

2005-06 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DECEMBER 1, 2005

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2 STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, December 1, 2005, at 2:36 p.m., as a joint meeting of the bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 23 academic professional members, 18 civil service members, 106 voting faculty/faculty-like academic professional members, and 21 voting student members. President Bruininks presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

Faculty Senate

Interpretation of the Undergraduate Residency and Credit Requirements Policy (Effective date fall 2005)

Presented to the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration – no action required
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy (Delete conflicting footnote on I converting to an F)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy (Freezing transcript at graduation)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy (Performance level for S)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Regents Policy on Openness in Research

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

Statement of Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies and Practices (Academic Probation)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005
Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Homa Amir-Fazli
Professor
Design, Housing & Apparel
1931 – 2005

Rutherford Aris
Professor
Chemical Engineering/Material Science
1929 – 2005

John Dolan
Professor
Philosophy
1937 – 2005

Lucille Hoiland
Professor
Anatomy
1914 – 2005

Alton H. Hollenbeck
Professor
Public Health
1920 – 2005

Rodney C. Loehr
Professor
History
1905 – 2005

David Noetzel
Professor
Entomology
1929 – 2005

Eldred Smith
Professor
University Libraries
1931 – 2004

Martin L. Snoke
Professor
Educational Psychology
1914 – 2005

John E. Turner
Regents Professor
Political Science
1917 – 2005

Chengxing Wang

Professor
Dentistry
1966 – 2005

Harry C. Walker
Associate Professor
Radiology
1924 – 2005

Walter Weyhmann
Professor
Physics
1935 – 2005

STUDENTS

Richard T. Rose
University of Minnesota – Morris

Wade Sibson
College of Liberal Arts - Duluth

Jill M. Tuttle
Graduate School

3. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Statement on Courses with a High Percentage of A's Information for the Faculty Senate

Statement on Courses with a High Percentage of A's

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has reviewed material provided by Vice Provost Swan with regard to courses with a high percentage of A's. There are clearly some situations where a high proportion of A's would not be unusual, e.g., smaller classes with a large proportion of high ability students. While there are no simple numeric limits that the Committee would want to impose, a high proportions of A's in large classes for which there is little reason to expect that enrollment would be selective does raise questions about the appropriateness of the use of the A-F grading scale.

In particular, SCEP believes that there are a group of courses for which S-N grades would be more appropriate. These include courses where there are not specific differential expectations of performance linked to grades; grades appear to be heavily based on attendance rather than an evaluation of learning.

The Committee asks the Provost's Office to share this statement with colleges, to have follow up conversations with colleges on specific courses, and to report back to SCEP by the end of the spring semester.

Adopted October 26, 2005

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

4. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Criteria for Noting Teaching Awards in the Class Schedule
Information for the Faculty Senate

Twin Cities: Identification of Award Winning Teachers for
Inclusion on the Class Schedule and Course Guide

Recognition of teaching awards should include

- All-University or all-campus awards for excellence in teaching
- College awards for excellence in teaching
- Disciplinary awards for excellence in teaching, e.g. national recognition by professional society.

Other awards that recognize outstanding contributions to the education of students are eligible to be considered for inclusion. For awards to be considered for inclusion, individuals should send a brief description of the award to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This material will be vetted with an appropriate group of faculty for review.

To be considered, materials must include information about the following:

- The history of the award (i.e., how long has the award been in existence)
- A listing of past University of Minnesota recipients
- An indication of how frequently the award is granted and how individuals are recognized
- A description of the process that solicits nominations
- A description of the material that is reviewed
- A description of what body reviews nominations/submissions

Approved September 28, 2005

RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

5. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Revised Rules for the Morse-Alumni and Graduate-Professional Awards
Information for the Faculty Senate

[Guidelines for both awards are available as a PDF on the web at:
<http://academic.umn.edu/provost/awards/aoce.html>]

HORACE T. MORSE-UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA ALUMNI ASSOCIATION
AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNDERGRADUATE
EDUCATION

Purpose

Each year since 1965, the University of Minnesota has recognized a select group of faculty members for their outstanding contributions to undergraduate education. This honor is awarded to exceptional candidates nominated by colleges in their quest to identify excellence in undergraduate education. In addition to honoring individual faculty members, the award

contributes to the improvement of undergraduate education at the University by publicizing their work to serve as a resource for the whole faculty.

The award, named for a former dean of General College, is made possible through generous support of the University of Minnesota Alumni Association and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Eligibility

Regular faculty (tenure-track and tenured) and term faculty (non-regular) salaried through the University and holding a 66 2/3% time or greater appointment, who have been at the University of Minnesota for at least **five** years, including the current year, may be nominated for the Morse-Alumni Award. Previous nominees who did not receive the award may be renominated; previous winners are ineligible.

For the purposes of this award, undergraduates are defined as students who are pursuing a baccalaureate or an associate degree program. Professional and graduate programs, if they offer education to undergraduates, are encouraged to nominate candidates.

Awards

During the 2005-06 academic year, up to eight University of Minnesota faculty members will be selected to receive the Morse-Alumni Award with the announcement of award recipients to be made mid-March. Recipients will receive a \$3,000 continuous augmentation to their annual salary during their lifetime as a University of Minnesota faculty member. In addition, each recipient's department will be given \$1,500 annually for five years to be used by the recipient for professional development or research.

Criteria

Nominees will be evaluated on the basis of a dossier documenting outstanding contributions to undergraduate education. The dossier should provide specific evidence of outstanding performance in one or more--not necessarily all--of the five categories listed below:

1. Teaching: direct contact with students in undergraduate courses and programs and in co-curricular activities. Teaching activities include instructing groups of students in classes, seminars, and laboratories; and supervising individual activities, such as practicums, internships, field-learning experiences, tutorials, performances, exhibitions, and independent study, including supervision of UROP projects. The activities listed above are representative, not exhaustive.
2. Advising: activities that aid individual students with course and major selection, career plans, and personal development, especially in ways that go beyond formal curricular advising; and those that provide guidance to student organizations or groups. Documentation should include information about accessibility to students, which ordinarily includes but is not limited to office availability.¹

¹ Where advising is the exclusive or primary contribution, a candidate should be nominated instead, or perhaps in addition, for the John Tate Award for Undergraduate Academic Advising; "Two awards will be given to those whose primary responsibilities include advising, and two awards will be given to those for whom advising is not a primary responsibility, but who meet the criteria for excellence in advising."

3. Research and Artistic Activities: such activities should be documented and discussed in terms of the relationship between these activities and the nominee's contributions to undergraduate education.

4. Academic Program Development: such activities that contribute to the planning, design, or development of improvements in undergraduate education. Contributions in this area include, for example, new courses or a cluster of courses, general-education options in the undergraduate curriculum, and valuable programmatic innovations of any kind.

5. Educational Leadership: extra-programmatic activities of any kind and at any level that constitute leadership and contribute substantially to undergraduate education; for example, presenting papers, holding a position such as national or regional officer or program chair in a professional association, or being a member of a college or all-University committee.

This list should not be considered exhaustive or restrictive. The selection committee will consider any and all outstanding contributions to undergraduate education described by the materials provided. The magnitude of an outstanding contribution in one area may compensate for little or no contribution in other areas. For example, not all distinguished classroom teachers have the opportunity to contribute to "academic program development" that persons in administrative offices do, but they may, nevertheless, make outstanding contributions to undergraduate education.

Selection committees will consider outstanding contributions ranging from broadly distinguished performance over many years to a single extraordinary contribution without favoring one kind over another. Persons receiving awards will be those whose contributions to undergraduate education the selection committee considers the most outstanding in a given year and also genuinely outstanding regardless of the year or the competition. The University of Minnesota is a research university, so the dossiers of all nominees should include evidence of their intellectual distinction.

Selection of College Nominees

Each college engaged in pre-baccalaureate education may submit, **on or before Thursday, January 26, 2006**, up to three nominations. Because of its size, the College of Liberal Arts may submit up to six nominations. Colleges may nominate faculty members of other colleges as well as their own.

Suggestions for nominees may be made to the college nominating committee² by individual students and faculty members, by departments and other administrative units of the college, and by student organizations and associations. College nominating committees should inform the faculty, student, and staff of that college of its nominating procedures well in advance of beginning its selection process.

Nomination Procedure

After selecting its nominees, the college, in consultation with the nominee, should prepare the nominee's dossier for review by the Morse-Alumni Award Selection Committee. This selection committee, which reports to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), is composed

² All colleges (small as well as large) are encouraged to have nominating committees.

of seven faculty, one or more student members of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and a representative of the University of Minnesota Alumni Association. Of the seven faculty members:

- at least one must be a current member of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy,
- two must come from coordinate campuses (not from the same campus) and serve two-year terms, with these two positions rotating among the coordinate campuses so that no campus is unrepresented for more than two consecutive years,
- at least two must be former award winners.

Organization and Presentation of Dossiers¹

The college should submit *an original plus nine copies* of each candidate's dossier to the **Morse-Alumni Selection Committee, 234 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 by no later than 4:00 p.m., Thursday, January 26, 2006.** *In addition to including the nomination form in each candidate's dossier, the designated college contact will submit the nomination form online, using a previously provided password and web site address for the online form submission. If this information has not been obtained, contact Karen Zentner Bacig, kbacig@umn.edu, 612.624.5082.* Decisions will be based on the content of the dossier, not on the dossier appearance. In order to maintain a similar appearance and reduce the burden to the college and nominees, each copy should be submitted in a plain report cover with index tabs (no three-ring binders, please). Photographs, videos, and other types of visual materials not central to the dossier are discouraged. Brevity is encouraged in assembling the following materials. Items should be presented in the order listed below. Successful dossiers will be made available for public review and various University of Minnesota editors may publish information from these dossiers in materials regarding the Morse-Alumni Award. Dossier contents will be publicly available except for information covered by the MN Data Privacy Act. Private or personal materials should not be included as part of the dossier.

- A. The nomination form and the release form. The nomination form must also be submitted online.
- B. A statement of no more than five pages (using a 12-point font and one-inch margins), presenting the full case for the nomination as well as summarizing the dossier, with specific reference to the criteria listed in these guidelines.

This statement forms the basis of the recommendation and is extremely important for the review process. The author should describe the nominee's qualifications and other relevant criteria, focusing on specific details. The aim of this statement is to set out a convincing and detailed case for the nominee's outstanding contributions to undergraduate education.

- C. Personal statement by the candidate of no more than 1200 words (using a 12-point font and one-inch margins)* addressing the criteria for the award and the impact on student learning.
- D. The candidate's curriculum vitae of no more than four pages (using 12-point font and one-inch margins) organized according to the following rubric: Education; Courses

¹ The dossiers from the 2004-2005 award recipients may be reviewed at the following libraries:

Twin Cities: Walter Library, Circulation/Reserve Desk (Perry Dean)
UMD: UMD Library, Reserve Desk (Bill Sozansky)
UMC: UMC Library (Owen Williams)
UMM: Rodney Briggs Library, Reserve Section (Shaheen Haji)

Taught at the University of Minnesota; Program and Curricular Development; Service; Outreach and Other Activities Related to Teaching/Learning; Publications (a summary list of the candidate's most important published works).

- E. A list of undergraduate courses taught at the University of Minnesota over the previous five years of active teaching, along with a numerical overview compiled from student evaluations, arranged according to the form supplied. For upper division courses please specify the percentage of undergraduates enrolled. Up to one additional page of assessment of student learning can be included.
- F. Up to ten supporting letters, three of which must be from individual undergraduate students, past or present. The remaining letters may be from students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, or non-University of Minnesota references. In all cases letter writers are encouraged to cite specific examples in support of the case.

***EXCESS INFORMATION WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.**

NOTE: Please retain a copy of the dossier at the collegiate or departmental level as dossiers will NOT be returned or retained centrally.

AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO POSTBACCALAUREATE, GRADUATE, AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Purpose

Commencing in 1998-1999, the University of Minnesota recognized a select group of faculty members for their outstanding contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education. This honor is awarded annually to exceptional candidates nominated by their colleges in their quest to identify excellence in postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education. In addition to honoring individual faculty members, the award will contribute to the improvement of postbaccalaureate, graduate, and professional education at the University by publicizing their work to serve as resources to the whole faculty.

The award is made possible through generous support of the University of Minnesota Alumni Association and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Eligibility

Regular faculty (tenure-track and tenured) and term faculty (non-regular) salaried through the University and holding a 66 2/3% time or greater appointment, who have been at the University of Minnesota for at least **five** years, including the current year, may be nominated for the award. Previous nominees who did not receive the award may be renominated; previous winners will be ineligible.

Self-nomination is not allowed.

For the purposes of this award, graduate and professional students are defined as students who are pursuing a postbaccalaureate, graduate, or professional program.

Awards

During the 2005-2006 academic year, up to eight University of Minnesota faculty members will be selected to receive the award with the announcement of award recipients to be made mid-

March. Recipients will receive a \$3,000 continuous augmentation to their annual salary during their lifetime as a University of Minnesota faculty member. In addition, each recipient's department will be given \$1,500 annually for five years to be used by the recipient for professional development or research.

Criteria

Nominees will be evaluated on the basis of a dossier documenting outstanding contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, or professional education. The dossier should provide specific evidence of outstanding performance in one or more--not necessarily all--of the categories listed below:

1. Excellence in instruction.
2. Involvement of students in research, scholarship, and professional development.
3. Development of postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional instructional programs.
4. Advising and mentoring of students.

This list should not be considered exhaustive or restrictive. The selection committee will consider any and all outstanding contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education described by the materials provided. The magnitude of an outstanding contribution in one area may compensate for little or no contribution in other areas.

The selection committee will consider outstanding contributions ranging from broadly distinguished performance over many years to a single extraordinary contribution. Persons receiving awards will be those whose contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education the selection committee considers the most outstanding in a given year and also genuinely outstanding regardless of the year or the competition. The University of Minnesota is a research university, so the dossiers of all nominees should include evidence of their intellectual distinction.

Selection of College Nominees

Each college engaged in postbaccalaureate, graduate, and/or professional education may submit, **on or before Thursday, January 26, 2006** the following number of nominations:

- 1) College of Liberal Arts, Institute of Technology, College of Agricultural, Food & Environmental Sciences, Medical School, Duluth campus - **up to 5 nominations**
- 2) Carlson School of Management, College of Education & Human Development, College of Biological Sciences, School of Public Health, College of Human Ecology, School of Dentistry - **up to 2 nominations**
- 3) All other units - **1 nomination**

Colleges may nominate faculty members of other colleges as well as their own.

Suggestions for nominees may be made to the college nominating committee¹ by individual students and faculty members, by departments and other administrative units of the college, and by student organizations and associations. Colleges nominating committees should inform the faculty, students, and staff of that college of its nominating procedures well in advance of beginning the selection process.

¹ All colleges (small as well as large) are encouraged to have nominating committees.

Nomination Procedure

After selecting its nominees, the college, in consultation with the nominee, should prepare the nominee's dossier for review by the Graduate-Professional Award Selection Committee. This selection committee, which is appointed by and reports to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), is composed of five faculty members and one graduate or professional student, and a representative of the University of Minnesota Alumni Association.

Organization and Presentation of Dossiers²

The college should submit *an original plus seven copies* of each candidate's dossier to the **Graduate-Professional Award Selection Committee, 234 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 by no later than 4:00 p.m., Thursday, January 26, 2006.** *In addition to including the nomination form in each candidate's dossier, the designated college contact will submit the nomination form online, using a previously provided password and web site address for the online form submission. If this information has not been obtained, contact Karen Zentner Bacig, kbacig@umn.edu, 612.624.5082.* Decisions will be based on the content of the dossier, not on the dossier appearance. In order to maintain a similar appearance and reduce the burden to the college and nominees, each copy should be submitted in a plain report cover with index tabs (no three-ring binders, please). Photographs, videos, and other types of visual materials not central to the dossier are discouraged. Brevity is encouraged in assembling the following materials. Items should be presented in the order listed below.

Successful dossiers will be made available for public review and various University of Minnesota editors may publish information from these dossiers in materials regarding the Graduate-Professional Award. Dossier contents will be publicly available, except for information covered by the Minnesota Data Privacy Act. Private or personal materials should not be included as part of the dossier.

- a. The nomination form and release form. The nomination form must also be submitted online.
- b. A statement of no more than five pages (using a 12-point font and one-inch margins)* presenting the full case for the nomination and summarizing the dossier, with specific reference to the criteria listed in these guidelines.

This statement forms the basis of the recommendation and is extremely important for the review process. The author should describe the nominee's qualifications and other relevant criteria, focusing on specific details. The aim of this statement is to set out a convincing and detailed case for the nominee's outstanding contributions to postbaccalaureate, graduate, or professional education.

- c. Personal statement by the candidate of no more than 1,200 words (using a 12-point font type and one-inch margins)*, addressing the criteria for the award and the impact on student learning.

² The dossiers from the 2004-2005 award recipients may be reviewed at the following libraries:

Twin Cities: Walter Library, Circulation/Reserve Desk (Perry Dean)
UMD: UMD Library, Reserve Desk (Bill Sozansky)
UMC: UMC Library (Owen Williams)
UMM: Rodney Briggs Library, Reserve Section (Shaheen Haji)

- d. The candidate's curriculum vitae of no more than four pages (using 12-point font and one-inch margins) organized according to the following rubric: Education; Courses Taught at the University of Minnesota; Program and Curricular Development; Service; Outreach and Other Activities Related to Teaching/Learning; Publications (a summary list of the candidate's most important published works).
- e. A list of graduate/professional courses taught at the University of Minnesota over the previous five years of active teaching, along with a numerical overview compiled from student evaluations, arranged according to the form supplied. For courses with both undergraduates and graduate/professional students, please specify the percentage of graduate/professional students enrolled. Up to one additional page of assessment of student learning can be included.
- f. Up to ten supporting letters, three of which must be from individual graduate/professional students, past or present. The remaining letters may be from students, faculty, administrators, staff, alumni, or non-University of Minnesota references. In all cases letter writers are encouraged to cite specific examples in support of the case.

***EXCESS INFORMATION WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.**

NOTE: Please retain a copy of the dossier at the collegiate or departmental level as dossiers will NOT be returned or retained centrally.

Approved September 28, 2005

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**6. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Statement on Faculty Salary Goal for Strategic Positioning
Information for the Faculty Senate**

Statement on Faculty Salaries

If the University aspires to be among the top three public research universities in the world, the aspiration must include salaries commensurate with that aspiration.

COMMENT:

The Provost asked the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning to identify, in the context of the University's strategic positioning process, an appropriate goal for faculty salaries.

The Committee recognizes that many factors go into making the University competitive, and that one can look at either salaries or total compensation as a measure of financial competitiveness for faculty. In the past, the Committee was told, compensation comparison made the University more competitive than a study of salaries alone, because the University had a benefits package that was superior to that offered at peer institutions. More recently, however, the differences in benefits packages has lessened, and so, therefore, has the comparative advantage the University held.

At present (fall, 2004) the University ranks 5th among Big Ten public institutions in average salary for faculty at all ranks. Among the top 20 public institutions by academic rank (AAU), it

ranks 17th. The AAU has 59 members, which include the top 30 research universities (public and private); in that group, Minnesota ranks 39th. The Committee doubts that any small comparative advantage in total compensation can begin to offset the significant differences in salary levels offered at Minnesota and at its aspirational peers.

The Committee intends to return to the Senate with a more detailed statement in the future, but wished to set the stage for its efforts with this simple declaration.

**FRED MORRISON, CHAIR
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**7. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Resolution on Employee Retention During Strategic Positioning
Information for the University Senate**

CAPA recognizes the current strategic positioning efforts may result in the jobs of some University of Minnesota employees becoming redundant or eliminated.

CAPA also recognizes that some employees, in anticipation of this, are already seeking other employment opportunities, while others hope to retain their current positions as long as possible.

CAPA believes many of these employees would stay at the University of Minnesota if assured of the opportunity as soon as possible, and CAPA believes it would benefit the University of Minnesota in many ways if these employees remain.

CAPA also believes that current severance policies can cost the University money, and create incentives for professional and administrative (P and A) employees (especially longer term employees) to leave if non-renewed, or if they fear the threat of non-renewal.

Finally, CAPA recognizes that the University of Minnesota is interested in doing all it can to provide an opportunity for all employees who may lose their current job, to find another suitable one here at the University. Such measures include the New Talent Connection.

In view of the above, CAPA recommends the University empower the Office of Human Resources to be proactive in implementing and monitoring extraordinary measures to ensure employees remain at the University. Such measures could include:

- Including financial incentives to departments for hiring current university employees, especially those affected by Strategic Positioning changes (e.g. those from a wave 1 college). Such incentive money could be gleaned from funds that otherwise would be provided in severance packages
- Emphasizing the advantages of hiring current University employees: such as knowing how the University works, and already having professional connections.
- Establishing a policy or process that gives priority to University employees for new positions, and/or
- Examining methods for delaying the start of, or extending the 60 day time limit for considering acceptance of a severance package.

CAPA believes these measures will help insure stability at the University during this time of change. This resolution is consistent with policy at other Universities that are members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

Approved October 21, 2005

**JACQUELINE COTTINGHAM-ZIERDT, CHAIR
COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

8. INTRODUCTIONS

**Interim Dean, Carlson School of Management; Dean, Minnesota Extension Service;
Chancellor, University of Minnesota, Crookston**

Professor Jean Bauer, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), introduced Michael Houston, Interim Dean of the Carlson School of Management, and Charles Casey, Chancellor of the University of Minnesota - Crookston.

9. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Jean Bauer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), reminded senators that the Academic Unit Governance Policy has been approved.

The FCC has been reviewing the new budget model and the strategic positioning process. A dinner was recently held with the Regents, during which she expressed her feeling of pride during the CIC meeting. The rationale was that while other institutions noted a feeling of frustration with and access to their administration, that sentiment is not present here.

The other issues that the FCC has addressed will be discussed later in the meeting as action items from its committees.

**10. MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 29, 2005
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/050929sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

11. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS

**Resolution on Employee Retention During Strategic Positioning
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

The University Senate recognizes the current strategic positioning efforts may result in the jobs of some University of Minnesota employees becoming redundant or eliminated.

The University Senate also recognizes that some employees, in anticipation of this, are already seeking other employment opportunities, while others hope to retain their current positions as long as possible.

The University Senate believes many of these employees would stay at the University of Minnesota if assured of the opportunity as soon as possible, and the University Senate believes it would benefit the University of Minnesota in many ways if these employees remain.

The University Senate also believes that current severance policies can cost the University of Minnesota money, and create incentives for professional and administrative (P and A) employees (especially longer term employees) to leave if non-renewed, or if they fear the threat of non-renewal.

Finally, the University Senate recognizes that the University of Minnesota is interested in doing all it can to provide an opportunity for all employees who may lose their current job, to find another suitable one here at the University. Such measures include the New Talent Connection.

In view of the above, the University Senate recommends the University empower the Office of Human Resources to be proactive in implementing and monitoring extraordinary measures to ensure employees remain at the University. Such measures could include:

- Including financial incentives to departments for hiring current University employees, especially those affected by Strategic Positioning changes (e.g. those from a wave 1 college). Such incentive money could be gleaned from funds that otherwise would be provided in severance packages.
- Emphasizing the advantages of hiring current University employees: such as knowing how the University works, and already having professional connections
- Establishing a policy or process that gives priority to University employees for new positions, and/or
- Examining methods for delaying the start of, or extending the 60 day time limit for considering acceptance of a severance package.

The University Senate believes these measures will help insure stability at the University during this time of change. This resolution is consistent with policy at other Universities that are members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

**JACQUELINE COTTINGHAM-ZIERDT, CHAIR
COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

DISCUSSION:

Jacqueline Cottingham-Zierdt, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that this resolution was approved by CAPA and is now being brought for University Senate approval.

The resolution does not say that employees cannot be eliminated, but states that many individuals are leaving in anticipation of future changes and there is still a need to get work done in the meantime. The resolution also notes the good work that Human Resources has been doing during this transition and encourages the continued effort and creativity of solutions to this problem.

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

APPROVED

**12. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Vacation Policy for Academic Professionals and 12 month Faculty
Discussion by the University Senate**

Jacqueline Cottingham-Zierdt, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that CAPA has asked for changes in the vacation carryover policy so that people do not lose vacation that they have accrued past the maximum of 22 days.

When the question was first asked, the response was that carryover is not allowable since vacation for faculty and academic professionals is not tracked centrally. However, even if the policy was changed to mandate tracking, there was concern that PeopleSoft would not be able to track vacation that only allows accrual of 22 days per year. The vacation rate would need to be two days for month with a total of 24 days.

This issue is now being brought to the Senate for a more inclusive discussion.

A senator noted that PeopleSoft should not dictate University policy.

A senator said that after comparing policies from the other Big Ten institutions, all institutions, except for the University and Michigan State, allow carryover for an additional 12 months.

Q: Tracking via PeopleSoft implies strict central accounting, while the current procedure is for departments to develop their own methods for tracking. Should the month that does not accrue vacation be based on the calendar year or a person's anniversary date?

A: At this time, a department has discretion to determine which month does not accrue vacation and how it is tracked. There is nothing tracked centrally and some departments are reluctant to monitor usage. PeopleSoft could be programmed to accrue vacation per pay period, based on a rate of 22 days per year divided by 26 pay periods. However, custom programming is hard and makes the system harder to update when new versions are available.

A senator stated that solutions are being proposed to solve a problem that exists. If the problem is flexibility, a policy from the appropriate level in the University would be an adequate solution. A policy of this type would give direction to units to allow employees to retain more than 22 days of vacation during periods when they are not able to take vacation.

**13. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Retirement Waiting Period for Academic Professionals and 12 month Faculty**

Discussion by the University Senate

Jacqueline Cottingham-Zierdt, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that the President addressed this issue in September and CAPA has discussed it with Vice President Carrier.

Currently, retirement waiting periods are determined by salary, which means that the lowest-paid employees are the most affected. At this time, 600 people are in this waiting period. This is also a recruitment issue for many departments.

The Faculty Senate and CAPA each approved separate resolutions last year, so now this issue is being brought to the University Senate so that all groups can discuss and work together on the issue.

President Bruininks noted that this issue is under review at the present time and consultation is taking place with many different groups to find a solution. It is hoped that this will not be an issue within six months. Currently, the retirement funding is being used for other initiatives, but he does understand that recruitment is compromised when the waiting period is present.

A senator noted that the current policy is odd in that waiting depends on a person's appointment and salary, but the money to put towards a person's retirement is already part of the salary line when the person is hired.

Q: What is the tax status of retirement benefits? Can a new employee rollover other retirement funds?

A: Retirement funds are paid pre-tax by the employee and the University. Currently, rollovers from previous retirement funds are not permitted, but the University is considering other options.

14. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks stated that there has been active participation during the strategic positioning process, with over 300 people serving on the task forces and more than 500 volunteers. Eleven reports will be released on the web as of December 12, with comments through mid-January.

He thanked the Faculty Consultative Committee, the University Senate, and senators for their work in the process, and noted that more discussions will be held in this forum as the process progresses.

He then noted that the capital binding request was submitted a month ago. The goals of it are to provide HEAPR funding and new building construction costs, enhance student life and classrooms, and continue the research mission. Funding from this request will allow other opportunities to be leveraged, such as:

- Space in a new Carlson School of Management building will also be used for the Economics department and West Bank classrooms, which will save \$15-17 million in remodeling costs; a similar plan and savings will be used at the Duluth School of Business and Economics
- Science Classroom Building renovation will provide more classroom space as well as centralize many student services in one building

President Bruininks noted that while these plans are not as captivating as the capital request years, these plans will affect everyone. The legislative session starts March 1 and he is looking for student, faculty, and staff support to articulate University needs.

Lastly, with the budget forecast being better than in recent years, the University submitted a request for \$22 million in one-time funds: \$15 million is to off-set the energy increases this winter, funding for a Dental School virtual reality education center, and clinical and research equipment for the College of Veterinary Medicine.

15. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

NONE

16. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

17. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

18. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction Discussion by the Faculty Senate

Draft Policy and Protocol on the Evaluation of Instruction September 16, 2005

PREAMBLE

The University of Minnesota seeks to achieve instruction of the highest quality so that students learn to their maximum potential. The evaluation of instruction is one way to help ensure excellence in instruction, so the Faculty Senate adopts the following policy and protocol on evaluation of instruction.

There are at least three reasons to evaluate instruction: (1) to improve instruction, (2) to provide information for (a) salary and promotion decisions based on merit and (b) faculty tenure decisions, and (3) to assist students in course selection. This policy and protocol is intended to meet all three objectives. With respect to the second, the purpose of this policy and protocol is to define what shall constitute adequate documentation for student and peer review of faculty and instructional staff teaching contributions.³

The required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student evaluation of teaching. Academic units must make provisions for peer review for faculty being considered for tenure, promotion, and salary increases, and for other instructional staff being considered for reappointment, promotion, and salary increases. The peer review information for individuals is to be supplemented by information from student evaluations of all their courses.

³ In this policy and protocol, the term "instructor" includes all who deliver instruction regardless of academic rank, appointment status, and so on. At some points in the policy, there will be a distinction between (1) tenured and tenure-track faculty, and (2) all others who deliver instruction; in the latter case, the language will refer to faculty and instructional staff.

Students must be made aware that their ratings will be used in making personnel decisions. A small number of questions, common to all courses throughout the University, will be used in the student evaluations of instruction. The use of common questions provides one means of making judgments on teaching effectiveness University-wide and allows calculation of statistical norms. This type of information can be used with other types to identify very good instructors who deserve rewards as well as instructors who may need assistance in improving their classroom effectiveness. This information does not have the resolution necessary to allow fine discrimination between instructors in intermediate categories. In addition to questions that request a numerical response, survey forms must include provisions for written comments by students.

POLICY

--Every course with a University course number shall be evaluated by the use of student rating forms every time it is offered, except that thesis-only credits, directed or independent study, internships, and classes with fewer than five students shall not be evaluated using such forms. **[Note: The Senate Committee on Educational Policy will appoint an ad hoc subcommittee to develop guidelines for departments to evaluate small classes, internships, directed/independent study, and so on. Those guidelines do not have to be in place to adopt this policy.]** A department that wishes permanently to exempt a course or courses from use of the standard student evaluation form must receive written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.⁴

Data and information from student evaluations shall not be used in isolation from peer evaluation and (for faculty) research and service in evaluating faculty and instructional staff.

The directions for students written on the student rating forms should stress the three purposes of the form: evaluation of instructors, improvement of teaching, and assistance to future students in selecting courses (the "student release" questions). The instructions should be written in a manner that will motivate students to complete the forms. The instructions should explain why demographic data are being collected.

--The student rating forms shall be anonymous.

--Students may not be required to fill in a student rating form for any course. This provision applies to all courses at the University, including multiple-instructor courses that are otherwise covered by a different evaluation protocol.

-- No incentives may be given for filling in a student rating form. Instructors are not to know who filled out a form and who did not.⁵

--The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation. This policy and protocol applies to all instructors regardless of whether they are tenure-track/tenured, term/P&A, or adjunct faculty or hold any other kind of teaching

⁴ This policy and protocol shall apply to student evaluation of courses having no more than two instructors. Units whose curricula feature courses with more than two instructors shall develop their own procedures for student evaluation of such courses and shall be reported to the dean of the college or other appropriate campus academic officer. These procedures for multi-instructor course evaluations shall be made available to all instructors in the unit.

⁵ For extra credit (such as points) to be awarded for filling out the form, the instructor must know who did and did not fill out the forms. It is not permissible for the instructor to have this information.

appointment at the University. Specific provisions are noted for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

--Personnel decisions (e.g., merit and salary reviews, promotion, tenure for tenure-track faculty) for all faculty and instructional staff whose salary is based in any part on teaching shall include review by appropriate department, college, and University officers, as set forth in pertinent rules and policies, all numeric data from the teaching evaluation forms from their courses.

--For tenured and tenure-track faculty, faculty peers must evaluate course objectives and syllabi, handouts, assignments and tests, theses and dissertations, and examples of graded student work in order to measure their quality and appropriateness. Faculty and instructional staff must do the same for all other instructors who are not tenured or tenure-track faculty. Peers must also assess the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, contributions to departmental teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions, such as development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications on discipline-specific teaching techniques. Peer review could also include assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline), survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction, or assessment of an instructor's classroom performance via personal visit or videotaping of the class.⁶

--The information collected pursuant to this policy to evaluate teaching effectiveness for personnel decisions remains confidential.⁷ The results must be shared with the faculty member being reviewed. Access to information on a specific instructor must be restricted to those responsible for decisions on reappointment (where applicable), promotion, tenure (where applicable), and salary adjustments.

--Faculty must always be allowed to respond to student rating results when those results are used for performance evaluation; faculty members must be permitted to add written comments to their files

--All student evaluation data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data.⁸

--Responsibility for implementing the provisions of this policy and protocol rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences, deans and department heads, all of whom must clearly convey to faculty the emphasis being placed on teaching in decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and merit-pay increases.

--Department heads and chairs should be evaluated in part on the extent to which they effectively implement this policy and protocol.

PROTOCOL

--Department heads and tenure and promotion review committees will be provided with comprehensive information on the interpretation and use of student rating data (including

⁶ It is to a faculty member's benefit to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during his/her evaluation. This policy is not meant to exclude continued use of other mechanisms for peer review that may already be in place in academic units, such as classroom visitation.

⁷ As required by Minnesota state law at the time this policy is adopted.

⁸ The Senate Committee on Educational Policy is concerned about the very low response rates when students are asked to fill out evaluation forms on the web, outside of class.

questions of reliability and validity) in making personnel decisions, and information on practices of peer evaluation of instruction.⁹

--The student rating form shall contain the following questions, with the verbal anchors as identified:

How would you rate the instructor's overall teaching ability?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How would you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How would you rate the instructor's respect and concern for students?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How much would you say you learned in this course?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Almost Nothing Amount Expected An Exceptional Amount

--All student rating forms shall have spaces for two questions permitting open-ended comments: "Describe things about the course that you found helpful" and "What suggestions do you have for improving the course?"

ALTERNATIVE ONE:

--All written comments on student evaluation forms shall be provided only to the instructor, after data processing by the designated unit on the campus. The evaluation form shall include the following statement: "All written comments will be provided only to the instructor. If you have a comment about the instructor, you should contact _____."¹⁰

ALTERNATIVE TWO:

--The disposition of written comments on student evaluation forms shall be decided by each college or campus.

Faculty and departments are free to add additional open-ended questions to the required form, but such questions will be in addition to rather than replace the required questions.

--Directions given on student evaluation questionnaires will include the following statement:

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

⁹ Responsibility for providing this information rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the chancellors, and the deans. Training for new department heads/chairs and for deans should include this information as well.

¹⁰ Students will thus understand that if they write comments that insult the instructor, the department will not see the comments. There are ways other than anonymous comments on forms that students can make their dissatisfaction known to the department or college

--The evaluation form will ask for information on the student's major, gpa and class year, as well as whether or not the course is in the student's major and whether the course is required or elective for the student. There will also be a request, marked optional, for information on the student's age, gender, and race or ethnicity. [Note: Information about the class size and type (lab, lecture, seminar, etc.) will be included, but this information will be compiled elsewhere.]¹¹

--The following question shall be included in the demographic section of the student evaluation form. The data from this question shall be linked to specific building and room numbers and the summary data by room number shall be provided to the chief academic officer and appropriate classroom management office on each campus to help guide decisions on facilities resource allocation.¹² [It has been suggested the information should be collected, but not in a demographic section.]

How would you rate the physical environment in which you take this class, especially the classroom facilities, including the effect of the environment on your ability to see, hear, concentrate, and participate?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Poor		Satisfactory			Exceptional	

-- The instructions on the evaluation forms shall state that harassing comments or comments on irrelevant factors are not helpful for evaluation of instruction. Faculty should be provided with guidelines on how to process and interpret open-ended student comments, particularly those that are inappropriate.

-- Administering student evaluations will be the responsibility of each instructional unit. Student evaluations used in promotion and salary decisions will be administered at the beginning of a class period, during the last two weeks of instruction for the term. The instructor may give instructions but must not be present while the forms are being completed and collected. The evaluations will be handed out, completed, and collected without the instructor being present. Once collected, evaluations will be put in a sealed envelope or box. It is suggested that a student be asked to hand out and collect the forms. Each instructional unit shall develop its own practices for ensuring that the completed forms are delivered to the appropriate office. If the forms are delivered to the department office, the department should deliver the envelopes to the data processing center without opening the envelopes. The instructor must never touch or see completed forms until after grades are turned in.

--Each campus will determine the appropriate manner of administering and evaluating student evaluation forms. To facilitate tabulation of the results of standardized questions on the student evaluation forms, each campus administration will provide the instructor and the unit chair/head with a summary of the data; the original questionnaires will be returned to the instructor. This summary will include appropriate statistical characterization of the responses to each question and, where a statistically meaningful data base exists, comparison to the responses for the same question on a campus, college, department, and program basis. To make comparative analysis more meaningful, there will also be comparisons on the basis of class type (e.g., large lecture, small discussion, laboratory, upper or lower division, elective, needed to meet university or

¹¹ Age/gender/ethnicity information shall be requested because the information obtained can be useful to instructors in demonstrating how different groups respond to his/her teaching; problems with different race/gender/age groups can be identified and addressed. Other personal information--class year, GPA, major, and whether the class was elective or required--will be requested (not marked optional) because these factors have been shown in prior research to have an effect on student evaluations.

¹² Variants of this question should be developed for classes that use multiple rooms, for field study class, for on-line classes, and for other classes that differ from the lecture-in-one-room format.

major requirements). As resources permit, other types of statistical processing and comparisons may be added at the request of faculty or instructional units.

-- Every instructional unit shall have a policy on peer review of faculty and instructional staff teaching efforts and contributions to teaching, both for purposes of promotion decisions and for teaching-based salary increases. Each unit shall determine what documentation will be used for peer review, and (for faculty) how to evaluate theses and dissertations as well as (for all instructors) samples of graded student work. The documentation is to be used as a basis for evaluating the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter as well as the quality of the instructor's instructional activities. Each unit shall determine who shall have access to the documentation for purposes of peer review, and which materials will be retained for future reference.

The documentation shall reflect what each unit determines to be an appropriately cumulative record of the instructor's contributions to the instructional mission of the University. It is the responsibility of the instructor to update the documentation regularly. It is the responsibility of the unit to retain appropriate portions of this material, including cumulative summaries of student evaluations of the instructor's courses. Each unit shall assume responsibility for maintaining the confidentiality of commentaries or conclusions based on the contents of the documentation.

The documentation for each instructor shall contain an appropriately cumulative listing of courses taught by the instructor, a comprehensive syllabus for each course, and examples of exams, assignments and handouts prepared by the instructor. Units may also wish to include, where appropriate, a listing of undergraduate and graduate students undertaking independent study under the supervision of the instructor, information about student performance on certification exams, and a listing of other activities that pertain to the teaching mission of the unit (e.g. participation in teaching-related committee work or curriculum development, publication of textbooks or study guides, participation in educational development programs, etc.) Documentation may also include a one- to-two page self-assessment of the instructor's teaching strengths and weaknesses. Instructors have the option of adding any other materials they believe are indicative of their contributions to teaching.

--Instructors are encouraged to adopt a mid-semester course evaluation process so that the course can be improved as it is delivered.

--The student evaluation form shall also include the following questions, the responses to which shall, with the consent of the instructor, be made available to students.¹³ The responses to these questions may not be used in any reappointment, promotion, salary, or (for tenure-track faculty) tenure decisions.

[NOTE: The Senate has delegated to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy final authority to approve new questions to be used; they will be inserted here.]

--In addition to the questions required by the preceding sections of this policy, a question bank will be provided for the student evaluation process.¹⁴ The questions would be supplemental to the required questions, would be selected by the instructor, and would be used primarily for improving teaching. Because the supplemental questions from the question bank are to be used for improving teaching, summary results should go to the instructor only. Use of supplemental questions from the question bank is optional. Provision will be made for instructors, should they choose, to add a reasonable number of custom questions that are not included in the bank.

¹³ On the web, for instance.

¹⁴ The University administration will provide the question bank on a website.

Departments or schools may also require questions from the question bank or from other sources to be used on all forms used in their area. These additional required questions could be used either for evaluation of instructors or for improving teaching, courses or programs. If for the evaluation of instructors, summary results should go to the department. If for improvement of teaching, courses, or programs, summary results should go to the instructor only if the results are to be used by the instructor, or to curriculum committees if the results are to be used for program improvements. Data from questions that are to be used only for improving teaching should not be released by the University to anyone other than the instructor. Data from questions that are to be used for program improvements may be released to department heads and curriculum committees. [LANGUAGE TO BE INCLUDED AT THE END OF THIS PARAGRAPH IF OPTION ONE IN THE PROTOCOL IS ADOPTED: As with the standard forms, written comments are to be provided only to the instructor. The student evaluation form shall notify students that department heads will not see any written comments. (See footnote 8.)]

--Departments shall develop and make available to instructors a written policy that defines (1) which data from student rating forms will be used for personnel decisions and available to department heads and committees charged with reviewing instructor performance, and (2) which data will be made available to curriculum committees for improving courses and programs. (It is assumed that all information from the four required questions will be used for personnel decisions; the written policy required by this section refers to any additional questions that a unit may require on the evaluation forms.)

--Department and college administrators should be held accountable for timely assessment of the evaluative materials assembled for each faculty member. However, for peer review of the documentation for the purpose of promotion or of teaching-related merit pay increases, the faculty in each unit should be free to decide whether they want their dean or head or chair to take responsibility for assessing the quality of teaching, on the basis of the materials, or whether they prefer that the evaluation be done by an advisory group from within the unit or college.

--Each semester, an appropriate University administrator should send a message to every instructor who is receiving data from a course evaluation with a request to make the release questions available to students.¹⁵

When adopted, this policy and protocol replaces all earlier policies, protocols, and questions approved by the University or Faculty Senates.

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard McCormick, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that this policy is an attempt by SCEP and Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA) to reconcile two policies from the early 1990s. The committees agreed on the majority of the changes, such as retaining four of the five questions minus the physical environment which was moved to a later section and adding verbal anchors to the seven-point scale.

The one difference between the two committees is what to do with written comments. Ideas from both committees have been incorporated into this document and labeled alternatives one and two.

¹⁵ Reminders each semester coupled with a very easy method to grant permission should increase the number of instructors who choose to release their data. The course release information should be cataloged by course along with instructor and should have a link at the entry for the course in the on-line Course Guide. This will make it easier for students to find information about a course

Alternative two is SCEP's position. The majority of the committee felt that the disposition of written comments should be decided by the college or campus, since it is a way to empower students to voice dissatisfaction with instruction. This opinion is then conveyed to administrators who make decisions about teaching. This is the current stance. A minority opinion believed in alternative one because it would protect faculty from defamatory comments.

Professor Morris Kleiner, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), noted that while the committee is supportive of evaluation of instruction and agrees with the majority of the document, there is concern about the disproportionate weight given to written comments during tenure and post-tenure evaluation. If there is a question on a person's teaching, there are opportunities beyond student evaluations. Individual student comments can be destructive and unreliable when used for purposes other than improving one's instruction. It was also noted that female faculty members receive comments that contain sexual stereotyping. The information in general contains very little useful information, but there is no way to challenge comments since they are anonymous. Therefore SCFA approved alternative one.

A senator commented that he receives a good sense of the work of the teaching assistants from student evaluations, and therefore, if comments are just released to the instructor, he asked for a provision to be added whereby faculty can see comments of the lab instructors.

Secondly, he says that while he has received very useful feedback from colleagues, he receives very little feedback from students which shapes his teaching, as the comments are not helpful or are abusive. There is only one comment on the entire evaluation that he feels is useful, and he feels that all the questions should be revised. He has looked at the evaluation questions from Duluth, and approves of the specific aspects that are questioned.

Another senator said that they find the question useful. He is confused about the relation between comments and promotion. He did not think this is automatically done.

A senator then noted that the issue about stereotypes seems to be a reason to include written comments. The same student who writes a stereotypical written comment will likely also give the instructor a poor overall evaluation. If the department does not see the written comments, the department will not have a basis for the other marks received.

Another senator said that written comments are difficult to assess and time-consuming to read, which leads to selective use for one evaluation and not for another.

A senator then stated that while he favors evaluation of instruction, this policy was meant to provide data to evaluate the benefits of evaluation and revise the instrument to be more useful. There is more research now, which shows that these are bad questions. The data from the evaluation is meaningless and its use is counter to what is recommended by most current research. This is a good opportunity to revise the entire form and policy, and it should not just be approved and forgotten about.

Another senator said that alternative two works well at Morris, and that the Morris assembly voted 92 percent in favor of this option. The numbers from the rest of the survey are meaningless without the comments. Common themes throughout a course or during a year can be telling for a faculty in a constructive manner. There is also a mechanism at Morris to remove and deal with abusive comments.

A senator stated that he favors alternative two since the department chair can filter what comments are and are not valuable.

The following statement was then read into the record:

As a member of SCEP and of the Durfee Committee on Student Evaluations, I oppose the SCFA proposal to preclude individual student comments from being seen by promotion and tenure committees. Its intent, I assume, is to prevent irrelevant insults and lies from becoming public. If so, it overreacts in the extreme by outlawing all comments from becoming public.

There is no way to differentiate insults from criticisms. It is not possible to say that "Prof. Smith should learn how to teach" is merely an insult, while "Prof. Smith needs to take a course in pedagogical methods" amounts to constructive criticism. The effect of the attempt to silence lies and insults is in fact to silence criticism and skew evaluations toward the positive by insisting that individual complaints have no place on evaluations and should be directed elsewhere.

I am of the opinion that making dissatisfaction known constitutes one proper and desired end of student evaluations and that the very purpose of anonymity is to protect students who want to blow the whistle. The SCFA policy tries to take away the whistle. In fact I know of no other avenues by which students can make their dissatisfactions known while enjoying appropriate protection.

The University needs to keep student comments public because in them the students need not be constrained by the parameters of the specific questions asked. For instance, the University includes no question about whether teachers consistently came to class late or dismissed class frequently; but if they did, that fact should not be concealed from P&T committees.

Students should be permitted to make their views known where they will count: in the deliberations of committees that review faculty. The effect of the SCFA policy is to disempower students, silencing their individual voices and reducing each one to some fraction of a percentage in a histogram. But what about the problem of "cherry picking," that is, selecting one unrepresentative complaint and building a case on it? This can indeed be a real problem, but the problem lies with those who exercise poor judgment in the process of decision-making, and the problem of poor judgment in faculty and administrators is not to be solved by imposing a gag order on students.

By and large, the individual classroom is a black box into which very little light is admitted, but whatever light there is comes from students. If use of special student release questions can be, and usually is, prevented by unwilling teachers and if student comments on the general form go no further than the teacher, then we have effectively pulled down a screen of complete darkness over professorial misconduct in the classroom. The University has ensured that faculty are not accountable to the very students whom teachers exist to serve.

A senator then noted that not all student comments are negative and student might not pursue the contact option offered in alternative one. A flawed rating system will hurt a faculty member if there are no supporting narratives.

A senator noted that evaluation is done at the tenure-level and a decision about written comments should be made at the same level.

Professor McCormick said that the student release questions are being revised and will be part of the new policy. The final question approval has been delegated to SCEP. Professor Michael Rodriguez and the Student Senate are working on revisions to these questions.

A senator said that these questions are largely summative, with some formative aspects. This means that needs for either type of evaluation are not being properly met. This then means that departments have to create a separate, formative evaluation to get at this information.

A straw vote was then taken among alternative one, alternative two, abstaining, or some other alternative. The majority votes were for alternative two and some other alternative.

19. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom
Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following policy.

Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom

Every instructor at the University of Minnesota has the authority to restrict or prohibit the use of personal electronic devices in his or her classroom, lab, or any other instructional setting. It is expected that faculty will make reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities in working with the Office for Disabilities Services.

COMMENT:

The question of instructor authority concerning the use of personal electronic devices in the classroom arises regularly with the Committee on Educational Policy. We concluded that a simple policy would be the best response.

Approved November 16, 2005

RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard McCormick, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that last year this topic was discussed at SCEP and Vice Provost Swan noted that it was his understanding that faculty already have this authority. This year the committee felt that it would be good to pass a simple policy that makes this understanding clear.

Q: Would this policy cover voice recorders and cell phones?

A: Yes.

A senator was then granted permission to read the following two student statements into the record:

Statement 1: Graduate students in the Student Senate support the policy as proposed by SCEP. Many of these students serve as teaching assistants and instructors for undergraduate courses and value the importance of teaching and learning. Creating an environment that supports learning for all students is a vital mission of this University and these students believe that this policy supports this mission.

Statement 2:

The feeling of the majority of the Student Senate, on this policy, seems to be that the policy is not clear regarding the determination of what technologies are appropriate for the classroom and

who should be making that determination. Many students feel that this determination should be made by all constituents in the classroom.

Students understand the value of preserving the academic integrity of the classroom during examinations, but they do not feel that the language of this policy speaks directly that that issue or provides an appropriate protection to students educational rights in the classroom.

The Student Senate took action and did not approve the policy with a vote of 6 in favor, 12 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

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

APPROVED

**20. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Amendment to the Faculty Compensation Policy
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Faculty Compensation Policy, adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1993-94, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined).

FACULTY COMPENSATION POLICY

...

PROMOTION INCREASES

~~Beginning with the 1993-94 salary year, p~~ Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring \$1,500 \$2250 increase in base salary and promotion from associate professor to professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring \$2,000 \$3000 increase in base salary. These figures should be interpreted as minima and are ~~It is intended that these promotional increments will be in addition~~ to the annual salary increase ~~award related to given for meritorious performance. The minima will be adjusted annually to reflect inflation using the Higher Education Price Index.¹⁶ It will be the responsibility of the Provost to identify the amounts each year and to communicate those amounts to the deans (or equivalent unit heads). The deans will set aside funding for promotional increases separate from funding normally set aside for merit and retention purposes. Deans may institute higher minima but are required to use consistent and equitable procedures when granting these increases. , from those funds provided to his/her unit for salary increase distribution, sufficient funds to cover these promotional increments. It is understood that the dean may also set aside funds from this overall pool to address special merit or retention purposes. It is intended that this promotion increment will receive inflation related increases in future years.~~

...

¹⁶ The Senate assumes the Provost's office will, after calculating the increases, round the results to the nearest \$50 or \$100. The Senate does not presume that any particular ratio between the two promotion increments will be maintained.

COMMENT:

The Provost asked the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning to review the policy on promotional increases awarded to faculty. The Committee recommends to the Faculty Senate that the changes to the policy be approved.

The amounts were increased by the HEPI (Higher Education Price Index) from 1993-94 to 2005-06. The Committee was informed that HEPI is a better measure than the CPI because HEPI is geared largely to college and university costs, in particular salaries.

The Committee also recommends that the funding for promotion increases not come from the general salary increase pool. Especially for smaller colleges or campuses, but for all colleges and campuses in general, if a larger-than-usual number of faculty are promoted in one year, and if the promotion increases must come from the general salary increase pool, there could be little left over for those faculty who are not being promoted that year. The Committee thus recommends the policy require the deans and chancellors to fund promotion increases from other sources.

Finally, the Committee recommends, in the amendments, that the Provost be responsible for adjusting the promotion increase amounts each year, by the increase in the HEPI, and that he or she notify the deans of the promotion amounts to be awarded that year.

**FRED MORRISON, CHAIR
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

21. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

22. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

23. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2005-06 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DECEMBER 1, 2005

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2005-06 was convened in 165 Peik Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, December 1, 2005, at 11:29 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 30 voting student members. Chair Josh Breyfogle presided.

1. MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 29, 2005

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/050929stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

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

Josh Breyfogle, Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that he has been working on making connections and is glad to see that the campuses have been keeping busy with their issues.

3. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – Joe Linder said that a new member was elected two weeks ago to CSA and a new treasurer is also needed. Campus is helping with Winter Wonderland in downtown Crookston. CSA will be looking into issues for commuter students.

Duluth – Timothy Tangen noted that new senators will be elected to UMDSA next semester. He is working on a University-wide housing policy that he will bring to Senate next semester. An RFP has been signed for Duluth taxi program.

Morris – Nathan Hilfiker stated student legal services held a workshop for students on renters' rights and MCSA is starting an on-line landlord rating system. Technology fee allocation is starting and the chancellor search is progressing.

GAPSA – Tony Kouba said that GAPSA recently dealt with resolutions on the Higher Education Affordability and Equity Act, cage-free egg use by UDS, encouraging the University to continue negotiations with its unionized employees, and support of the University’s Capital Request. There were 78 applicants for the student fees committee, of which 20 were graduate students. A program is also being started to transport international students to local stores. Lastly, a Duluth Pharmacy representative has been added to GAPSA.

MSA – Rick Orr said that MSA also supported GAPSA’s union resolution and is discussing the cage-free egg use issue. All campus election rules were approved. President Bruininks spoke to forum about the Rochester proposal and a city council ordinance regarding unruly housing. MSA then passed a resolution opposed to the ordinance,

4. UNIVERSITY METRICS AND MEASUREMENTS
Discussion with Associate Vice President Alfred Sullivan, Task Force Chair

John Ziegenhagen, a member of the Metrics and Measurements Task Force, provided the task force charge and an update on progress that has been made. He referred senators to the following handout.

Transforming the U: Metrics and Measurements

TASK FORCE CHARGE

- How will we know when we have become one of the top three public research universities in the world?
- How will we track performance leading to improved outcomes?
- How will we measure progress on the University’s five action strategies?
- How will the Minnesota Legislature’s higher education accountability project help the University achieve its aspirational goal?
- How will the University’s accountability report be modified to reflect our aspirational goal and strategic positioning efforts?
- How will the University gather, analyze, and report information more effectively for planning and decision-making?

MEASUREMENT CATEGORIES (PRELIMINARY)

Action Strategy 1: Recruit, educate, challenge, and graduate outstanding students.	
Student Quality Quality of the Student Experience Student Success/Educational Quality Outcomes	Student Diversity Instructional and Curricular Management Affordability and Accessibility
Action Strategy 2: Recruit, monitor, reward, and retain outstanding faculty and staff.	
Research Funding and Productivity Faculty Distinction and Quality Technology Transfer	Faculty and Staff Diversity Workplace Satisfaction Outreach
Action Strategy 3: Enhance and effectively utilize our resources and infrastructure.	
Research Funding and Productivity Enrollment Management Instructional and Curricular Management Financial Resources	Facilities Management Affordability and Accessibility Quality of Academic Support Resources
Action Strategy 4: Communicate clearly and credibly with all our constituencies and	

practice public engagement responsive to the public good.	
Research Funding and Productivity Quality of Academic Support Resources Economic Impact of the University on the State	Financial Resources Technology Transfer Outreach
Action Strategy 5: Promote an effective organizational <u>culture</u> that is committed to excellence and responsive to change.	
[Consultation in progress]	

KEY DATES

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ October – November, 2005 ▪ December 12, 2005 ▪ December 13, 2005 – January 27, 2006 ▪ February 9, 2006 ▪ March 10, 2006 ▪ May 1, 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task Force/Steering Committee Meetings and Consultation with University Groups Task Force Progress Report Due to Provost Public Comment Period Accountability Report (Draft) to Regents Accountability Report (Final) to Regents and Minnesota Legislature Task Force Final Report Due to Provost
--	--

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Alfred Sullivan (chair), Executive Associate Vice President
Susan Grotevant, Director, Information Management Systems
Richard Howard, Director, Office of Institutional Research and Reporting
Lincoln Kallsen, Director of Financial Research, Office of Budget and Finance
Scott Martens, Director, Office of Service and Continuous Improvement
Elizabeth Nunnally, Associate Vice President for Academic Health Sciences
John Ziegenhagen, Director, University Accountability

Staff to Task Force: Christina Frazier, Assistant to Executive Associate Vice President; Joseph Shultz, Graduate Fellow

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Linda Thrane, Vice President, University Relations
Steve Cawley, Chief Information Officer
Craig Swan, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
Tim Mulcahy, Vice President, Research
Gail Dubrow, Vice Provost, Dean, Graduate School
Jerry Rinehart, Vice Provost, Student Affairs
Mike Volna, Associate Vice President, Finance, Controller
Bruce Gildseth, Vice Chancellor, University of Minnesota Duluth
Terry Roe, Professor of Applied Economics, Faculty Consultative Committee Member
Peter Radcliffe, Senior Analyst, College of Liberal Arts
Abu Jalal, Ph.D. Student in Finance, Carlson School
Eric Ling, Undergraduate Student, Institute of Technology

SEND US YOUR COMMENTS: The Metrics and Measurements Task Force invites your comments and suggestions. Visit the “Transforming the U” Website at www.umn.edu/systemwide/strategic_positioning and click on “Feedback to Task Forces.” Then click on “Metrics and Measurement” (see end of list).

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON UNIVERSITY MEASURES: For a summary of the University's current performance and measures, see the *2004-05 University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report* at: <http://academic.umn.edu/accountability>. This report is submitted annually to the Board of Regents and the Minnesota Legislature.

John Ziegenhagen noted that most people want to know how the University will be able to assess when it is a top three institution. The way most people phrase the question, most emphasis is put on rankings and which one will be used. Any ranking system that is used must be done in conjunction with other measures. Twenty-two measures are now being considered, but none is without fault.

The task force will identify basic measures to be tracked, while local units can track other measures that are meaningful to that unit. The likely measures to be used are the none currently used for the University of Florida annual survey, plus a few others designated by the University.

The University has an obligation to the state to increase graduation rates and compete for the best students, faculty, and staff. A progress report is due December 12, with a comment period to follow. He invited students to submit their comments on this and other reports. A final report from this task force is due in May, although an annual accountability report is due to the Regents for action in March before being forwarded to the state,

The point of this task force is to keep an eye on aspirational goals towards improvement and to not settle for the status quo.

Q: Do these metrics apply to the work of the various task forces or the work being done as a whole?

A: The metrics apply to the work as a whole; individual task forces will develop their own progress checks.

Q: Will these measures be applied to the coordinate campuses?

A: These measures are being created for the Twin Cities and will not have the same relevance due to different missions at each campus. Some measures will be universal, such as graduation rates, but each campus will need to find their own measures that do apply and compare their data to their peer institutions.

Q: What is the vision for technology transfers as part of action strategies two and four? How will this retain staff and improve the relationship with this public?

A: Technology transfers refers to a range of items, such as patents, new business starts-ups, and income from licensing agreements. A metric will need to be used to capture this progress. It will engage the public by creating jobs and increasing the number of faculty and students who want to come to the University.

Q: Many University funding difficulties have to do more with the opinions of average citizens rather than how reports are brought to the legislature. What will be done to change the public mindset?

A: University Relations does an annual citizen survey to gauge the public perception of the University. When most people think about the University they think about the undergraduate colleges, sports, and special events, unless they have had another experience. This leads to misperceptions. The public needs to be informed about the public engagement, service, and outreach being done by the University. There is no easy answer to this issue.

A senator said that it will be very important to see how the University functions in the next 10 years. Students should make sure that they are informed and well-represented throughout this process.

Q: Of the nine measures used in the University of Florida survey, eight refer to work being done by faculty or at the post-graduate level. Before entering the University, what can undergraduate students do to help this effort if all of the items used to measure institutional success do not apply to undergraduates?

A: The reputation of the university can attract students, otherwise the University needs to look at other internal measures.

5. SPRING STUDENT SENATE AGENDA ITEMS

Discussion

Student senators provided the following list of potential agenda items for spring semester:

- Safety for commuter students, including help with landlords and housing that is up to code
- Housing for international students
- Increased participation in administrative searches
- Communication with administrators
- Partnership with Student Legislative Coalition
- Watching business being brought to the Faculty Senate
- Involvement in steering capital planning ideas
- Use of collapsible goal posts that conform with NCAA safety standards
- University-wide housing policy to deal with international students and non-traditional students
- Discussion of Student Conduct Code being applied to off-campus incidents
- Change in excused absence policy from class to attend funerals
- Implementation of new student evaluation questions
- More communication with the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators and the Civil Service Committee
- Improve process for internal student transfers
- Look into civic engagement and take a position
- Work with the student representatives on the Senate committees on better communication with them
- Discuss restructuring the University Senate to have more committee issues dealt with in that body

6. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Resolution on Employee Retention During Strategic Positioning Action

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

The Student Senate recognizes the current strategic positioning efforts may result in the jobs of some University of Minnesota employees becoming redundant or eliminated.

The Student Senate also recognizes that some employees, in anticipation of this, are already seeking other employment opportunities, while others hope to retain their current positions as long as possible.

The Student Senate believes many of these employees would stay at the University of Minnesota if assured of the opportunity as soon as possible, and the Student Senate believes it would benefit the University of Minnesota in many ways if these employees remain.

The Student Senate also believes that current severance policies can cost the University of Minnesota money, and create incentives for professional and administrative (P and A) employees (especially longer term employees) to leave if non-renewed, or if they fear the threat of non-renewal.

Finally, the Student Senate recognizes that the University of Minnesota is interested in doing all it can to provide an opportunity for all employees who may lose their current job to find another suitable one here at the University. Such measures include the New Talent Connection.

In view of the above, the Student Senate recommends the University empower the Office of Human Resources to be proactive in implementing and monitoring extraordinary measures to ensure employees remain at the University. Such measures could include:

- Including financial incentives to departments for hiring current University employees, especially those affected by Strategic Positioning changes (e.g. those from a wave 1 college). Such incentive money could be gleaned from funds that otherwise would be provided in severance packages.
- Emphasizing the advantages of hiring current University employees: such as knowing how the University works, and already having professional connections
- Establishing a policy or process that gives priority to University employees for new positions, and/or
- Examining methods for delaying the start of, or extending the 60 day time limit for considering acceptance of a severance package.

The Student Senate believes these measures will help insure stability at the University during this time of change. This resolution is consistent with policy at other Universities that are members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

**JACQUELINE COTTINGHAM-ZIERDT, CHAIR
COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

DISCUSSION:

Jaki Cottingham-Zierdt, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that there are 4600 employees in this group and CAPA is the elected governance body for this employee group. CAPA approved this resolution and is asking for the Student Senate to approve it as well.

She said that academic professionals are in the most diverse classification at the University, but are also offered the least protection since positions can be non-renewed and this action is not grievable. Therefore, these positions are the most affected at times of change. During this strategic positioning process, many employees are worried about their future and have chosen to leave early rather than be non-renewed later.

This resolution deals with employee retention during transition by asking that Human Resources exercises creativity, problem-solving, extraordinary measures, and transition options. This resolution does not ask that all academic professional employees be guaranteed jobs, since the realization is that restructuring will result in an overall decrease for some jobs. CAPA knows that Human Resources is doing a good job, and this resolution supports their efforts, while noting that current services should not be compromised during this process.

Q: What is meant by extraordinary measures?

A: At this time, there is not a need to mandate this. At some future time, it might be necessary to consider a policy similar to the University of Illinois in which a qualified academic professional employee must be considered for open positions, although the policy does not guarantee that they would be awarded the position. This would just offer a chance at continued employment.

Q: What is the New Talent Connection?

A: It is a program from Human Resources Employee Career Enrichment. It allows employees to share jobs by offering someone who wants experience in an area to help out in another department that needs assistance in that same area. It also guarantees the person continued employment in their old position during the job sharing process.

Q: How would this proposed policy merge with current policies on holding searches and internal candidates?

A: The current policy comes from a request years ago that legitimate searches be done for all positions to increase diversity on campus instead of just appointing internal candidates. All employee groups do allow for, in times of change, hiring without searches. This position might create some tension but it will only be done for a short period and in a few number of cases.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 19 in favor, 3 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

APPROVED

7. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom
Action

Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom

Every instructor at the University of Minnesota has the authority to restrict or prohibit the use of personal electronic devices in his or her classroom, lab, or any other instructional setting. It is expected that faculty will make reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities in working with the Office for Disabilities Services.

COMMENT:

The question of instructor authority concerning the use of personal electronic devices in the classroom arises regularly with the Committee on Educational Policy. We concluded that a simple policy would be the best response.

Approved November 16, 2005

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard McCormick, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that last year this topic was discussed at SCEP and Vice Provost Swan noted that it was his understanding that faculty already have this authority. This year the committee felt that it would be good to pass a simple policy that makes this understanding clear.

Q: As a student reading this policy, it seemed to mean that faculty could take away iPods and CD players in class, but the impression now is to ensure integrity during tests. Is this correct?

A: The policy was meant to target devices that could affect an exam, but it would also allow a faculty member to question students about other electronic devices being used during normal class periods.

A senator said that he is concerned about student rights in the classroom, since it should be up to the student to either follow along during class or use an electronic device to do something else during that time. He is worried about the rights of students versus the educational experience that the faculty would like them to have.

Professor McCormick said that this policy simply gives faculty the right to limit use, but does mandate that all electronic devices need to be shut off in class. The policy can be applied at the discretion of the professor, and if a student felt that it was being abused, channels should be established to deal with this issue.

A senator then proposed that language be added that this policy only applies during tests, when a distraction is created, or if use would violate the Student Conduct Code. There is no reason that a student should be limited from educational uses, such as taking notes on a laptop. This policy relies on faculty being reasonable, but at the same time students are adults and can make their own assessment of use. Language should be added to allow reasonable use of electronic devices.

A senator then said that he agreed with the policy as written and felt that it would be applied reasonably.

Another senator said that Duluth is starting a technology initiative, which would seem to conflict with this policy.

A senator noted that if he was told that he could not use a laptop to take notes in class, how easy would it be to talk to someone about an exemption? If that process was easy, he would not hesitate to approve this policy, but if the process is difficult, he would be against the policy.

Q: As someone who had taught classes, students have already been removed from class for reading the newspaper or playing solitaire on the computer because both actions are distractions to the rest of the class. Since this action can already be done, why is a policy now needed?

A: The rationale was to make this authority clear to all faculty.

A senator notes that if the policy is approved, it then opens the door to appeals external to the situation. In reality, the students are in class, not a lounge, and the instructor is in charge.

A senator then suggested amending the policy to add at the end, “This policy does not apply to the legitimate and responsible use of personal electronic devices for pertinent academic purposes in accordance with the Student Conduct Code.”

A senator noted that this amendment could lead to abuse by student who try to justify their need to use an electronic device in class.

Another student said that when she is teaching a class, anything that is distracting she should be able to stop, including typing notes on a laptop. Students should not be able to determine what they feel is or is not distracting.

A senator then noted that this policy is simply clarifying a practice that already exists. He suggested adding language, ‘to preserve the academic integrity of the classroom.’ The previous amendment would take judgment away from the faculty and complicate matters.

Another senator thought that some judgment should lie with the student, so that a decision does not solely rest with either group.

A senator then noted that either amendment does not clarify that faculty have the right under any circumstances to prohibit use during tests or quizzes. Faculty should also be able to limit use at any time for electronic devices that are distracting to anyone. He proposed amending the policy to read, “However, the policy holds whenever assessment or when distraction, as defined by the Student Conduct Code, disrupts a classroom.”

This was accepted as a friendly amendment to the first amendment proposed.

A senator said that if ‘distraction’ is used in the policy, then it needs to be defined.

Another senator said that ‘distraction’ is already defined by the Student Conduct Code.

A senator then said that the discussion is being hung up on the most extreme examples. The policy is a reasonable proposal to put in writing what is already being done.

Q: How would conflicts be resolved?

A: They would likely be handled by SCEP, which meets every other week during the year.

A senator said that the examples being given are not extremes since he has seen two professors tell students that they could not use a laptop to take notes in class. Faculty should not be able to tell students how they can best learn in a class.

Another senator then noted that whatever version is approved here, would need to be reconciled with the version that it being proposed to the Faculty Senate.

A senator then noted that this body should not be concerned with what the Faculty Senate will approve, but should instead approve a policy that best protects the students that the Student Senate represents.

The first amendment, with the friendly amendment included, was then moved and seconded. A vote was taken and the amendment was approved with 15 in favor, 9 opposed and one abstention.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken on the policy as amended and the motion was not approved with only 6 in favor, 12 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

NOT APPROVED

8. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

9. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:21 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**