

2004-05 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APRIL 7, 2005

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 4
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES: No. 4
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 4
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 5**

The fourth meeting of the University Senate, Twin Cities Campus Assembly, and Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 7, 2005, at 2:35 p.m., as a joint meeting of the three bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 115 voting faculty/academic professional members and 24 voting student members. Vice Chair Judith Martin presided.

**1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS
Information**

University Senate

Interpretation of the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy (Zero credit courses do not count in GPA)

Presented to the: University Senate March 3, 2005
Approved by the: Administration – no action required
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Interpretation of the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy (F grade for academic dishonesty)

Presented to the: University Senate March 3, 2005
Approved by the: Administration – no action required
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Interpretation of the Policy on Makeup Examinations for Legitimate Absences (Absence for voting)

Presented to the: University Senate March 3, 2005
Approved by the: Administration – no action required
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Policy on Makeup Examinations for Legitimate Absences

Approved by the: University Senate March 3, 2005
Approved by the: Administration PENDING (Response due by August 2, 2005)
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Policy on Undergraduate Residency Credit Requirements

Approved by the: University Senate March 3, 2005

Approved by the: Administration PENDING (Response due by August 2, 2005)

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2008-09 Morris and 2008-09 and 2009-2010 Twin Cities Calendars

Approved by the: University Senate March 3, 2005

Approved by the: Administration PENDING (Response due by August 2, 2005)

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Faculty Senate

Academic Unit Governance Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 20, 2003

Approved by the: Administration March 22, 2005

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Resolution on the Faculty Waiting Period

Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 3, 2005

Approved by the: Administration – PENDING (Response due by August 2, 2005)

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Paul J. Ellis
Professor
Physics
1941 – 2005

Hildegard Graber
Physician
Boynton Health Services
1922 – 2005

STUDENT

Lucas W. DesLauriers
College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture

Michelle M. Mentzer

College of Pharmacy

Leah M. Rich
College of Liberal Arts

3. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Faculty Consultative Committee Slate
Information for the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Consultative Committee, in its charge, has the authority “to act on behalf of the Faculty Senate when a decision is required prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate and when a decision is required when it would not be possible to convene a special meeting of the Faculty Senate in a timely fashion; such actions will be reported to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting and the Faculty Senate may then overrule the Faculty Consultative Committee.”

Pursuant to that grant of authority, the Faculty Consultative Committee approved the six names to stand for election to the Senate/Faculty Consultative Committee, from which one of each pair are to be elected by the Twin Cities and non-represented UMD faculty for a term of 2005-08.

MARVIN MARSHAK, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

4. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics
Information for the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Consultative Committee, in its charge, has the authority “to act on behalf of the Faculty Senate when a decision is required prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate and when a decision is required when it would not be possible to convene a special meeting of the Faculty Senate in a timely fashion; such actions will be reported to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting and the Faculty Senate may then overrule the Faculty Consultative Committee.”

Pursuant to that grant of authority, the Faculty Consultative Committee voted that the University of Minnesota is in favor of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics academic integrity document.

MARVIN MARSHAK, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

5. INTRODUCTION OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS
Dean, Institute of Technology

Professor Marvin Marshak, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), introduced Steven Crouch, the new Dean of the Institute of Technology. He was given a few moments to speak to the University Senate.

6. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Marvin Marshak, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that the much of the effort of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has been devoted to strategic planning, which is a topic later on the agenda. He then announced that the next University Senate meeting will be held April 28. In closing, he urged faculty senators to vote for candidates in the FCC election.

7. MINUTES FOR MARCH 3, 2005

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/050303sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

8. STUDENT SENATE Resolution on Program Closures Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on Program Closures

WHEREAS, the core of the University of Minnesota's proposed mission is to "prepare graduate,

professional, and undergraduate students...” as well as to “generate and preserve knowledge...by conducting high-quality research.”

WHEREAS, as stated on the University’s website, “In all its activities, the University strives to sustain an open exchange of ideas in an environment that embodies the values of academic freedom, responsibility, integrity, and cooperation.”

WHEREAS, many graduate programs at the University add strength and depth to the mission and also represent unique opportunities that Minnesota residents will not have access to via other local institutions

WHEREAS, the University has been facing financial challenges; the administration has been and will likely continue to base critical decisions, in part, according to budgetary concerns.

WHEREAS, the proposed mission statement, the Report from the Task Force on the Future of Funding Graduate Students as well as Provost Sullivan and President Bruininks in public forums have warned that graduate programs and departments are under consideration for cuts or closures in response to the University’s need to reorient its decreased funding.

WHEREAS, the Department of Occupational Therapy has been the first department to face closure, as they have been informed to suspend all new enrollment of graduate students. In addition, this decision was made without a formal and open hearing procedure or a sense of transparency to that decision.

WHEREAS, compassion and concern for our fellow students in Occupational Therapy as well as concern for the future of our own departments and programs has caused University students to react to this process of cutting OT with alarm.

BE IT RESOLVED, the University Senate urges the University Administration to be straightforward, clear, compassionate, flexible, cautious and transparent when deciding the future of programs and to include public discussions of all parties involved in that decision including student government representation.

COMMENT:

In May 1999, the University Senate approved a policy describing procedures for reorganization. The policy can be found on the web at:
<http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/groups/senate/documents/policy/reorganization.html>

This resolution was approved by the Student Senate on March 3, 2005.

**NATHAN WANDERMAN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

Jamie Larson, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) member, said that this resolution

was created after the suspension of enrollment in the Occupational Therapy department and asks that graduate and professional students be involved in the discussions regarding graduate programs. The resolution has been approved by the Student Senate, the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA), and the Council of Graduate Students (COGS).

Q: The resolution mentions student governance involvement in program closures. Currently, students involved in the programs are involved in the consultation. Is this resolution asking that another group be involved?

A: Student governance was included in the resolution just to serve as a contact point for reaching affected students, not to provide feedback to program closures.

A senator noted that the Graduate School already requires that students in affected programs be involved.

Jamie Larson responded that while there might be a policy to this affect in place, students have not been invited to participate.

A senator noted that the resolution asks that students have input into the process and discussions but are not involved in the actual decision.

A senator then proposed a friendly amendment to the last resolved statement to strike 'student government representation' and add 'students in the affected programs'.

Another senator then said that she would not support the friendly amendment because she does not support any amendment that requires action to be taken.

A senator then noted that most faculty also first heard about the recent program closures when they appeared in the paper.

Another senator said that this resolution only asks for more transparency in the process and that students be informed of what is being considered.

A senator then said that students want to be involved in the process and student governance is mentioned in the resolution since it is the body that represents students.

Nathan Wanderman then responded that he did not accept the resolution as friendly.

A motion was then made to amend the resolution to strike 'student government representation' and add 'students in the affected programs.'

The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and the motion was not approved.

Q: Does the motion require students to be involved in the discussions or the voting?

A: Just that students be able to participate in the discussions and be informed of the process.

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

APPROVED

**9. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Resolution on Exit Interviews for Faculty
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on Exit Interviews for Faculty

The Faculty Senate requests the administration to establish the practice of conducting an exit interview with every tenured and tenure-track faculty member who leaves the University.

Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee, March 22, 2005.

COMMENT:

On April 25, 2002, the Faculty Senate approved the following statement: "The Faculty Senate requests the President to direct the Office of Human Resources, in concert with a subcommittee of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, to develop a strategy for gathering systematic information from faculty who leave the University for other academic positions. An annual report of the findings from faculty who have left should be presented to the Committee on Faculty Affairs."

The response of the administration was this: "The Administration strongly supports the spirit of this request and will direct Vice President Carol Carrier and Vice President/Vice Provost Robert Jones to work with the subcommittee to determine need and benefit, discuss options and strategies, and determine cost to benefit ratio for the proposed new Human Resources program."

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) on February 1, 2005 heard from Vice President Carrier and Ms. Julie Sweitzer (Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmation Action) about surveys that are provided to all faculty and staff who leave the University for reasons other than retirement. The response rates from faculty are very low and provide no information that is of any use. It appears that there has not been significant progress in implementing the resolution adopted in 2002.

SCFA continues to believe, however, that this information would be extremely valuable. If the University is losing good faculty members to other institutions, or to the private sector, it needs to know the reasons in order to take steps to prevent the erosion of faculty quality. SCFA thus recommends that the Faculty Senate again request the administration to conduct exit interviews for all faculty who leave the University. SCFA does not propose to tell the administration how to

conduct them, but only asks that such some one or group be charge to begin conducting such interviews as soon as possible.

SCFA would have no objection to interviewing faculty who leave because they are retiring, but in the interest of conserving resources and using them where they can provide the most useful information, we recommend that at a minimum the University interview those who leave for reasons other than retirement.

**MORRIS KLEINER, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

DISCUSSION:

Q: How would interviews be conducted?

A: The intent is to have a personal interview, but the actual details would be left up to the University to decide.

Q: What is the intention for the data?

A: Currently, survey data is made public in aggregate form, and the intent would be to do the same with this data.

Q: What would be the cost estimate?

A: There is no cost estimate, but there are various groups, such as faculty retirees, who might be willing to conduct the interviews.

A senator said that there are many reasons that faculty leave the University, some of which may be confidential. This resolution does not specify the format, who would conduct the interviews, how data would be used, and how confidentiality would be ensured. Until these details are finalized it is hard to approve the resolution.

Morris Kleiner said that there are various surveys being done on paper, but that this survey would be done one-on-one.

Q: How would an interview ensure yield greater results than a paper survey?

A: If individuals are contacted via phone or in person, it would yield better survey data.

A senator said that he also is a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA) and shared some background from those discussions. SCFA asked the University why faculty leave and was surprised that the University does not have these data. SCFA felt it would be important to know the reasons for departure, such as salary or work conditions. The survey that is currently sent is general, short, and similar to those in other industries. SCFA was hesitant to be too dictatorial in what it is requesting since SCFA will not be conducting the interviews.

Q: Has SCFA examined what other institutions do, how they do it, and what they do with the data?

A: There are other institutions that conduct these interviews, using boiler-plate questions. SCFA does not know what they do with the data.

A senator said that her college is conducting interviews with everyone who has left in the last five years. Another interesting piece besides why faculty left is where they went, which is not always known. Faculty who are contacted have been willing to talk with the interviewer. The results are confidential and the interviews yield much better data than a survey. The process has also not been expensive.

Another senator noted that this is a sensible measure for the University to conduct interviews and for the administration to determine how they should be done. Department chairs should also be tapped as another source for information in addition to the faculty who leave.

A senator then spoke in support of the resolution, noting that he trusts that it will be well-implemented and shows concern for why faculty depart the University.

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

APPROVED

**10. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Resolution on Tuition Benefits
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on Tuition Benefits

Whereas the University of Minnesota seeks to become one of the three best public research universities in the world, which aspiration perforce includes the recruitment and retention of the highest-quality faculty, staff, and students, and

Whereas the University of Minnesota, as a land grant institution, has as one of its central missions the education of highly-qualified undergraduate students, and

Whereas the University of Minnesota benefits from the efforts and commitment of all of its employees, and

Whereas University of Minnesota employees, especially as employees of an institution of higher learning, understand the benefits of higher education and seek to make them available to their children/dependents, and

Whereas the University of Minnesota desires to improve the effectiveness of its workforce and reduce employment costs by reducing employee turnover, and

Whereas the faculty of the University of Minnesota seeks a stronger sense of community among all employee groups, each of which contributes to the mission of the University, and

Whereas it can be demonstrated that the inclusion of a partial tuition remission benefit would reduce employment costs under relatively conservative assumptions, therefore

Be it resolved

--that the Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the children/dependents of all University employees having accrued 5 or more years of uninterrupted University service be granted a 50% tuition reduction upon being regularly admitted to an approved undergraduate program leading to a bachelor's degree,

--that the tuition reduction apply for the first four years of a child/dependent's enrollment, during periods in which the child/dependent student is in good academic standing; and

--that the percentage of tuition covered by the benefit increase by 10% for each additional year of uninterrupted service through year 10.

Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee, March 22, 2005.

COMMENT:

This resolution was approved by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) and the Faculty Consultative Committee in 2000 and reported to the Faculty Senate for information at its April 20, 2000 meeting. No tuition benefit has been offered for dependents of University employees.

The case for the benefit, if anything, is stronger today than it was five years ago. The competitive pressures on the University have increased and SCFA is aware of cases where departments have been unable to retain outstanding faculty members because the University did not offer a tuition benefit. When most other Big Ten schools, most private institutions, and the MNSCU institutions offer such a benefit, the University puts itself at a disadvantage in recruiting both faculty and staff by failing to offer it as well. Moreover, as the SCFA study at the time demonstrated, it is likely the University will save money with such a benefit because it will reduce staff turnover; see the attached analysis.

SCFA urges the Faculty Senate to vote in favor of the resolution.

**MORRIS KLEINER, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

DISCUSSION:

Q: How will these costs be recaptured, especially in smaller, tuition-dependent units?

A: The recapture mechanism is up to the administration to decide, but staff currently attend for no cost so there is a process already in place.

Q: Would undeclared majors be eligible?

A: If the student is admitted, then they would be eligible for the program.

A senator said that this intent does not match the language in the first resolved statement.

Q: Would spouses and partners be eligible for the program?

A: Yes since they are considered dependents.

A senator proposed a friendly amendment to the first resolved statement to add 'at the University of Minnesota' following 'approved undergraduate program'.

Morris Kleiner accepted this as a friendly amendment.

A senator commented that this resolution gives an extra benefit to families with children of college age.

A senator then proposed a friendly amendment to the third resolved statement to add 'points' following 'increase by 10%'.

Morris Kleiner accepted this as a friendly amendment.

A senator said that the last time this was presented to the administration, there was not support. One reason for this might have been the public perception of free tuition. However, most people outside the University already assume that there is free tuition for dependents since MnSCU already does it.

Q: Can a dependent acquire more than 100% tuition?

A: No.

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

APPROVED

**11. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
University Senate Rules Amendment
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the University Senate Rules, Article II, Sections 2(f) and 6(e) as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

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

...

2. Terms of Membership, Chairing of Committees, and Removal of Members for Absences

...

f. A member of a committee (whether appointed or elected) of the University Senate shall be said to have been absent if the member does not attend a meeting for which notification was given, subject to the provisions of (1) – (6) of this section (f). A non-student member of a committee of the University Senate shall forfeit membership if absent for three consecutive meetings of the committee unless excused by the chair majority vote of the committee. A student member of a committee of the University Senate shall forfeit membership if absent for two meetings of the committee unless excused by the chair majority vote of the committee. Summer meetings of a committee do not count in tallying consecutive absences from meetings. A member whose membership has been forfeited may appeal to the appropriate appointing authority for reinstatement.

(1) Committee members who have official class teaching responsibilities, class conflicts (students), medical issues, or other serious and uncontrollable factors that prevent their attendance at committee meetings for a semester should be given "excused absences" and not have the rule applied to them. If circumstances will prevent someone from attending meetings for more than a semester, the person should be asked to consider resigning and be appointed at a future time when commitments would not preclude participation.

(2) Before the first meeting of the year (and of spring semester), the chair (or committee staff on behalf of the chair) should inquire if there are people who will be unable to attend meetings because of involuntary commitments/circumstances (e.g., teaching), and if there are a number of individuals who will be unable to attend, the chair should consider the possibility of changing the meeting time or rotating committee meeting times so that some members would be able to attend at least some of the meetings.

(3) Letters of forfeiture from the chair of Committee on Committees will be sent only after the chair of the committee in question has been notified that one of the committee members has forfeited his or her seat. It is the responsibility of the committee chair, if he or she wishes, to discuss with committee members problems with scheduling before any forfeiture letter is sent.

(4) If the number of excused absences is significant but moving the meeting time is not

appropriate, the committee chair can request of the Committee on Committees an expansion of the committee size so that there will always be a sufficient number of people able to attend meetings to conduct the committee's business.

(5) Individuals who are going on leave may wish to take a leave of absence from their committee but resume committee participation upon their return. In that case, the individuals need not be permanently replaced on a committee. Those individuals will be asked if they can identify someone to serve in their place, preferably from their own department, while they are on leave. Such a nomination would have to be approved by the Committee on Committees. In the event the individual was unable to find an interim replacement, the Committee on Committees will do so.

(6) This section (f) applies to committee members who miss any three consecutive meetings (non-student members) or two consecutive meetings (students), whether within one academic year or spanning more than one academic year.

g. In those instances when a committee member makes arrangements to attend a meeting by teleconference or other technological means, and the necessary technology fails to work, that committee member will not be considered to be absent from the meeting.

...

6. Procedures for Committees of the University Senate

...

e. A committee chair may exercise discretion to close all or part of a meeting to administrative ex officio members of the committee in order to permit candid discussion of matters that include, but are not limited to, personnel or administrative organization matters. The reason for the closed session should be included on the agenda for the meeting.

...

COMMENT:

The Faculty Committee on Committees has concluded that the rigid application of the Senate Rule concerning forfeiture of committee membership if the committee member misses meetings does not adequately take into account the varying circumstances in which faculty, staff, and students may find themselves. The Committee thus recommends this more flexible application of the Rule in the case of the University Senate and the Faculty Senate in order to accommodate faculty, staff, and students who may have legitimate reasons for missing meetings. The Student Committee on Committees may wish to consider a similar Rule change for the Student Senate, but the Faculty Committee on Committees did not presume to propose a change for the Student Senate.

The Committee also believes that it is appropriate for a committee chair to make a decision about

excusing someone from meetings, rather than subjecting the matter to a vote at a committee meeting, and thus proposes to locate the authority for granting excused absences to the chair.

On the matter of ex officio representatives, there are rare occasions when a committee needs to discuss items without administrators present. For example, the Senate Research Committee wished to discuss the candidates for Vice President for Research as it prepared its advice to the President, but since the Vice President for Research is an ex officio member of the committee, as are several administrators who report to the Vice President, it would have been awkward or impossible for the faculty members of the committee to have an open discussion. The 2003-04 Senate Consultative Committee believed that committee chairs should have the option to close meetings to administrative ex officio members when required and recommended this Rules revision for the University Senate, which the 2004-05 Faculty Consultative Committee recommends for the new Rules for both the University Senate and the Faculty Senate. It is assumed that this authority would be exercised only rarely.

**KATHRYN HANNA, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**12. FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Faculty Senate Rules Amendment
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Faculty Senate Rules, Article IV, Sections 2(f) and 6(e) as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

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

...

2. Terms of Membership, Chairing of Committees, and Removal of Members for Absences

...

f. A member of a committee (whether appointed or elected) of the Faculty Senate shall be said to have been absent if the member does not attend a meeting for which notification was given, subject to the provisions of (1) – (6) of this section (f). A non-student member of a committee of the Faculty Senate shall forfeit membership if absent for three consecutive meetings of the committee unless excused by the chair ~~majority vote~~ of the committee. A student member of a

committee of the Faculty Senate shall forfeit membership if absent for two meetings of the committee unless excused by the chair majority vote of the committee. Summer meetings of a committee do not count in tallying consecutive absences from meetings. A member whose membership has been forfeited may appeal to the appropriate appointing authority for reinstatement.

(1) Committee members who have official class teaching responsibilities, class conflicts (students), medical issues, or other serious and uncontrollable factors that prevent their attendance at committee meetings for a semester should be given "excused absences" and not have the rule applied to them. If circumstances will prevent someone from attending meetings for more than a semester, the person should be asked to consider resigning and be appointed at a future time when commitments would not preclude participation.

(2) Before the first meeting of the year (and of spring semester), the chair (or committee staff on behalf of the chair) should inquire if there are people who will be unable to attend meetings because of involuntary commitments/circumstances (e.g., teaching), and if there are a number of individuals who will be unable to attend, the chair should consider the possibility of changing the meeting time or rotating committee meeting times so that some members would be able to attend at least some of the meetings.

(3) Letters of forfeiture from the chair of Committee on Committees will be sent only after the chair of the committee in question has been notified that one of the committee members has forfeited his or her seat. It is the responsibility of the committee chair, if he or she wishes, to discuss with committee members problems with scheduling before any forfeiture letter is sent.

(4) If the number of excused absences is significant but moving the meeting time is not appropriate, the committee chair can request of the Committee on Committees an expansion of the committee size so that there will always be a sufficient number of people able to attend meetings to conduct the committee's business.

(5) Individuals who are going on leave may wish to take a leave of absence from their committee but resume committee participation upon their return. In that case, the individuals need not be permanently replaced on a committee. Those individuals will be asked if they can identify someone to serve in their place, preferably from their own department, while they are on leave. Such a nomination would have to be approved by the Committee on Committees. In the event the individual was unable to find an interim replacement, the Committee on Committees will do so.

(6) This section (f) applies to committee members who miss any three consecutive meetings (non-student members) or two consecutive meetings (students), whether within one academic year or spanning more than one academic year.

...

6. Procedures for Committees of the Faculty Senate

...

e. A committee chair may exercise discretion to close all or part of a meeting to administrative ex officio members of the committee in order to permit candid discussion of matters that include, but are not limited to, personnel or administrative organization matters. The reason for the closed session should be included on the agenda for the meeting.

...

COMMENT:

The Faculty Committee on Committees has concluded that the rigid application of the Senate Rule concerning forfeiture of committee membership if the committee member misses meetings does not adequately take into account the varying circumstances in which faculty, staff, and students may find themselves. The Committee thus recommends this more flexible application of the Rule in the case of the University Senate and the Faculty Senate in order to accommodate faculty, staff, and students who may have legitimate reasons for missing meetings. The Student Committee on Committees may wish to consider a similar Rule change for the Student Senate, but the Faculty Committee on Committees did not presume to propose a change for the Student Senate.

The Committee also believes that it is appropriate for a committee chair to make a decision about excusing someone from meetings, rather than subjecting the matter to a vote at a committee meeting, and thus proposes to locate the authority for granting excused absences to the chair.

On the matter of ex officio representatives, there are rare occasions when a committee needs to discuss items without administrators present. For example, the Senate Research Committee wished to discuss the candidates for Vice President for Research as it prepared its advice to the President, but since the Vice President for Research is an ex officio member of the committee, as are several administrators who report to the Vice President, it would have been awkward or impossible for the faculty members of the committee to have an open discussion. The 2003-04 Senate Consultative Committee believed that committee chairs should have the option to close meetings to administrative ex officio members when required and recommended this Rules revision for the University Senate, which the 2004-05 Faculty Consultative Committee recommends for the new Rules for both the University Senate and the Faculty Senate. It is assumed that this authority would be exercised only rarely.

**KATHRYN HANNA, CHAIR
FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

13. REPORT OF THE FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE

**FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION
Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members**

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly confirm the reappointment of one faculty for an additional three year term on the Nominating Committee. A simple majority is required for approval.

NELSON RHODUS: Professor of Diagnostic/Surgical Sciences, School of Dentistry. University Senate member: 1993-97. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Nominating, 2002-05; Subcommittee on Capital Projects/Campus Master Planning, 2004-07.

INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Faculty Steering Committee may present the name of an individual, eligible for re-election, to the Assembly for confirmation of reappointment without another candidate on the ballot to fill the position.

**MARVIN MARSHAK, CHAIR
FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**14. REPORT OF THE FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE
FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION
Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members**

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly approve the following slate of nominees to fill two 2005-08 Twin Cities faculty vacancies on the Nominating Committee. A simple majority is required for approval. Once the slate is approved, a ballot will be distributed for voting.

FIRST PAIR (INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY)

CATHERINE FRENCH: Professor of Civil Engineering, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2000-05 (Chair, 2003-04); Council on Liberal Education, 1992-95; Finance and Planning, 1996-2000; Capital Projects/Campus Master Planning Subcommittee, 2004-07.

KENNETH HELLER: Professor of Physics and Astronomy, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: 2004-07. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Council

on Liberal Education, 1998-2001; Educational Policy, 1991-95 (Chair, 1993-95); Social Concerns, 2002-05 (Chair, 2004-05); Classroom Advisory Subcommittee, 2001-2005.

SECOND PAIR (ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTER)

PETER BITTERMAN: Professor of Medicine, Medical School. University Senate member: 1991-94, 1995-98, 1999-2005. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): AHC Faculty Consultative, 1996-98.

LESLIE SCHIFF: Associate Professor of Microbiology, Medical School. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

FOR INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Assembly shall elect by written ballot faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Nominating Committee from a slate of candidates provided by the Faculty Steering Committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Assembly. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the slate must be in the hands of the Clerk of the Assembly on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted. The elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2005-06 are:

F. Ronald Akehurst, College of Liberal Arts
W. Andrew Collins, College of Education and Human Development
Michael Darger, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences
Gary Gardner, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences
Jean Quam, College of Human Ecology
Mary Ellen Shaw, General College
W. Phillips Shively, College of Liberal Arts

**MARVIN MARSHAK, CHAIR
FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**15. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS REPORT
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

Professor Martin Sampson, Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that the legislature passed the bonding bill last night. The University came out well, with full funding for all building projects. The funding for general upkeep was the disappointing part of the bill.

A year ago, it was proposed that MnSCU be permitted to offer doctoral degrees, but this proposal

was not heard as it requires an amendment to the higher education act. This year MnSCU organized effectively and the Higher Education committees in both the House and Senate listened to testimony and agreed to consider putting this change in their recommendations. People from the University have spoken against this change. There is momentum for an amendment to the higher education act to add two words, the opportunity, for applied doctoral degrees which would add to MnSCU's mission.

A second item relates to the Academic Bill of Rights. It would mandate certain qualities in curriculum of courses. A press conference was held six weeks ago, and garnered some press coverage, but then there was a lag until the actual bill was introduced. It was been suggested that their committee will hear this bill this session.

16. STRATEGIC POSITIONING

Discussion with Senior Vice President Sullivan and Vice President Thrane

Vice Chair Judith Martin said that this is a first discussion to get feedback from the University Senate. Another meeting has been scheduled for April 28 when most of the time will be devoted to this topic.

Senior Vice President Sullivan provided some background on the strategic planning process. A week ago the task forces made their recommendations to the President. The entire process has taken place in a series of five steps since it began in July. The first step was a larger planning committee that met each week from July through January. Five reports to the Regents culminated in the Regents' unanimous approval in March.

Stage 2 began with the President appointing two task forces that met each week and issued reports last week. Stage 3 consists of the President seeking consultation and advice over the next six weeks to form his recommendations. These recommendations will be made to the Regents in May followed by a public hearing by the Regents on May 16. The Regents will then make a decision on the President's recommendations at its June meeting.

If approved by the Regents, Stage 4 would start with the formation of task forces on the recommendations. These task forces would discuss implementation option plans and strategies for about six months. Stage 5 is a multi-year review process to see the changes through their implementation.

The strategic planning process had several themes: align academic strengths and leadership at the University, build quality at each task undertaken to deal with increased pressure from competitors and for finances, strengthen leadership and outcomes in academic fields, positive outcomes for students throughout their University experience, and integrating academic relationships where similar work is being done at two locations within the University.

Vice President Thrane said that the University is working with constituencies within and outside the University to understand the stakes and driving force for the proposed changes. She asked senators to provide her with any information that help other people understand what is being proposed. In the last week, most news media outlets have been briefed to help the state

understand.

Q: What information and data were available to the task force to lead them to the conclusions contained in the report?

A: Each committee had many subcommittees working on distinct topics, and they were able to consult with people outside the task force members, such as faculty and officials in offices, such as Admissions.

Q: Faculty participation needs to be recognized on the task forces that will begin. Is there a plan to provide funding for nine month faculty, especially junior faculty, to participate on the task forces?

A: Once the Regents approve recommendations in June, task forces would form soon thereafter and would solicit members from the colleges.

A senator said that as the Regents Honor College is outlined in the recommendations, it does not capitalize on the competitive advantages that the University has. She asked to see a better mission for this program that would more closely align with the University's public land-grant and research missions. She suggested recruiting students who have demonstrated that they can contribute to bringing diverse perspectives and connections, and not focusing on class rankings and standardized test scores. These students should serve as liaisons, recruiters, and mentors for the University. They could also fill a gap by taking real problems as they are experienced and translating them into problems that scholars can address.

Q: What assurance will there be for student involvement, especially from the coordinate campuses, on the task forces?

A: Section 5 of the report discusses the coordinate campus, their role, and their expectations. The administration would like to see a large faculty, staff, and student contribution to the task forces. They are the people in the units who are directly involved with the recommendations. Recent alumni might also contribute to the discussions.

Q: While there is excitement for the initiatives proposed, there is also concern about General College and the diversity of and accessibility for students from inner city schools. How will these areas be maintained?

A: Section 2 of the report deals with undergraduate admissions, enrichment, and support services. Of the five action strategies in the strategic plan, the first one refers to students by directing energy and resources to these areas. There is a University-wide commitment and investment of new resources in academic support, mentoring, and advising. This is done within the colleges, but can be strengthened with University-wide coordination. Many parts of the recommendations also speak to diversity. The University has a commitment to preserving, strengthening, and deepening diversity.

Presently, 16.4 percent of undergraduates are students of color; the K-12 percentage of students

of color in the state is 12.7. This statistic is not good enough, nor is the 4.5 percent of K-12 students of color who are college-eligible. The University must do a better job and a four-part diversity section has been developed in consultation with the task force. The first recommendation is to strengthen the University's ability to partner with colleagues in P-12 in terms of curriculum instruction, information, and expectations. Second, there are conversations with the admissions office to strengthen and deepen the commitment to diversity, as well as increase student scholarship programs so that no student who is eligible cannot attend for financial reasons. A third piece is campus climate. If more students of color are enrolled, the University must have positive and appropriate climates and attitudes to retain these students. Fourth, communication needs to be better to all groups.

Lastly, 61 percent of students of color are enrolled in other colleges besides General College. The General College commitment to diversity will be the same commitment from the University, and skills and talents from that college in terms of research and its application will be put on a larger platform with greater resources to deliver these commitments across the University to all students.

Q: The task forces had little faculty participation, and then made specific recommendations in some areas. Will the follow-up task forces just do what is stated in the report or can they go beyond those mandates? How open will the continuing process be?

A: Some sections of the report are very specific while others are more general. These differences were based on the level of information available to the task force members. The President is using the next four to six weeks to listen and seek counsel, and the ultimate recommendations will not be decided until the end of the consulting period. He may reject or modify recommendations from the task forces, or he may ask for further study before making a final decision.

A senator said that there is concern that in the next four to six weeks decisions will be made that involve broad changes to the University. It appears that most decisions are being made by administrators and that faculty and students have not had an opportunity to weigh in.

Senior Vice President Sullivan stated that he respectfully disagrees. The strategic planning committee was a large group and sought the opinion of many people and held five town hall sessions on the report. Five public presentations were also given to the Regents, as well as 36 presentations to other groups. The task forces were smaller by design to handle delicate and confidential matters, and did not involve open discussions. Now that the reports have been released is the time for transparent discussions.

Vice Chair Judith Martin noted that the Faculty Consultative Committee held three public fora this week on the Twin Cities campus and there will be a forum Monday at Morris. Questions and opinions can also be emailed to facviews@umn.edu.

Q: When will students be involved in the process?

A: The President will be meeting with student groups to get their feedback and students will be

asked to serve on the task forces.

Q: How will the University ensure that partnerships with P-12 education takes place?

A: Page 14 of the academic task force report lists specific recommendations and a plan. This is not a new program, but an on-going process for the University. However, it has become clear that much of the activity is distributed and more coordination is needed. The plan will identify where these efforts are happening, how successful they have been, and to coordinate new efforts. If the University does not make this commitment, it will fail as an institution to the students that it enrolls.

A senator noted that most students are also not on campus over the summer so task forces should be formed before students leave campus.

Senior Vice President Sullivan said that he will work with student leaders now to identify students.

17. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

18. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

19. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor