all departments; if there is a significant variation from those principles in a department, the college would include a supplemental description and rationale in the college plan for that department.

Professor Ahern said it would be helpful to identify areas where the Joint Committee (chaired by Professor Bales) agrees or disagrees with the proposal and how the revisions might respond to its

concerns. The Committee is dealing with an effort to say something about academic appointments in response to concerns about ensuring the quality of instruction at the University.

Dr. Carrier explained that to be either tenure-track/tenured (TT) faculty or NTT faculty an individual must do some combination of teaching, research, and outreach. The proportions of each could vary between the two categories (for example, clinical faculty in the Medical School might have a heavier concentration in one area).

Professor Ahern noted that Professor Morrison was concerned that the administration was "backing down" at the behest of the deans; Professor Morrison feels the deans want to mask the extent to which NTT faculty are teaching. Does the document address this concern in a different way, he asked? Dr. Carrier pointed out that there is a section of the guidelines which embodies the notion that there is a 25% FTE threshold for NTT faculty, beyond which, in any department, a college plan would have to include a supplemental plan. The idea is to contain the percentage at 25.

There is still disagreement about how to count them, Professor Ahern commented, and in particular the change from a headcount measure to FTEs. It is the view of the Joint Committee and Professor Morrison that headcount should be used, not FTEs, because there could be an increase in the number of NTT faculty if FTE is used. And at the same time, Professor Bales noted, TT faculty are not to be counted by FTE. All appointments would be reported in each college, Dr. Carrier observed, including the actual numbers in each category.

What is intended with the "specific supplemental plan" called for when the numbers of NTT faculty in a department exceed 25%, Professor Ahern asked? In any college this is an issue only for a few departments; where it happens, the situation is to be brought out and discussed, not buried in a college plan, Dr. Carrier replied.

Another concern Professor Morrison identified is the participation of NTT faculty in educational policy decisions; this also came up in discussions that FCC members have had with members of the Faculty Senate. In some cases, TT faculty are outnumbered by NTT faculty. Dr. Carrier said that Dean Rosenstone has reported there are only one or two such departments in CLA; there could be more in the Academic Health Center while it is unlikely there are any in IT.

The 25% target raises a question about value system, Professor Kulacki said. What central discussions have there been about the value of NTT faculty? AHC units feel strongly the need for this flexibility in clinical programs, Dr. Carrier said, because of their programmatic requirements and the need to generate income; they are probably the closest to the maximum of any units, and feel such appointees are important because of the AHC financial situation and the nature of their programs. So there is no institutional vision; the guidelines are practical, intended to strike a balance, Professor Kulacki concluded. The institution recognizes the need for such faculty, Dr. Carrier said, and these guidelines establish a way to monitor their use, to avoid letting the situation get out of control, and to ensure that all faculty and academic staff are appropriately selected and fairly treated.

Professor Bales reported that the Joint Committee heard a great deal about the AHC and were briefed on NTT faculty; it makes a difference who one talks to about these issues. If one talks to the faculty, not the deans, there is a LOT of unhappiness about the continued reduction in the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty in various AHC units. If one wants to hear talk about flexibility, talk to

deans and administrators; if one wants to hear talk about academic freedom and the ability to do research of one's own choosing rather than research to make money, one hears quite another story from the faculty--and indeed from deans, who lament the reductions in tenured and tenure-track faculty. While it may be that units cannot afford that kind of faculty any more, there should be an institutional discussion of the change and what should be done about it.

Moreover, titles mask realities, Professor Bales continued, so it is hard to get at the number of faculty at the University who are teaching. If clinical faculty bear faculty titles, one cannot tell how many or which are faculty as defined by the tenure code. The Joint Committee wanted this kind of discussion in the Senate but its proposal was removed because it was thought wise to negotiate with the administration. He pointed out that he has had only a brief time to look at the documents provided by Dr. Carrier but still wants to talk about FTEs. They are, he contended, a smokescreen in order to have a better negotiating position. If the guidelines call for FTEs, not head count, there is an advantage to hiring part-time faculty, especially in colleges where there are some fluctuations in the number of students. The problem with part-time faculty is that they do not have benefits and the University can be seen to be exploiting them. Professor Bales concluded that he could not say this proposal was unacceptable but he was quite certain that all of the members of the Joint Committee will not like it.

The purpose of the Joint Committee was twofold, Professor Ahern recalled: to set parameters on the use of NTT faculty and to improve the position of NTT faculty (in terms of benefits, appointments, etc.). Part-time NTT faculty are not eligible for benefits; that invites a concern. There was an interesting albeit unplanned juxtaposition of agenda items at the last SCEP meeting, he reflected; the academic appointments discussion was followed by the discussion about civic engagement with Professor Fogelman. Professor Fogelman's explanation of why civic engagement is important, Professor Ahern recalled, is in order to resist the commodification of the University--the narrowing of its mission to respond to small segments of society that wield great power. Professor Fogelman brought up the tenure code: the University went through a traumatic experience to preserve tenure, but the pattern of appointments may make it a meaningless victory. That in part is what drives the concerns about these guidelines.

There was to be a statement of principles, Professor Ahern said. Professor Morrison expected that if anything went to the Senate, it would be such a statement about the importance of having a preponderance of TT faculty to ensure the instructional quality of the University; is that statement still in the works, he asked Dr. Carrier? There was a draft statement that was not supported by the deans, she said, so it has been set aside. It could come back through the Senate. The deans were not prepared to accept the version that was drafted.

Dr. Carrier went on to note that there are a number of adjunct faculty from outside the University, none of whom would have benefits from the University because they are employed full-time elsewhere. The Joint Committee worried about contract faculty, who could be part-time without other employment. Or, Professor Ahern added, they could have a one-third-time appointment at the University, one-third-time at Augsburg, and one-third-time at Macalester, or some such arrangement. Dr. Carrier said she would like to determine whether such individuals would be better off in a Teaching Specialist or Lecturer category, with a percent-time appointment that would qualify them for benefits. She agreed with the concern about piecing together a job at several different institutions.

From the P&A view, Ms. Shaw said, there are changes in the way teaching appointments can be offered; they must be 100% teaching [to be a teaching specialist or lecturer]. At present one can put together a job with a research piece and a teaching piece; people may want more flexibility. These are not part-time appointments but they are people who wear more than one hat. It is necessary to recognize unit needs, but that seems not to be possible under the draft guidelines. Some would find that a 100%-time teaching appointment would give them no room for professional growth, but the guidelines do not allow for a dual role.

The point is fair, Dr. Carrier said. Anyone here for a while will get other responsibilities to help keep their job interesting. The language of the guidelines, however, says "primarily." The concern is that someone will be hired to teach 100% time and be told that if they want to do anything else it will be on their own time, Ms. Shaw said. Many P&A staff do some teaching in addition to their work; if there is a 25% cap that could artificially limit the flux and flow in people's jobs. How will units have to report on this, she asked? Dr. Carrier said there will be an annual report on the use of personnel by the college with a full report of the numbers; she expressed doubt whether it would be possible to require colleges to break out percent time devoted to separate activities with each individual appointment.

Why would it benefit anyone to move from P&A to NTT faculty, Ms. Shaw asked? Will the contract faculty (non-tenure-track faculty who are not visiting or temporary faculty) be between job classes or will they be fully represented in and participate in faculty ranks? Dr. Carrier said the document speaks to governance, review, and so on. Whether an individual would make the change could depend on the unit they are in. Her concern is that there could be three pecking orders, Ms. Shaw said; NTT faculty could be neither fish nor fowl (neither faculty nor P&A). Ideally they would be fully participating faculty, but the concern that there will be too many of them and that academic freedom will be weakened suggests that may not happen. Whether their interests will be represented is a concern that will require attention, she said. There is tremendous cultural variation by unit, Dr. Carrier observed.

Professor Hoover repeated the point made earlier: if 25% of the FTEs can be NTT faculty, there could be a huge number of NTT faculty in a department; the number of individuals could be very large. She has been in meetings where the number of NTT faculty is larger than the number of TT faculty (she was brought in as a mediator) and it was a very difficult situation. It is the TT faculty who bring in the academic values, she said, and agreed with Professor Bales; the "percent" does not tell the same story as the number of people.

Another concern is that as there are more and more part-time people they become marginal, Professor Ahern said. Ms. Shaw is concerned about full-time staff. When one talks about innovative educational programs, however, someone who has four jobs will have only a limited willingness to explore innovation. If they are also voting members of a department, that becomes a matter of even more concern.

Professor Bales responded to Ms. Shaw. There would be little reason for anyone to switch from P&A to contract faculty, he said, since unless one becomes a clinical assistant professor with renewal, doing so puts an end date on one's employment. The contract faculty appointment also requires the Ph.D. or equivalent so Teaching Specialists would not typically make the switch. On the

issue of full-time versus part-time, the Joint Committee favored full-time appointments but did not oppose split appointments (an appointment in one unit with teaching responsibilities in another).

The Joint Committee also looked at titles, Professor Bales said. There is another smokescreen here because there are NTT faculty hired under the provisions of the tenure code who are supposed to do all three things (teach, do research, and do service) but who really only do two. The Joint Committee did not propose to stop such appointments but to have titles and an appointment system so that the University could count the teachers among them. There are pressures to have as many grant-getters as Principal Investigators as possible--that came out in recent CIC discussions about research appointments and the issue will stay around. The University should talk about the ratio and the relationship between those faculty and TT faculty. This new version of the guidelines, with its 25% FTEs, does not speak to physicians or research appointments (such as a research associate who might have the working title of associate professor); the plan concerns only those who are primarily responsible for teaching.

That is not clear, Professor Hirsch said. Dr. Carrier said one objective is to code P&A staff who are teaching on a part-time basis, such as research associates with a teaching assignment. A college can decide how to use titles for people such as research associates (whether to give them the adjunct professorial title) but it must decide and then be consistent. In the case of Crookston and Morris, they will be treated as one unit.

Professor Ahern inquired if the Committee wished to say anything about the guidelines. It seemed unlikely the Committee wished to endorse them. There is worry about the lack of a philosophical statement with principles, Ms. Shaw said, as well as the concern about excessive use of part-time appointments. Professor Ahern said he heard three concerns: the absence of an over-arching statement of principle, the use of FTE versus head count, and the question of the use of titles.

It was moved and seconded that Professor Ahern draft a statement and circulate it to the Committee by email. Dr. Carrier also urged Committee members to send her comments on the new version if they have a chance to look at it in more depth.

## **2. The K Grade**

Professor Ahern turned to Ms. VanVoorhis to discuss the K grade, about which questions had been raised earlier by a member of the Committee. The question, Professor Odom said, is when to use the K grade. What about internships, some of which use the K and some the I.

Dr. Rovic explained that if a course or internship does not end when the session (semester) ends, it is to be set up with the Registrar so that they know the K is the appropriate grade to use at the end of the term. Even if there are different students with different internships of different lengths, the K should be used, but they must be set up with the Registrar. So if the intent is that work not be finished by the end of the term, the K should be used; if the intent is that the work be done but it is not, then the I should be used--with a contract, Professor Newell asked? That is correct. How does one let the Registrar know? By the course description, Dr. Rovic said.

The situation also comes up in graduate departments, Professor Scheman said, although she did not know if there is Graduate School policy on the question: it is understandable and appropriate

for graduate students to use the time between fall and spring semesters to finish a paper. A faculty member cannot not hand in the grade sheets but it is not appropriate to use an I. Dr. Rovic noted that the I does not lapse to an F for graduate students. Nothing in the description of the grades describes this situation, Professor Scheman said; perhaps because it is University policy to discourage the practice, in which case there should be a discussion about why units do it. What should the grade sheets say in this case, she asked?

Ms. VanVoorhis said she would just be happy if she could get the grade sheets in a timely fashion. When students are doing papers between terms, Professor Scheman said, she simply does not turn in the grade sheets. That upset Dean Maziar, so presumably she should turn in an I for all the students, Professor Scheman concluded, although that does not fit the situation. Both Dr. Rovic and Ms. VanVoorhis said that the I should be used.

Dr. Swan offered several observations about the I. First, when grades are turned in, the report is the status at that time. Second, most faculty would be thrilled if students would complete their work within the term. Third, students do not have a RIGHT to an I; they cannot say they do not want to take the exam because they are not prepared.

### **3. Web Advising/Portfolio Project**

Ms. VanVoorhis called on Ms. Christopherson to describe the web advising tool, which is the only part of the project that they are prepared to present at this point.

Ms. Christopherson explained that she serves as chair of the academic advising network and had been asked to serve on a team project to develop an advising tool for people without access to PeopleSoft (typically faculty advisors) so that they can look up a transcript, demographic information, holds, and so on. They are working with advisors at the college and campus level to find out what they need. The idea is to provide a simple tool that will not require training; it will be linked to the portfolio project and students will have the same access to their own records that they can check for accuracy.

This will only download from PeopleSoft, Dr. Rovic added; one cannot write on to PeopleSoft with this tool. As a result, the APAS information (which is on the mainframe) will not be available, although they are looking at ways to make it accessible.

This will work for graduate and well as undergraduate students and will be on the portfolio web site; advisors will use their on X.500 ID and will only have access to the records of their own advisees. (The technology of that last provision still needs to be worked out.)

This system will be available about a year from now, in time for spring, 2002, registration. Ms. Christopherson said the purpose of this discussion was simply to let people know that the tool is coming and to ask people to make suggestions because they cannot represent all the advisors at the University. In response to a question from Professor Scheman, Dr. Smith commented that it has been the judgment of those developing the web advising tool that it would not serve graduate advisors because it would not be that much help to them. That will be a second phase of development, Ms. VanVoorhis said; there are differences between graduate students and undergraduates and at this point they are trying to provide data elements that are needed for advising. They are looking at PeopleSoft

data elements that graduate advisors need but the tool will not incorporate the elements of the Graduate School shadow system.

Professor Ahern thanked Ms. VanVoorhis, Dr. Rovic, and Ms. Christopherson for the presentation.

#### **4. Bush Foundation Proposal**

Professor Ahern welcomed back Professor Collins and Dr. Smith. He recalled that the Committee had been briefed at its last meeting about the proposal and had since been provided the executive summary and the URL for the full proposal (which can be found at <http://www.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/bushgrant.html>). The Committee is not in a position to amend or rewrite the proposal but it could adopt a resolution about the proposal if it wished. Professor Ahern read one that he had prepared.

In response to questions from new members of the Committee, Dr. Smith explained the background of the proposal and how it was developed. She also explained that this is a proposal for FACULTY development so students will not be involved in it. The idea, Professor Collins said, is to identify problems and then seek solutions from expert peers.

Is the amount of money enough, Professor Kulacki asked? It is not, both Professor Collins and Dr. Smith agreed, but it was what the University believed it should seek. Should there be cost-sharing, Professor Kulacki asked? There have been in-kind contributions from the University, Dr. Smith said: her time, the planning process, and so on. Most campuses are so strapped for money that it is hoped that when the grant runs out the activities will be continued with University funds.

Professor Kulacki said it has been his experience that most centers do not continue when the funds run out. He suggested asking the Provost to match the Bush funds dollar for dollar; the impact will be much greater. IT has 200 faculty; how many will be able to take advantage of this program? He recommended that the Committee recommend funding from the Executive Vice President's office. He pointed out that funding for technology is a black hole and that unless one puts enough money in there will be no effect. Those in the trenches see little effect from these kinds of grants.

Dr. Smith said the Provost's office is concerned about the number of faculty affected. Given the funds required to change behavior, however, and the number who are experienced with technology, they cannot do more right now. Asked how the 100 faculty who will participate will be chosen, Dr. Smith said that on the Twin Cities campus the decision will be made college by college in the three colleges that will receive the funds (Carlson, CAFES, and CLA). In the second year of the grant there will be more colleges that participate.

Mr. Amattoey asked if there would be feedback on the coordinate campuses. Professor Collins recalled that the proposal was prepared in collaboration with all campuses and that there were committees on each campus. He also explained that participation in the program will require a fair amount of time from faculty members and they hope that early participants will serve as evangelists. That is why they want mid-career faculty, people who are experienced and who can command attention from their colleagues.



The Bush Foundation is inviting participation by bodies such as SCEP, Dr. Smith said. Professor Collins added that the Foundation insisted the proposal be faculty-driven, something they tried to achieve, in part by bringing it to this Committee. The proposal has also been reviewed by the members of the Academy of Distinguished Teachers, which has endorsed it in principle.

The Committee unanimously approved a resolution prepared by Professor Ahern, as follows:

"Finding that it will support faculty in meeting significant instructional challenges, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy endorses the faculty development proposal to the Bush Foundation."

Professor Ahern thanked Professor Collins and Dr. Smith for rejoining the Committee and promised to send a letter to the president of the Bush Foundation conveying the Committee's endorsement of the proposal.

## **5. Class Notes Policy**

Professor Ahern next welcomed Ms. Tracy Smith from the Office of the General Counsel to discuss proposed changes in the policy on class notes that had been adopted by the Senate last year. He recalled that the President's Office had reviewed the Senate policy and suggested some change in wording which most saw as in keeping with the spirit of the Senate language.

Ms. Smith distributed a handout with strike-outs and additions to the Senate language. She explained that the President had learned of student objections to the original language on the grounds that it was too restrictive (e.g., it would prohibit students from sharing notes with friends who took the course at a different time) and he thought they were valid points. The focus of the policy as recast is on COMMERCIAL use of class notes, which will also avoid possible First Amendment problems, Ms. Smith told the Committee.

Professor Kulacki said that he puts all his notes on the web without restrictions on their use; he also distributes them to colleagues around the country. They may be sold somewhere else, as far as he knows, he said. How are they protected? Ms. Smith pointed out that the notes are copyrighted even without the c in the circle; if he found them being sold, he could sue for copyright infringement.

Mr. Amattoey said there has been no system created to monitor the policy, unlike other Senate policies. Will there be monitoring? Professor Ahern said the Committee expected there would probably be some violations of the policy but that instructors would be the ones most likely to become aware of such violations; this policy gives them a way to stop the selling of notes because violation of the policy is a violation of the Student Conduct Code.

The Senate adopted the policy, the President has proposed changes, and the Committee is being asked if it agrees with the changes, Professor Ahern said. Does it? The Committee voted unanimously to approve the changes and to report them to the Senate.

Professor Ahern thanked Ms. Smith for bringing the changes to the Committee.

**6. Subcommittee Matters**

Professor Ahern noted that two subcommittees have been appointed, one on credits and degrees and barriers to graduation, the other on IMG. The former will be chaired by Professor Hirsch; the latter has no chair as yet.

The Committee also glanced briefly at a memo concerning the relationship between course credits and revenue and agreed that it should be on the agenda of the next meeting.

Professor Ahern adjourned the meeting at 2:50.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota