

2004-05 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DECEMBER 2, 2004

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES: No. 2
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 3**

The second meeting of the University Senate, Twin Cities Campus Assembly, and Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, December 2, 2004, at 2:34 p.m., as a joint meeting of the three bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 141 voting faculty/academic professional members, 28 voting student members, 1 non-member, and 1 ex officio member. President Bruininks presided.

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

University Senate

Revised Senate Constitution

Approved by the: University Senate October 5, 2004

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

Amendment to the Administrative Procedures for the Grievance Policy

Approved by the: University Senate September 30, 2004

Approved by the: Administration November 8, 2004

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Declare Null and Void the TCCA Constitution

Approved by the: TCCA October 5, 2004

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

**2. CLERK OF THE SENATE/ASSEMBLY REPORT
Electronic Vote Results
Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

Following the September 30, 2004, University Senate/Twin Cities Campus Assembly meeting, an electronic vote was taken to pass the proposed Senate constitution and the revised representational structure for the Senate. At the end of the three working day voting period, 158 votes in favor of and 31 votes opposed were received. These motions were approved. The approved Senate Constitution, with the representative numbers, will now be presented to the President and the Board of Regents for approval.

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/**

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

3. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Elmer L. Andersen
Regent Emeritus
1909 – 2004

Lyle A. French
Professor
Neurosurgery
1915 – 2004

Edith L. Mucke
Professor
Continuing Education Program Development and Management
1914 – 2004

STUDENTS

Grant Geiselhart
College of Science and Engineering – Duluth

**4. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Resolution on Tuition Policies
Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy opposes any tuition policy change that includes differential undergraduate tuition rates for different programs or colleges on a given campus. The Committee endorses the current Board of Regents' policy.

Approved by the Committee, October 20, 2004.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**5. INTRODUCTION OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS
Dean, School of Dentistry; Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost**

Professor Marvin Marshak, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), introduced Patrick Lloyd, the new Dean of the School of Dentistry, and E. Thomas Sullivan, the new Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

6. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Marvin Marshak, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that Strategic Planning has been continuously discussed by the committees this fall, and is a topic later on today's agenda. Linked to planning is the discussion of a new University budget model to revise how funds are allocated. The Finance and Planning Committee has done much of the work on this topic.

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has also done much work off the record with its Faculty Legislative Liaisons this semester. If senators are interested in hearing more about this topic, please contact any FCC member.

Policy issues have been discussed at meetings with invited guests from outside the University: Art Rolnick, Vice President for Research at the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis; Susan Heegard, Director of the Minnesota Higher Education Services Office; and, Charlie Weaver, former Chief of Staff for Governor Pawlenty and currently Executive Director of the Minnesota Business Partnership.

Today, the FCC met with the Instrumentalization Task Force. Its report agrees that the University is the economic engine of the state, but outlines the non-economic contribution that the University makes to the state and its people.

The Chair of the Academy of Distinguished Teachers also attended today's meeting to discuss the contributions that the Academy has been making to education at the University.

The SCC has dealt with a few other issues, including inter-campus transportation, late night buses, and student housing.

7. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Resolution for Elmer L. Andersen
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution for Elmer L. Andersen

On behalf of the faculty and students of the University, we convey our deepest sympathy to the family of the Honorable Elmer L. Andersen.

Elmer L. Andersen was a statesman, an outstanding leader of the state, and a supporter of this University. In addition to his business leadership, he served as a legislator, as governor, and as chair of the constitutional commission. At a critical time for our University, he served as Regent, as Chair of the Board of Regents, and as Chair of the University Foundation Board of Trustees. Even after leaving active service, his counsel, guidance, and support were invaluable to us. He will be missed.

MARVIN MARSHAK, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**8. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Resolution for Ed Prescott
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution for Ed Prescott

The Senate of the University of Minnesota offers its heartiest congratulations to former University of Minnesota Economics Professor Edward Prescott on his being awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics.

**MARVIN MARSHAK, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

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

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 1 of the Faculty Senate Rules as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Rules, the motion requires a simple majority vote.

ARTICLE IV. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

...

- **Research**--Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (two representatives, including the Director of Agricultural Experiment Stations); Office of the Vice President for Finance; Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; Vice President for Research; University Librarian; Director of Compliance; Assistant Vice President for Regulatory Affairs

...

COMMENT:

The Committee on Committees and the Senate Research Committee concur that the Assistant Vice President for Regulatory Affairs should be an ex officio member of the Senate Research Committee. This officer (currently Richard Bianco) has responsibility for the Institutional

Review Board (IRB) and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), among many other things, so has a central role in assisting faculty in carrying out the research mission of the University. Mr. Bianco regularly appears at Senate Research Committee meetings on items related to his work; there are other items that come up where the Committee would appreciate having his insights.

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

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**10. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Strategic Planning
Discussion by the University Senate**

DISCUSSION:

President Bruininks said that the University has begun to rethink its long-range planning and positioning for the future, and Provost Sullivan has been asked to lead this effort. The results of this effort will be taken to the Regents in February or March for a more formal review. He then thanked the senators and Faculty Consultative Committees members who have hosted the community forums.

E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, also thanked Professors Carol Chomsky, Mary Jo Kane, and Marvin Marshak for moderating the three town hall meetings that have been held. Almost three dozen other presentations have also been held on this subject. Today's discussion will focus on the process and procedures, as well as outlining the basic principles on the web site, but which are constantly changing because of the dynamic process being used during this effort. He then presented the following information to the University Senate.

Strategic Positioning for the University of Minnesota

Why now?

- Articulate our vision of the University
- Articulate our aspirations for the future
- Use to guide decisions about priorities, structures, and strategies for maintaining greatness in the face of fiscal challenges.

Process and timeline

July 2004: Provost Sullivan convenes internal working group to lead strategic positioning process.

September 2004: President Bruininks and Provost Sullivan present framing concepts to Board of Regents for comment.

October 2004: President Bruininks and Provost Sullivan present criteria for setting priorities and reviewing programs and services to Board of Regents for comment.

October-November 2004: Comments on two documents--Framing Concepts and Criteria for Setting Priorities--invited from University community via Web site and town hall meetings.

November 2004: Working Group develops environmental scan from data submitted by colleges and organizational groups across the University. Trends and strategies for future are identified.

December-January 2004: Working group reviews comments, revises documents.

February 2005: Revised documents presented to Board of Regents.

Working group members

E. Thomas Sullivan, SVP, Academic Affairs and Provost
Shirley Baugher, Dean, College of Human Ecology
Frank Cerra, SVP, Health Sciences
Donna Peterson, University Relations
David Hamilton, Interim VP, Research
Patricia Hampl, English Language & Literature
Robert Jones, SVP, System Administration
Jeffrey Klausner, Dean, Vet Medicine
Robert Kudrle, HHH Institute
Marvin Marshak, Physics and Astronomy
Judith Martin, Geography
Kathryn A. Martin, Chancellor, (Duluth)
Kathleen O'Brien, VP, University Services
Jeffrey Ratliff-Crain, Social Sciences (Morris)
Steven Rosenstone, Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Al Sullivan, Office of Planning and Academic Affairs
David Tilman, Ecology, Evolution and Behavior
Dan Gilchrist, Office of the President
Lincoln Kallsen, Office of Budget and Finance
H. Jeanie Taylor, Office of the President
John Ziegenhagen, Office of Planning and Academic Affairs

Questions to consider

- Do the ideas in the framing concepts capture the essence of our mission and aspirations?
- Have we appropriately taken into account the University's workplace, learning and physical environments, and the relationship to communities around us?
- Does the outline sufficiently encompass the entire University system, including the coordinate campuses?
- Are the criteria and their relationships with each other clear?
- Will the criteria help us position ourselves to make appropriate decisions regarding strengths, weaknesses, and priorities?
- Will the criteria help us determine how well we are doing in relation to our goals, vision, mission, values, culture, and strategies?

Part I: Framing Concepts

- Goal
- Vision
- Mission
- Values
- Organizational Culture
- Strategies

Goal

To be one of the top 3 public research universities in the world.

(For coordinate and partnership campuses, we will require an equivalent level of excellence in their respective peer groups.)

Vision

To improve the human condition through the advancement of knowledge

Mission

The University's mission, carried out on multiple campuses and throughout the state, is threefold:

- Research and Discovery
- Teaching and Learning
- Outreach and Public Service

Values

- Integrity
- Academic freedom
- Innovation
- Discovery and the search for truth
- Diversity of ideas and community
- Excellence
- Stewardship and accountability of resources and relationships
- Sharing knowledge in a learning environment
- Service to Minnesota, the United States, and the world

Organizational culture

- Demands excellence in research and discovery, teaching and learning, and public outreach and civic engagement
- Fosters high achievement, innovation, and inspirational energy
- Attracts top faculty and bright, curious students
- Supports academic freedom
- Invests in physical environments and technological infrastructures to support excellence in research, creative work, and learning
- Produces knowledge for the people of Minnesota, the country, and the world

- Embraces diversity of ideas and community and promotes mutual respect
- Operates with integrity and complies with ethical practices
- Practices individual accountability and stewardship of resources in order to operate efficiently and effectively, seeking constantly to improve
- Appropriately balances centralization with decentralized autonomy
- Respects Minnesota's history and cultures, and values the University's role in the state

Strategies

- Provide strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary research and teaching
- Offer exceptional professional and graduate programs and a distinguished, challenging undergraduate education
- Function as an academic and economic talent magnet
- Create and nurture world-class information and research centers
- Support a greater diversity of ideas and communities
- Strategically align resources with intellectual and academic goals
- Serve as a catalyst for economic growth in Minnesota
- Improve the quality of life for Minnesotans

Part II: The criteria

Will be used for:

- Setting priorities
- Evaluating programs and services

The criteria will address:

- Whether programs or services should be expanded, maintained at current levels, reduced, or eliminated?
- If programs or services are to be expanded or maintained, can they be strengthened or improved?

The criteria

- Centrality to Mission
- Quality, Productivity, and Impact
- Uniqueness and Comparative Advantage
- Enhancement of Academic Synergies
- Demand and Resources
- Efficiency and Effectiveness
- Development and Leveraging of Resources

Strategic Action Areas

- Recruit, nurture, reward and retain quality **faculty and staff**.
- Recruit, nurture and educate quality **students**.
- Promote an effective **organizational culture**.
- Promote effective **communication and engagement**.

- Enhance and effectively utilize **resources and infrastructure**.

Questions to consider

- Do the ideas in the framing concepts capture the essence of our mission and aspirations?
- Have we appropriately taken into account the University's workplace, learning and physical environments, and the relationship to communities around us?
- Does the outline sufficiently encompass the entire University system, including the coordinate campuses?
- Are the criteria and their relationships with each other clear?
- Will the criteria help us position ourselves to make appropriate decisions regarding strengths, weaknesses, and priorities?
- Will the criteria help us determine how well we are doing in relation to our goals, vision, mission, values, culture, and strategies?

Q: Two areas of the University that occupy significant space are sports and business, but they are not mentioned here. What do they have to do with the strategic plan and future University spending?

A: Strategic planning is a process which permits the University to have a framework to review and make priorities for the University. The goal is to align all decision making within the context of the strategic planning principles, concepts, and criteria in terms of academic priorities. With regard to athletics, the President has been clear that whether the University goes forward with a stadium, the principles that will guide the decision are those that are consistent with the academic mission and priorities of the University.

Q: According to this plan, from where will new ideas come?

A: New ideas have always come from and will continue to be generated by the faculty, staff, and students at the University. The President wants the best ideas, and is open to these ideas and suggestions. This entire process is meant to be open and transparent.

Q: While this process is impressive since it provides a general statement about improvement in an abstract way, what does it actually mean to be one of the top three public institutions? Which other institutions and factors are being used for this comparison?

A: The presentation today is simply some ideas and concepts, but there is a much richer description at the core. This fuller description will be conveyed to the Regents, along with a full document which includes definitions, benchmarks, and timelines.

A senator noted that these details need to be available before presentation to the Regents to allow full faculty feedback.

Provost Sullivan said that this document will be available on the web, for review, prior to presentation to the Regents.

Q: If the University is going to be one of the top three research institutions, these other institutions are fairly selective for students. Is the intent then to make the University a more selective institution?

A: This is a question that needs to be addressed. In the recent report from the Citizen's League, the recommendation was that the University should become more nationally selective in its undergraduate programs. However, the University has a rich and distinguished land-grant

tradition which includes access to high education to students of the state. The University will need to define 'access' for the institution in the future, but will not ignore its history and traditions, as well as providing an education for low-income students. To protect access for students, a \$150 million student scholarship campaign has been started. Lastly, the University cannot forget its tradition of promoting diversity of people and ideas.

Q: How will the current document be integrated with the separate documents from the coordinate campuses? How will all the documents be discussed among the larger University community? How will the develop of broader, University-wide goals proceed?

A: Ideas, goals, and visions from each coordinate campus will be integrated into the current document so that there is one system-wide document for the President to consider.

Q: The goal to be a top three research institution carries the assumption that public research institutions in the United States know what they are doing and what quality is. The University needs to consider how utterly false these assumptions are. The University needs to ask the question if there are things that desperately need doing that the University is in a better position to do than anyone else. There is an under-utilization of current resources and a proliferation of everything a public research institution should have, and more. The problem is that people do not talk to each other. How can the University make better use of what it has and promote cross-collegiate conversations? How can the University move away from seeing its land-grant mission in terms of just outreach? Making knowledge from the University available to the public is a limited goal and it does not promote collaborative, knowledge creation between University members and people from diverse communities throughout the state. The University should claim its uniqueness and commit itself to doing a task that needs to be done. There are bits and pieces of this vision on the document on the web, but there is no commitment to bringing them all together and taking advantage of what Minnesota can do differently.

A: The committee has spent time on these topics. Uniqueness and comparative advantage are key components in the criteria. The University's breadth is often criticized, but it is also a strength. The committee is discussing how to better integrate knowledge across colleges and departments. If there is a major flaw organizationally, it is probably the lack of integration.

Q: The University is committed to excellence, but how can this be accomplished with declining resources? There are doubts that the public, legislature, and Governor are equally committed to excellence versus an institution that is just good enough. In the past, the University has confronted these issues by saying it will be better by being smaller in terms of campuses and programs. How does this process deal with decreased public commitment and resources? Does the plan contemplate the University becoming smaller?

A: The committee does not view itself as here to cut, slash, and burn. The committee is inspired to take advantage of an opportunity, during difficult times, to create a better, more-effective, and more-engaged University. The end goal must be to finish with a much stronger University. The President works every day to get more funding from the state, yet the University knows that it needs more resources from the private sector and grants. If the University finishes this process with a credible plan, it will increase public and private support in the long-term.

Q: Will the committee be addressing the declining preparedness of incoming students and including this in the plan?

A: The University needs a better partnership with K-12 to have its students be more successful. The University is not satisfied with the job that has been done so far. The President is committed to reaching out to communities to help, assist, advise, and support these students. The University will fail unless this is recognized as a major part of the University's responsibility.

11. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks said that, according to public perception, many citizens do not have a clear idea of the value, importance, and role of the University in the state, although many see the University as the state's best asset. The University needs to make its position clear when talking with the public.

The strategic plan is a living document that changes as new ideas emerge, but helps frame new discussions and think about how resources are spent on the academic priorities. The University will need to think more broadly and creatively about resources, since it relies on much more than tuition and state support.

The recent state budget forecast still projects a deficit. It is less than two years ago, but any deficit is still a problem for the University. The University will still be challenged in seeking to obtain its requested \$42 million since it cannot achieve its goals without a strong partnership from the state.

At the Governor's press conference yesterday, he mentioned the enrollment adjustment for higher education. In 1994, the state passed a law which would provide a financial adjustment to the base budgets of the University and MnSCU for changes in enrollment. These adjustments are paid two years after the enrollment is counted. For higher education, this amounts to \$220 million, which is reflected in the deficit. The Governor said that he will try to grant these adjustments. This is good news for the University, since it amounts to \$15 million in recurring funds and \$43 million of one-time funding. The primary commitment of these funds would be to educational programs.

The University, however, still needs to pursue its biennial and bonding requests. The University community needs to make its voice heard for the best outcome.

A question in the last item of business addressed the business school program. It is requesting a new building on the West Bank, to be included in the 2006 bonding request. This building has a substantial private gift and includes classrooms solutions for the entire West Bank. The Carlson School receives relatively little state support in relation to its total budget.

The University will be playing football after 2011 and is looking after its own interests. The two professional teams will probably no longer be playing at the Metrodome after 2011, and he does not want the University to get caught without options available. The University has proposed raising most of the funding for a new stadium from private funds, with a modest state investment of \$7 million per year in bonds to pay off the project. If the University inherits the Metrodome, it will cost \$10-12 million per year. The University athletics' program can also be more self-supporting with its own building. An environmental impact study proposal on the possible site will be presented to the Regents. This does not represent a commitment to build a stadium.

12. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: Graduate students are alarmed with the recent decision to close the Occupational Therapy department. What has happened to this department? What is the administration's response that this process has not been transparent or allows for an appeal? Does this signal an open season on other graduate programs that are not determined to be efficient or essential?

A: The University could have handled the closing of the Occupational Therapy department better. At the present time, there is a committee with members from the University assessing the Occupational Therapy needs in the state, but no report has yet been issued. This program closing is not the first step of an open season, but the University cannot continue to take budgetary hits, meet the growing costs of higher education, keep the University strong for the future, and not make some changes. If the University keeps everything going through a challenging period, it is a compact to be mediocre and lowers the quality of what the University provides. This is the most painful experience for any person or program that has as a strong and rich tradition. There will be some recommendations over the next few years to reallocate needs. This is not easy, but it is the right decision.

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

Professor Fred Morrison, Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that from the November elections, there is only a two-vote margin between the parties in the state House of Representatives and a three-vote margin in the state Senate. This will make it a hard legislative session, and is compounded by a state deficit of \$700 million to \$1.3 billion once inflation is included.

There are some indications that the University situation might be better than anticipated. The legislature has agreed to set up two joint committees to address stadiums and one other issue. This leads him to believe that this session might involve more cooperation. He has also talked with House Republicans and he was surprised to hear that their constituents were positive about the University.

Professors Morrison and Sampson are helping the three professional lobbyists handle faculty issues. However, all faculty are critical to the effort and can help in several ways. First, if you know a legislator, talk to him or her since personal contact is always worthwhile. Second, you are valued because you carry a vote in elections, so call the representatives who have been elected.

He said that they are hoping to set up in many districts faculty gatherings with legislators in January. He will be asking some faculty to host or attend these meetings. Second, he asked faculty to read their emails instead of deleting them since they ask for specific messages to be conveyed to legislators. Lastly, the University will have a lobbying day at the legislature.

Professor Sampson, the second Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that there is no substitute for legislators hearing from people in their own districts.

14. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

15. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

16. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

2004-05 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DECEMBER 2, 2004

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 3

The third meeting of the Student Senate for 2004-05 was convened in 165 Peik Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, December 2, 2004, at 11:32 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 31 voting student. Chair Nathan Wanderman presided.

1. DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT BRUININKS

President Bruininks said that a concern for him and students is to keep higher education accessible and affordable. He stated that the University put forth a sound and respectful budget request in light of the state's budget forecast, which as of yesterday is an expected \$700 million deficit on July 1, 2005. Therefore, unless the state decides to raise revenues, the University still has a challenge, but it is a fraction of what it was two years ago. The University is hoping that there is no reduction in its base budget.

He said that when the University increases its enrollment, there is a formula in state law that provides an adjustment to the University's budget, generally two years after the increase. Two years ago, the University and MnSCU both experienced substantial increases in enrollment, and the University is near record enrollments at the Twin Cities and Duluth this year. Due to the state law, if the state honors its commitment, the University's budget would increase \$15 million per year recurring and \$40 million in one-time funding. The University has not decided where these funds would be spent in relation to funding from the biennial request, but the highest priority will be addressing student needs.

At the press conference yesterday to discuss the budget forecast, the Governor said that he would do what he could to honor that commitment. The announced \$700 million deficit even includes \$200 million to honor these commitments to the University and MnSCU. President Bruininks called the Governor yesterday to thank him for remembering the state commitment, even though there is no guarantee that funding will be approved in the end.

He then noted that funding is a big issue for students and the future of the University since this Governor will not increase taxes to create more revenues. There is a fundamental flaw in the Minnesota tax system which creates revenue shortages, but more funding is needed to ensure quality institutions in the state.

President Bruininks then reminded senators that this year's request has three parts: Biosciences for a Healthy Society, Attracting and Retaining Talent for Minnesota's Future, and Creating and Sustaining Essential Research and Technology Infrastructure, and asks the state for a 50-50 partnership of \$42 million each year.

Fundraising for scholarship support has been made the highest priority this year and \$34 million was raised last year, much of which will be matched by internal resources. The University's goal is to raise \$150 million in a permanent endowment within the next few years.

He said that he is not sure at what rate tuition will increase, but it will be lower than last year, hopefully not double-digits. He asked students to lobby hard for the biennial budget and the capital request from last year.

President Bruininks then stated that Provost Sullivan is looking at the University's vision and strategic direction for the future, and is heading up the strategic planning and positioning initiative. A briefing on this topic will be provided at the University Senate meeting later today, but he noted that more discussions should take place with other student groups. The initiative states that the University is one of the best institutions in the world and wants to retain this status, as well as making commitments to improvement. Budget cuts cannot be used as an excuse for mediocrity.

Q: In a recent article in a Minnesota business magazine, a proposal was presented to have Crookston and Morris become campuses in the MnSCU system. What is the University's response to this proposal?

A: Vance Opperman was asked by Governor Pawlenty to co-chair a commission on the future of higher education in the state. A report was published late this summer, but did not contain this proposal. The proposal, offered by Mr. Opperman personally, was that Crookston, Morris and the Extension Service should be moved to MnSCU so that the University could focus on research. The University does not agree with this proposal. Regarding extension, the purpose is to link research to the needs of the state's citizens. For Crookston and Morris, there is no good reason to transfer assets between systems.

Q: If Duluth does a large portion of research in the state, why are there no Ph.D. programs offered on this campus?

A: There are some graduate programs under review now that would involve a strong cooperative relationship between Duluth and the Twin Cities, and this should be the way to proceed. In the state statutes, there is a law regarding mission differentiation. It states that the University should be the primary granter of advanced graduate and professional degrees. A state of 5 million people with limited resources should not multiply costly Ph.D. programs. However, niche areas should be identified for the Duluth area to extend graduate education.

Q: There is a rumor on campus to close Crookston within the next five years. Is the administration considering this proposal?

A: This issue will be more thoroughly discussed when the administration is at Crookston on December 16. With growing costs and reductions in resources, the University has to make choices in the future. A special study will be called within the next few months regarding Crookston and other parts of the University, but no decision has yet been made. If the University wants to approach the future creatively, there needs to be a clear view of what the University is trying to accomplish, what the challenges are, demographics, financing, student recruitment, use of current funds, administrative overhead, and the needs of the region. If these issues are ignored, costs continue to increase and are passed onto students. A study of Crookston will also look at the other assets in that area, the Research Station and the Regional Extension Service Center.

Q: What is the administrative response to professors who do not allow students to complete evaluations at the end of the semester?

A: The administration believes in the importance of evaluations and insists that evaluations be included in requests for promotion and tenure because teaching does matter. There needs to be a cultural commitment that faculty are responsible to students and need to ask for student

evaluations. If evaluations are good in other areas, then they are good for teaching as well. The University works to improve the quality of its teaching through evaluations and recognition through the Academy of Distinguished Teachers. This Academy advises the administration on how to improve teaching. Other improvements include increased training and support, especially mid-career programs.

Q: How can students best engage the state legislature?

A: Students should be connected to the Legislative Network and the Government Relations Office. They can also be informed about the request and then attend at the lobbying day at the capital in large numbers. Lastly, get to know your senator and representative, and talk to them with a clear message about the big picture idea for University funding.

In conclusion, President Bruininks said that he would like to return in the spring to talk about other creative ways to increase the scholarships initiatives and support ideas for students.

2. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 4, 2004 Action by the Student Senate

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URLs. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/041104stu.html>

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

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

3. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Nathan Wanderman, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that the committee has been working on three resolutions, which appear on this agenda. The Intra-University Student Leadership Conference planning is progressing, with the event being planned for mid to late spring semester to work on issues of student governance collaboration. Lastly, SSCC is working to create a solid lobbying plan.

4. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – Paul Christensen reported that the campus assembly is tomorrow. The main topic at that meeting is a campus smoking ban.

Duluth – Tom Pielow said that UMDSA recently had an open house.

Morris – Nate Hilfiker said that MCSA is working on revising its bylaws and recently had its bowling night. The assembly approved the curriculum for the next course catalog.

GAPSA - Jamie Larson said that a joint executive meeting was held last night with MSA. The goal is to get the groups to work better together. GAPSA's other goal is to raise graduate and professional student involvement.

MSA - Nathan Wanderman said that MSA is working to streamline the election process and prepare for the fees process.

5. UPDATE ON STUDENT LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

Nathan Wanderman, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that details on the conference have been delayed, but he would like feedback from members about the goal for the conference. Should it be an opportunity to extend relations between student government groups or should the conference accomplish specific items?

A senator responded that the conference should be a way for other student groups to use the Student Senate as a forum for the University system. Important student issues being discussed now, as well as those that recur, should be discussed at the conference.

Another senator said that the conference should have both purposes, as well as making the Student Senate more known to University faculty and students. The conference should also address ways to get students involved in student government.

A senator then stated that extending relations between groups should be the main goal since students need to get to know each other and what their respective groups do.

6. UPDATE ON STUDENT LOBBYING

Nathan Wanderman, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that the SSCC is attempting to get a meeting with the Governor between the end of January and the beginning of February. The goal would be to present the student perspective on the University's biennial request, which is to preserve the integrity of the University. The most effective way to approach a meeting with the Governor, and any future testifying at the capital, would be to have a small group trained and prepared to speak. If anyone is interesting in participating, please email him, since this small group will start to meet early spring semester. Lastly, he asked that senators keep their colleges involved and help to organize those efforts.

7. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Resolution Regarding One Stop Improvement Action by the Student Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution Regarding One Stop Improvement

WHEREAS Students fill out an evaluation of teaching at the conclusion of each course; and

WHEREAS The evaluation of teaching includes a student release section with questions focused on the instructor's style and curriculum content; and

WHEREAS The student release section is a useful tool for students registering for classes; and

WHEREAS The accessibility of released student sections is unsatisfactory; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the Student Senate recommends to One Stop that a teacher evaluation link be added to each course and instructor in the course guide; and be it further

RESOLVED That if a course is new or a instructor has not taught before, the student be notified as such; and be it further

RESOLVED That if a instructor has not consented to the release of his or her evaluation, the student be notified as such.

Approved by SSCC, November 18, 2004

**NATHAN WANDERMAN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Nathan Wanderman, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that goal of this resolution is to ask the One Stop Office to redesign the course selection website to include a link to professor evaluations instead of having to go to a different web page to find them, thereby providing more education for students when registering for courses.

A senator suggested that the term 'instructor' be changed to 'faculty.' This change was accepted as friendly.

Q: What is the goal of the second resolved statement since students might not want to register for a course if a professor does not have any evaluations yet? Is the third resolved statement necessary, since non-release is the implied reason when evaluations are not available on the web?

A: It is important for students to know the difference between no evaluations due to no previous experience at the University and non-consent to release evaluations.

The senator asked that this distinction be included in the wording for the second resolved statement.

Q: Can faculty selectively release evaluations?

A: For each course taught, the faculty will receive the evaluations and a waiver to release the evaluations.

Nathan Wanderman said that SSCC is looking at developing better evaluation questions to replace those currently in use. Once approved, this resolution will not be forwarded to the University Senate, since it does not affect faculty, but will be forwarded to the One Stop Office.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the resolution was approved as amended.

APPROVED

**8. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Resolution to Encourage Faculty to Release Student Release Sections
Action by the Student Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution to Encourage Faculty to Release Student Release Sections

WHEREAS Students fill out an evaluation of teaching at the conclusion of each class; and

WHEREAS The evaluation of teaching includes a student release section with questions focused on the instructor's style and curriculum content; and

WHEREAS Knowing this information will improve sustained enrollment and serve to drastically reduce schedule changes once classes have started; and

WHEREAS Informed understanding of course selection leads to increased course satisfaction; and

WHEREAS The percentage of student release sections released reached an all time high in Spring of 2004 of 22.9%; and

WHEREAS That percentage is unsatisfactory; be it

RESOLVED That the Student Senate strongly encourages the faculty of the University of Minnesota to release student release sections.

RESOLVED That deans, department heads, and department chairs should make the release of student release questions by their faculty a priority.

Approved by SSCC, November 18, 2004

**NATHAN WANDERMAN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Taqee Khaled, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) member, said that this resolution encourages deans and department heads to make evaluation releases a priority among their

faculty since the overall release from classes spring semester 2004 was only 22 percent. The goal of the resolution would also be to improve student course selection and reduce course switching at the beginning of each semester.

Q: Why is the overall release percentage so poor?

A: It is because faculty are not signing the waivers to release their course evaluations. Most faculty appear to not sign the waiver more because they think students do not care to read them rather than because the faculty received poor evaluation results.

A senator noted that while this is not a big issue at the smaller campuses, it should still be approved.

Another senator stated that evaluations cannot be released because of the union's negative stance at Duluth.

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

APPROVED

9. MOUNT GRAHAM RESOLUTION

Discussion

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE MOUNT GRAHAM INTERNATIONAL OBSERVATORY (MGIO)

WHEREAS Mount Graham, (Dzil Nchaa Si'an, to the Apache), is considered sacred by a significant portion of the San Carlos Apache; and

WHEREAS the contention of the University of Arizona that Native American concerns were either resolved or received positive, neutral, or non-response from the Apache population was addressed and refuted in a letter from Sandra Rambler of the San Carlos Apache Reservation to then University of Minnesota president Mark Yudof on December 9, 2001; and

WHEREAS Robert Tippeconnic, formerly of the United States Forest Service and supervisor of the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements on the MGIO, admitted in an article in the *Phoenix New Times* on June 16, 1993, that he knew the Apache believed Mount Graham was sacred but would be reluctant to discuss concerns with non-Indians and yet made no concerted effort to evoke Apache concerns; and

WHEREAS it is unethical to take advantage of the tribe's perceived lack of clarity in communicating its protests to the MGIO in order to advance University interests; and

WHEREAS it is at best unfair for an international coalition of academic institutions, lawyers and lobbyists to confront a single tribe in a legal case; and

WHEREAS the claim that Mount Graham is on federal land and ultimately does not need the tribe's permission is predicated on the United States of America's regrettable history of asymmetric dealings with its native population and, specifically, upon President Grant's 1873 reassignment of Mount Graham to federal status from its 1871 designation as part of a reservation,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Student Senate urges the Board of Regents to remove the University of Minnesota's financial investment and academic participation from the MGIO as a matter of principle despite the losses involved therein.

DISCUSSION:

Taqee Khaled, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) member, said that he researched the topic of the University's partnership with the University of Arizona in relation to the MGIO. The telescope is located on federal land that borders the reservations of four Native American Indian tribes and is considered sacred ground by the San Carlos Apache tribe. The telescope project has evolved through two decades of discussions, with different views being expressed by the tribe as council members have changed over these years. While the University is already invested in the project, this resolution, only for discussion at today's meeting, proposes a difficult choice by asking the University to withdraw from the project for ethical reasons.

A senator noted that the University contribution to date is a \$5 million investment in the MGIO, which yields the University 22 days of observatory time, and \$40,000 towards a scholarship fund for the tribe.

Q: What is the basis for the dispute over the land for the MGIO?

A: In 1871, a treaty was signed which included Mount Graham within the border of a new reservation for an Apache tribe. In 1873, the border for the reservation was shifted to exclude Mount Graham, and this landmark became federal property.

A senator said that it is important for the University to acknowledge the concerns expressed by the Native Americans and respect their wishes regarding this land.

Q: Are there alternate locations for the University to do its research?

A: Mount Graham is one of the top site in the United States and there are no other U.S. sites with open viewing time to purchase. If the University withdrew from MGIO, there are a list of other institutions that would buy its viewing time. The MGIO is already built, so the University's withdrawal would not impede construction.

10. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

11. NEW BUSINESS

Nathan Wanderman reminded senators of the University Senate meeting at 2:30 p.m. today. He then invited all senators to lunch at the Big Ten restaurant following the meeting. Lastly, he reminded SSCC members that they have a meeting next Thursday.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

APPENDIX A MEMORIAL STATEMENTS

Edith L. Mucke

Edith Mucke, former director of the University of Minnesota's Continuing Education for Women program, published author, and long time advocate of lifelong learning, died on Oct. 6, 2004 at age 90 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Mucke was born in Minneapolis and grew up in the southern Minnesota town of Triumph (now Trimont), where her Swedish-born parents ran the general store. She attended the University of Minnesota but with the onset of the Depression, she switched to a Minneapolis business school and took a job as a secretary at Gamble-Skogmo.

In 1939, at age 25, she married her boss, Paul Mucke, and as was customary for married, middle-class women at the time, quit her job. Mucke threw herself into her new roles as bride and homemaker, volunteering for Girl Scouts, Parent Teachers' Association, and serving as president of a women's club. On November 7, 1961, when her children were grown, she made an appointment with counselors at the University of Minnesota's ground breaking Continuing Education for Women program to discuss re-entering the University. Edith began on that very day what she later described as "a love affair with those halls of learning," earning her bachelor's degree in humanities in 1967 and a master's degree in American studies in 1971. She joined the staff of Continuing Education for Women as a graduate student, and a few years later, in 1974 was named its director.

Under her leadership, enrollment tripled to 7,000 students per year and was heralded as the premier program of its kind in the country. Then in the mid 1980's after achieving its mission of making the university as accessible to women as it was to men, the program disbanded. But courses formerly taught in the program became part of the Compleat Scholar program now in the College of Continuing Education.

Edith retired in 1983 and in retirement, devoted herself to her memoirs, travel and to her greatest passion - life long learning. In celebration of her retirement, friends and colleagues established the Mucke/Roff Scholarship Fund in the College of Continuing Education to help insure that other motivated adults would also have the opportunity to attend the University.

Her memoirs were published in 1994 and in 2001, her second book, "The 85th Year" was published.

In addition to her daughters Jane Elmore and Cathy Meagher and her sister, Ruth Runsvold, she is survived by four grandchildren and numerous great-grandchildren.