

2007-08 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

NOVEMBER 29, 2007

**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, November 29, 2007, at 2:32 p.m., as a joint meeting of the bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 25 academic professional members, 19 civil service members, 128 faculty/faculty-like academic professional members, and 16 student members. President Bruininks presided.

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

Faculty Senate

Course Numbering Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 4, 2007

Approved by the: Administration October 30, 2007

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no response required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Daphne Berdahl

Professor

Anthropology

1964 – 2007

David Evertz

Professor

HHH Institute of Public Affairs

1947 – 2007

Donald F. McGavisk

Physician

Boynton Health Service

1931 – 2007

David W. Thompson

Professor

Theatre Arts and Dance

1917 – 2007

John Verby Jr.

Professor

Medical School

1923 – 2007

Marion B. Wallace
Professor
Entomology
1917 – 2007

Julius F. Wolff
Professor
Political Science – Duluth
1918 – 2007

Nassif A. Youssif
Professor
Library Collection Development and Management
1939 – 2007

STUDENTS

Edward A. Bump
Carlson School of Management

Katherine A. Olson
College of Continuing Education

Jeff Stoll
University of Minnesota – Crookston

3. INTRODUCTIONS

**Vice President Steven Rosenstone, Scholarly and Cultural Affairs;
Chancellor Stephen Lehmkuhle, University of Minnesota-Rochester**

President Bruininks introduced Steven Rosenstone, Vice President for Scholarly and Cultural Affairs, and Stephen Lehmkuhle, Chancellor of the University of Minnesota-Rochester.

4. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Gary Balas, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committees (SCC), apologized to Civil Service senators for neglecting to recognize them at the October Senate meeting. He asked them to stand for a round of applause and then introduced Cathy Marquardt as this year's Civil Service Committee Chair.

Since the last meeting, SCC has received reports from the Information Technologies Committee and the Advisory Committee on Athletics. SCC plans to continue to listen to the concerns from all Senate committee and offer help when appropriate.

5. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE Resolution on Retiree Benefits Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

The University Senate recommends that the University:

1. Develop a system-wide process to:

- a) invite all retiring employees to contribute their skills to the University after formal retirement;
- b) distribute timely information to employees concerning benefits, privileges, and opportunities of retirees;
- c) oversee the provision of benefits provided by colleges and departments, not only to retired professors, but also to civil service and professional and administrative staff;
- d) amend the Regents Policy on Faculty Emeriti and the Regents' Conflict Resolution Policy to include all retired faculty, civil service and professional and administrative employees; and
- e) always use gender-inclusive language such as "retired faculty" instead of "emeriti faculty." When referring to individuals, of course the traditional "Professor Emeritus" and "Professor Emerita" are appropriate.

2. Coordinate and facilitate the service of retirees in the areas of

- a) mentoring new or junior University faculty members,
- b) participating in advisory teams for interdisciplinary centers,
- c) teaching courses,
- d) advising and examining undergraduate and graduate students where needed,
- e) mentoring or tutoring individual undergraduate or graduate students in their specialties, such as in English language acquisition for foreign students, in writing, in developing library skills, or in orientation to the University beyond the students' regular classroom instruction,
- f) serving on University search committees, development committees, or governance committees, where appropriate and when needed by the University, and serving as advocates for the University in situations where the University's needs and the retirees' abilities and concerns match.

3. Implement the Regents' Policy concerning "listing in directories" to include retired faculty, civil service and professional and administrative retirees in all directory listings and Web sites at every level.

4. Ensure that achievements and honors of retirees be noted systematically in college and University publications, such as possibly having a designated retirees section in the Provost's Academic Update and similar materials.

5. Host an annual reception honoring all retirees (faculty, professional and administrative employees, and civil service staff) of the previous twelve months, with the University president and some members of Board of Regents present.

6. Consider the establishment of a University-supported Retirement Center.

(Note: There are numerous models around the country for relationships of retirees groups with the universities. Some retirees' associations are arms of the university, some are entirely separate but related in the manner of student organizations or a faculty union, some are members of parallel bodies like alum associations. The University of Minnesota has a volunteer center sponsored by retirees, the University Retirees Volunteer Center, and also the University of Minnesota Retirees Association (UMRA). Looking at the model that is being developed at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, The Senate recommends that SCFA begin discussions with appropriate administrative officers about the possibility of establishing a University-supported Retirement Center along the lines of the Madison proposal. [See Web link <http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2006/1204/1958.pdf>.] Such a center might consolidate budget, space, activities and authority for its retirees within the University and focus the organization of retired persons who might be helpful to the University when they are needed.)

COMMENT 1:

The Faculty Retirees' Bill of Rights was adopted by the Senate on April 16, 1998, and the Regents included most of it in their Policy on Faculty Emeriti (July 14, 2000). The UMRA Web site (<http://www.umn.edu/umra>) prominently displays these policies.

The 1998 Senate Resolution points out that in addition to pension and health plans, "many emeriti[ae] wished to retain a connection with the University by volunteering or contracting their services, continuing their research, or working with students, affirmed that such continuing ties brought substantial benefits to retirees and University alike, and urged that policies be developed for dealing with such activity."

The Regents Policy on Faculty Emeriti further elaborates that "the University shall provide the following privileges and services to a faculty emeritus[a] equal to those provided to regular faculty:

- 1) email accounts;
- 2) library privileges;
- 3) listing in the University directory;
- 4) some faculty discounts offered by the University as identified in the administrative procedures; and
- 5) other services of a cost and nature similar to those listed above and as identified in the administrative procedures." (Administrative Procedures document approved by University Senate April 20, 2000)

In addition, a November 2004 report sponsored by President Robert Bruininks and Senior Vice President for Administration Robert Jones and conducted by Professor Carole J. Bland, Director of Research in Family Medicine, concludes that late-career senior faculty desire the following ten institutional relationships and benefits following retirement:

- 1) health care benefits (98%),
- 2) intellectual stimulation,
- 3) emeritus status (80%),

- 4) library privileges (majority),
- 5) office access (majority),
- 6) part-time teaching opportunities (majority),
- 7) parking privileges (majority),
- 8) faculty association (40%),
- 9) institutional volunteer roles (33%), and
- 10) institutional fundraising roles (21%).

Some of these--emeritus/a status, library privileges, office space where available, teaching and office services use possibilities, and parking privileges--are available either by University arrangements, UMRA negotiations, or through the University Retirees Volunteer Center. Although outstanding opportunities have been made available to many retired faculty through their departments and colleges, recent discussions in UMRA have revealed that policies regarding retirees have been unevenly implemented and do not include some important matters. The UMRA goal is to seek to have them available to all. SCFA would like to explore the possibilities, with the support of the Faculty Senate.

**GEOFFREY SIRK, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

COMMENT 2:

To: Geoffrey Sirk, Chair, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

From: Pam Stenhjem, Chair, Council of Academic Professionals & Administrators

Re: Proposal for the Enhanced Recognition of Retirees

Date: November 16, 2007

The Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) notes the passage by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) of a Proposal for the Enhanced Recognition of Retirees (attached) to be presented to the University Senate at its November 29 meeting.

Based upon discussions with Earl Nolting, the University of Minnesota Retirees Association (UMRA) liaison to CAPA, and statements made by individual employees, CAPA believes the application of existing University retiree benefits and the offering of retiree volunteer opportunities on campus is applied inconsistently at the University. Statements from individual employees have revealed confusion among current P&As and other employee groups about the benefits and opportunities available to University retirees.

CAPA believes that University retirees are an invaluable resource to the University. Retirees provide a deep and diverse source of organizational history and culture, as well as crucial talents and experience that can be utilized for the benefit of the entire University community.

Therefore, CAPA supports this proposal and the continued discussion of a system-wide process to:

- provide accurate retiree benefit information to all employees in timely and accessible ways;
- build and sustain a predictable University-wide system for application of those benefits;
- offer and facilitate volunteer and other service opportunities for retirees with University units and programs;
- find meaningful occasions to celebrate and honor retiree accomplishments and contributions to the University and the community; and
- explore the establishment of a University-supported Retirement Center for the benefit of all University retirees.

CAPA strongly advocates for a broad inclusion of all employee groups when retiree benefits and opportunities are discussed, particularly regarding the formation of a system-wide process to facilitate the retiree benefits and service opportunities outlined in the proposal.

CAPA stands ready to support continued work on behalf of University retirees and asks that all appropriate governance and representative groups on campus, including University Civil Service Committee, UMRA, Senate Benefits Advisory Committee, CAPA, and CAPA's Benefits & Compensation Committee, be included in discussions and planning.

CAPA applauds UMRA's and SCFA's work to bring this proposal forward to the Senate and looks forward to continued, collaborative dialogue and work on retiree benefits for all University employees.

DISCUSSION:

A senator noted that the goals of this resolution are right, but the language feels sloppy by mixing unlike items. Also, not all benefits should be applied evenly to all retiring staff. Departmental selectivity and clear details are also not included.

Gayle Graham Yates, President of the University of Minnesota Retirees Association (UMRA), said that her group drafted this document and it was reworked by SCFA. The intent of the resolution was to provide faculty, academic professionals, and civil service staff retirees benefits equitably among employment categories. The resolution also requests that the University centrally oversee the administration of retiree benefits.

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

APPROVED

**6. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Advisory Committee on Athletics Charge
Action by the Twin Cities Delegation**

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 5(A) of the University Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the University Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Twin Cities Delegation (113) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

...

5. University Senate Committee Charges

...

A. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS

...

Membership

The Advisory Committee on Athletics shall consist of the following voting members:

(1) a Chair, who must be a tenured faculty member, who holds no administrative appointment higher than department chair or head, appointed by the President after consultation with the ~~Senate Consultative Committee~~ Faculty Committee on Committees, for a term of one year;

(2) four (4) members of the faculty or academic staff (at least two of whom shall be members of the tenured faculty), appointed by the President after consultation with the faculty members of the ~~Senate Consultative Committee~~ Faculty Committee on Committees, for terms of three (3) years;

(3) the Faculty Representatives to the NCAA;

(4) the chair of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, or a member designated by that committee;

(5) a dean, appointed by the President after consultation with the Twin Cities' deans, for a term of three (3) years, or another member of the tenured faculty;

(6) four (4) students, two of whom will be appointed by the President after consultation with the ~~student members of the Senate Consultative Committee~~ Student Committee on Committees, for terms of one year, and two of whom will be selected by the representatives of students in the intercollegiate athletic programs for terms of one year;

(7) two graduates of the University, appointed by the President after appropriate consultation for terms of three (3) years;

(8) one University civil service employee, appointed by the Civil Service Committee for a term of three (3) years.

The appointments are subject to approval by the ~~Assembly~~ Twin Cities Delegation. ~~The President designates a vice chair from among the other tenured faculty members of the committee.~~ No one, other than the faculty representatives, may serve more than six (6) consecutive years on this committee. ~~Initial appointments will be arranged to provide for partial replacement of the committee each year.~~

The director of intercollegiate athletics, the director of academic counseling and the director of compliance shall serve as non-voting ex officio members.

...

COMMENT:

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) is recommending that the process for appointing the members of the Advisory Committee on Athletics (ACA) be placed in the hands of the Committee on Committees. SCC was given responsibility for appointing the members in the wake of the most recent Twin Cities campus basketball scandal, when it was thought important that the executive committee of the University Senate keep a watchful eye on the relationship between the athletic program and the academic programs in which student-athletes are enrolled.

While SCC continues to believe that ACA plays an important role on the campus, SCC finds it is not the best group to make such appointments. The Faculty Committee on Committees regularly considers lists of faculty in various colleges and departments and both committees solicit expressions of interest from faculty, academic professionals, and students in serving on Senate committees. SCC has no ready mechanism to identify individuals for committee service, so must rely on who SCC members may know personally. SCC is also sufficiently obligated in other ways that the task of identifying ACA members sometimes falls by the wayside, to the disadvantage of ACA.

SCC thus recommends that the Faculty Committee on Committees and the Student Committee on Committees be given this responsibility.

The language beginning "Initial appointments. . . ." is to be deleted because those provisions are elsewhere in the University Senate bylaws and apply to all University Senate committees. There is no need to repeat the language here.

**GARY BALAS, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 147 votes in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

**7. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Disabilities Issues Charge
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 5(C) of the University Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the University Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the University Senate (124) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

...

5. University Senate Committee Charges

...

C. DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE

...

Membership

The Disabilities Issues Committee shall be composed of at least 7 faculty members, 2 academic professional members, 2 4 students (~~at least one~~ two graduate/professional and ~~one~~ two undergraduates), 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Faculty, academic professional, and student members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. Civil service members shall be appointed by the Civil Service Committee.

...

COMMENT:

The Disabilities Issues Committee would like to double the number of students serving so the committee receives input from a larger number of students and represents a broader student viewpoint.

**ALEX LUBET, CHAIR
DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 160 votes in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

8. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks said that a few years ago October was designated as scholarship month to draw attention to the importance of keeping higher education accessible and affordable at all campuses. Three-years ago he also made a commitment to double scholarships and fellowships and raise more than \$150 million. This statement was made on the heels of a successful seven-year capital campaign that raised \$1.7 billion.

At the end of October the fund had approached \$200 million, but he has told fundraisers to keep working. He believes that this is one of the most important ways to strengthen the long-term future of the University. The scholarship will cover 10,000 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students throughout the system in the next few years and includes a fifty percent increase in the number of awards provided.

Private donors also suggested other ways to help, such as funding up to ninety percent of the total cost to attend the University, transition programs, and mentoring. More than 125 students

in two years have this grant. Ninety percent are Pell-eligible, only one of 77 students did not return for their second year of classes, and thirty-five percent of the recipients are students of color.

President Bruininks then turned to the February capital request to the state legislature. There will be close to \$300 million total in the bonding request, of which \$210 million is for asset preservation. The state revenue forecast will be released tomorrow, which might show a downturn in the economy. He stated that this is not a time to be timid, but a time to invest in the core infrastructure of the state.

He then noted that this has been an historic fall for the University. Professor Leo Hurwicz was granted the Nobel Prize for his life-long achievements in Economics. Large Animal Sciences saw an expansion with the opening of the Doug and Louise Leatherdale Equine Center on the St. Paul Campus in October. The Department of Energy awarded a \$50 million four-year grant to Physics to develop the new international physics laboratory in Northern Minnesota. This could become a \$200 million long-term investment. A \$14 million five-year award was given to conduct a national children's study on environmental effects on children's health and development. Seven colleagues were named as fellows to the American Association for the Advancement of Science: Professors Judith Berman, Robert Herman, David Lilja, John Lipscomb, Stephen Polasky, Jeffrey Roberts, and Lanny Schmidt. A post-secondary grant to build a set of academic partnerships with North Minneapolis was also awarded. Lastly, the Institute for Advanced Studies and the University Press received a \$700,000 Mellon grant to cultivate interdisciplinary scholarship and publication.

9. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

NONE

10. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

11. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

12. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate was adjourned at 3:22 p.m.

13. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Gary Balas, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committees (FCC), said that the Metrics and Measures Subcommittee is still working to identify metrics for scholarly work, because FCC does not believe that the current set is representative of what faculty do.

He and the Vice Chair, Professor Emily Hoover, attended the CIC faculty governance meeting in Iowa. It was clear after listening to the other institutions that the University has excellent processes in place, especially regarding access to and influence on the administration.

FCC hosted four meetings with department heads and chairs. Topics discussed included faculty morale, departmental resources, faculty support, centralization versus decentralization, burdens affecting faculty productivity, budget model impact, and improved communication between central administration and academic units. FCC will work with the administration to address these issues.

Future topics include a report from the budget-model subcommittee, senior administrator reviews, financing of the strategic plan, and funds for spousal and under-represented minority hires.

Yesterday representatives of FCC met with some members of the Twin Cities Deans Council. The meeting was informative for both sides and will be repeated.

Lastly, FCC discussed two items that are on the agenda later today, student rating of teaching questions and the liberal education requirements.

In closing Professor Balas thanked outgoing Vice Provost Craig Swan for his service to the University and welcomed Professor Robert McMaster to the position.

14. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE

Professor Martin Sampson, Faculty Legislative Liaison, began by introducing Professor Caroline Hayes as the second faculty legislative liaison. The role of the liaisons is to attend all hearings at which the University is being discussed, keep faculty informed, and talk to legislators about the faculty point of view. He reminded senators of the clout that each has as a constituent in a particular district. He asked everyone to contact their legislators on behalf of the University. He will be asking for specific help once the session starts.

MOTION A Consent Agenda Action by the Faculty Senate

Agenda Items 15. and 16. are offered as a “Consent Agenda” to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator.

15. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT Nominating Committee Charge Action by Twin Cities Faculty Delegation

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 5(K) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation (80) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

...

5. Faculty Senate Committee Charges

...

K. NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee is responsible for identifying Twin Cities faculty candidates for the Committee on Committees and for the Faculty Consultative Committee and for overseeing elections to those two committees.

Membership

The Nominating Committee shall consist of at least nine tenured or tenure-track faculty ~~and at least two academic professional staff members~~. In case of a vacancy, the remaining members, by majority vote, shall fill the vacancy by interim appointment until the next general election.

The Twin Cities members of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall nominate and certify as available twice as many tenured or tenure-track faculty members as there are faculty seats available seats on the Nominating Committee. ~~The Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators shall nominate and certify as available twice as many academic professional staff members as there are academic professional seats available on the Nominating Committee.~~

1. The ~~faculty~~ nominations will be presented at a spring semester meeting of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculty provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. In the event there are additional nominations, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall by vote reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected, and shall forward the results to the clerk of the Senate.

The Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall then vote on the slate by secret ballot at the spring semester meeting when the slate of candidates is presented. In case of a tie, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate by lot.

~~2. The academic professional and administrative candidates will be elected by the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators.~~

In those instances when an incumbent member of the Nominating Committee is eligible for re-election, the Faculty Consultative Committee ~~(for a faculty member) or the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (for an academic professional member)~~ may present to the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation ~~or the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators~~, as appropriate, the name of that individual for confirmation of reappointment without another candidate on the ballot to fill the position. A proposed confirmation of reappointment would not preclude additional nominations made according to the provisions of the preceding paragraph; any such nomination must stipulate against whom the nominee will run.

The Nominating Committee shall elect its chair from amongst its members for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. The ~~faculty members of the~~ Nominating Committee shall nominate and certify as available twice as many faculty candidates as are to be elected each year from the Twin Cities campus and from those faculty from the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections to the Faculty Consultative Committee. These candidates shall be announced in the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation docket for a spring semester meeting. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculties, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. The Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall by vote reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected and shall forward the results to the clerk of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. Election procedures shall be in accordance with Article III, Section 3, of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

- b. ~~Both the faculty and academic professional members of t~~The Nominating Committee shall nominate and certify as available twice as many faculty/~~academic professional~~ candidates for the Committee on Committees as are to be elected each year.
 - 1. The faculty candidates for the Committee on Committees shall be announced in the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation docket at a spring semester meeting. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculty or academic professional staff eligible to serve in the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation the day before the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. At the meeting when the slate is presented and approved, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall elect by secret ballot members of the Committee on Committees for three-year terms. In case of a tie, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate by lot.

 - ~~2. The academic professional candidates for the Committee on Committees shall be elected in accord with procedures established by the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators.~~

- c. In those instances when a member of the Committee on Committees is eligible for re-election, the Nominating Committee may present the name of that individual to the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation ~~or the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators,~~ as appropriate, for confirmation of reappointment without another candidate on the ballot to fill the position. A proposed confirmation of reappointment would not preclude additional nominations made according to the provisions of the preceding paragraph; any such nomination must stipulate against whom the nominee will run.

- d. To oversee the conduct of the elections of the members of the Committee on Committees and the Twin Cities members of the Faculty Consultative Committee.

- e. To report to the Faculty Consultative Committee ~~or the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators~~ any issues or problems it encounters which require the attention of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation ~~or the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators.~~

...

COMMENT:

The Faculty Consultative Committee recommends that the P&A members of the Nominating Committee be removed. The reason is that by the terms of another bylaw amendment on this

docket, the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) will make P&A appointments to the Faculty Committee on Committees, so the Nominating Committee will only be responsible for faculty nominations to the Faculty Committee on Committees (as well as for the nomination of Faculty Consultative Committee members).

**CATHERINE FRENCH, CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

**16. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Committee on Committees Charge
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 5(G) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (84) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

...

5. Faculty Senate Committee Charges

...

G. FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Faculty Committee on Committees

...

Membership

The Faculty Committee on Committees shall be composed of at least 13 and no more than 15 elected tenured or tenure-track faculty members, at least 2 and no more than 4 elected academic professional members.

Of the faculty/academic professional members, 12 shall be from the Twin Cities campus. There shall also be one member from the Morris campus. All ~~faculty/academic professional~~ members shall be elected for three-year terms by the ~~faculty/academic professional~~ members of the Senate from these respective campuses. The academic professional candidates for the Committee on Committees shall be elected in accord with procedures established by the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators. In case of a faculty/academic professional vacancy, the remaining faculty/academic professional members, by majority vote, shall fill the vacancy by interim appointment until the next general election.

The Faculty Committee on Committees shall elect its chair from amongst its members for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position. The chair shall also serve as the chair of the Senate Committee on Committees.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To forward annually to the Faculty Senate for approval names of faculty members, academic professionals, and chairs it recommends for appointment to those committees of the Faculty Senate specified in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various campuses and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the faculty/academic professional member currently is serving; 3) the principle of rotation of committee assignments; 4) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student and graduate/professional student members; and 5) expressions of interest in committee service offered by faculty and academic professionals. In addition, the committee shall select senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Faculty Senate and its committees. The committee also shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, sex, and academic rank in constituting committees.
- b. To review periodically the committees of the Faculty Senate and recommend to the Faculty Consultative Committee any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership which it deems appropriate.
- c. To solicit annually from each newly elected faculty/academic professional member of the Faculty Senate a list of Faculty Senate committees on which the senator is serving or has an interest in serving.
- d. To request annually from deans, directors, and department heads a list of faculty/academic professional members who they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.
- e. To recommend to the Student Committee on Committees, the Senate Committee on Committees, and the Faculty Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

...

COMMENT:

With the change to the Nominating Committee charge, language is needed in the Committee on Committees charge to address appointment of academic professionals to the Committee on Committees. The new language puts into writing the arrangement that has been used for two years.

**PERRY LEO, CHAIR
FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 101 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

END OF MOTION A

**17. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics Charge
Action by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation**

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 5(E) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation (80) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

...

5. Faculty Senate Committee Charges

...

E. FACULTY ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

...

Membership

The voting membership of this committee consists of six (6) members of the tenured faculty, plus the two (2) Faculty Representatives and the Chair of the Advisory Committee on Athletics. Since the purpose of this committee is to ensure that students who choose to participate in athletics have a full opportunity to pursue and complete their University studies, the primary qualification for appointment to this committee is a commitment to teaching students, rather than a special interest in athletics.

~~The Faculty Consultative Committee appoints six (6) members of the committee after consultation with the President. The Committee on Committees will provide a list of candidates for consideration. The appointments are subject to approval by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. After consultation with the President, all members shall be nominated by the Faculty Committee on Committees with the approval of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. The term of office is three (3) years; the initial terms will be arranged so that one-third of the terms expire each year. No one may serve more than six (6) consecutive years on the committee.~~

The ~~Faculty Consultative~~ Faculty Committee on Committees designates the chair of the committee.

...

COMMENT:

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) is recommending that the process for appointing the members of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA) be placed in the hands of the Committee on Committees. FCC was given responsibility for appointing the members in the wake of the most recent Twin Cities campus basketball scandal, when it was thought important that the executive committee of the Faculty Senate keep a watchful eye on the relationship between the athletic program and the academic programs in which student-athletes are enrolled.

While FCC continues to believe that FAOCIA plays an important role on the campus, FCC finds it is not the best group to make such appointments. The Faculty Committee on Committees regularly considers lists of faculty in various colleges and departments and solicits expressions of interest from faculty in serving on Senate committees. FCC has no ready mechanism to identify individuals for committee service, so must rely on who FCC members may know personally. FCC is also sufficiently obligated in other ways that the task of identifying FAOCIA members sometimes falls by the wayside, to the disadvantage of FAOCIA and faculty interests generally.

FCC thus recommends that the Faculty Committee on Committees be given this responsibility.

The language beginning "The term of office. . . ." is to be deleted because those provisions are elsewhere in the Faculty Senate bylaws and apply to all Faculty Senate committees. There is no need to repeat the language here.

**GARY BALAS, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 97 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

**18. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Revisions to the Policy and Protocol on the Student Rating
and Peer Evaluation of Teaching
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Policy and Protocol on the Student Rating and Peer Evaluation of Teaching as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined).

Policy and Protocol on the Student Rating and Peer Evaluation of Instruction

PREAMBLE

The University of Minnesota seeks to achieve instruction of the highest quality so that students learn to their maximum potential. The student rating and peer evaluation of instruction is one

way to help ensure excellence in instruction, so the Faculty Senate adopts the following policy and protocol.

There are at least three reasons to rate and 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.¹

The required student rating and peer evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student rating 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 ratings of all their courses.

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 ratings 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.² A department that wishes permanently to exempt a course or courses from use of the standard student rating form must receive written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.³

Data and information from student ratings 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: rating of instructors, improvement of teaching, and assistance to future students in

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ This policy and protocol shall apply to student evaluation of courses having no more than two instructors. In other cases departments and/or colleges that wish to develop alternative evaluation procedures must seek written approval from SCEP. SCEP is open to discussion with units in which student evaluation procedures must meet national accreditation standards.

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. Instructors may require students to participate in course ratings but any system for gathering student ratings, whether paper or electronic, shall include an opt-out provision allowing students to decline to respond to questions,

--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 rating protocol.

--The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to student ratings and peer 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 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 rating 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.⁴

--The information collected pursuant to this policy to evaluate teaching effectiveness for personnel decisions remains confidential.⁵ 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 rating data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data.⁶

⁴ 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.

⁵ As required by Minnesota state law at the time this policy is adopted.

⁶ 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.

--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 questions of reliability and validity) in making personnel decisions, and information on practices of peer evaluation of instruction.⁷

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

1. The instructor was well prepared for class.
2. The instructor presented the subject matter clearly.
3. The instructor provided feedback intended to improve my course performance.
4. The instructor treated me with respect.
5. I have a deeper understanding of the subject matter as a result of this course.
6. My interest in the subject matter was stimulated by this course.

--Each of the six questions will have the following scale attached to it on the form that is provided to students:

- 6-Strongly Agree
- 5-Agree
- 4-Somewhat Agree
- 3-Somewhat Disagree
- 2-Disagree
- 1-Strongly Disagree

Open Ended Questions

1. What did the instructor do that most helped your learning?
2. What could you have done to be a better learner?
3. Additional Comments.

⁷ 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.

--The disposition of written comments on student rating 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 rating 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 rating (including the rating forms) will not be returned to the instructor until after the final grades are submitted for this course."

--The rating 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.]⁸

--The following question shall be included in the demographic section of the student rating 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.⁹

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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.

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 rating 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 ratings will be the responsibility of each instructional unit. Student ratings 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 rating forms will be handed out, completed, and collected without the instructor being present. Once collected, ratings 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 rating forms. To facilitate tabulation of the results of standardized questions on the student rating 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 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 ratings 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 rating process so that the course can be improved as it is delivered.

--The student rating form shall also include the following questions, the responses to which shall, with the consent of the instructor, be made available to students.¹⁰ 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 (SCEP) final authority to approve new questions to be used; they will be inserted here. As of the November 29, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting, SCEP has approved a new set of student-release questions, but they were developed before the six mandatory questions now included in this policy and there is overlap between the two sets. SCEP is discussing with the Student Senate the possibility that the student-release questions will be revised or that some alternative system of identifying highly-rated instructors will be used. This issue does not need to be resolved in order for the Faculty Senate to adopt this policy.]

--In addition to the questions required by the preceding sections of this policy, a question bank will be provided for the student rating process.¹¹ 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.

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 rating of instructors or for improving teaching, courses or programs. If for the rating 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.

--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

¹⁰ On the web, for instance.

¹¹ The University administration will provide the question bank on a website.

data will be made available to curriculum committees for improving courses and programs. (It is assumed that all information from the six 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 rating 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 rating with a request to make the release questions available to students.¹²

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

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) appointed an ad hoc committee to analyze the current SET form in light of research on teaching and principles of good practice on evaluation. The committee was chaired by Dr. David Langley, Center for Teaching and Learning, and included faculty, instructional staff, and professional/administrative staff.

Over a five month period, the committee a) examined the structure of well-established rating forms, b) constructed criteria to guide the development of a new form, c) identified core items appropriate for diverse courses, d) deliberated on an appropriate measurement scale, and e) provided an optional, early semester form focused on instructional development and feedback. In addition, a bank of supplemental student rating statements to augment the six core items is under construction.

The results continue to meet Senate policy on the purpose of the form, i.e., instructional improvement, information for salary, promotion, tenure, and merit raises, and assisting students in course selection. The research-based rating form comprises a wide set of constructs known to influence effective teaching and learning. In addition, the final report of the committee emphasizes the importance of multiple approaches for documenting teaching performance.

The ad hoc committee brought its recommendations to SCEP and SCFA. Both committees deliberated several times about the wording of the questions. The committees also involved the Faculty Consultative Committee in the discussions. The questions contained in this motion are ones that have the endorsement of all three committees and they represent many hours of debate and discussion.

¹² 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.

There was no intent to restrict the nature of additional questions instructors might wish to add, whether open-ended or subject-specific, so the motion also includes the deletion of "open-ended" in the policy language about adding questions.

Note that the questions are the only major part of the policy to change. The term "rating" is substituted for "evaluation" at appropriate places in the revised policy. All other elements of the policy approved earlier by the Faculty Senate remain intact.

**CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**GEOFFREY SIRC, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**GARY BALAS, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Cathrine Wambach, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that this motion comes from jointly from SCEP, the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), which have all spent considerable time on this issue.

This revision started with a small committee that reviewed the literature on student ratings and then brought a small set of questions to SCEP and SCFA for discussion. At that time the subcommittee was asked to engage in a pilot study of the questions in spring 2007. The results were brought back to the three committees, at which time more discussion and some minor adjustments occurred.

In addition to new questions, the language in the policy be changed from 'student evaluation' to 'student rating' since student opinion alone is not the sole factor used in the evaluation of teaching.

Q: Why is there a large red space on the back of the evaluation page?

A: That is the space allotted for the student release questions.

Q: In the report of the Council on Liberal Education (CLE) there is a recommendation that there be a question which focuses on students' perceptions of the impact of the course in the context of the liberal education requirements. How will this recommendation be addressed

A: These new questions will be implemented spring 2008. Additional questions might be crafted, specific to learner outcomes and the CLE requirements, and added of evaluations to courses to which they pertain. This set of questions is a brief set of core questions that will allow questions to be added for individual needs without making the form too burdensome.

Q: For question number 3, did the committees feel that feedback can be provided to students in large classes?

A: There was much discussion on this topic in SCEP, especially with faculty who teach large classes where most feedback is provided through teaching assistants in recitation sections. Departments will need to realize that not every question can be viewed the same in all courses.

Q: Why is there no overall question?

A: Literature on this issue recommends that if only one question is going to be asked, then it should be an overall question. If the evaluation has multiple questions, then the literature recommends against an overall question since a global question on a student's perception of teaching is overwhelming. An overall question also makes it easy for a department to just rely on responses to this one question when evaluating instructors, instead of the responses from the remaining questions.

Q: Will this evaluation only be offered on-line?

A: No. A paper copy will still be offered.

A senator commented that ratings can affect a faculty member's willingness to take on a difficult course or less-appealing subject matter. He asked that the directions be worded to ask student to differentiate between the subject matter and the instructor.

Another senator noted that while this is a much-improved form, there are a few modifications to still be made. The initial questions blur the line between the instructor as the manager of an educational experience and the instructor as a lecturer. The second concern is a potential loophole in the policy on the use of evaluation. Faculty know that evaluations are to be done during the last two weeks of class at the start of the class period, however, there are faculty who ask that evaluations be completed at the end of the class period. Does the policy permit evaluations to be discarded if they are not completed at the start of the class period?

Professor Sirc said that a group will be charged with developing a set of best practices, and this comment will be forwarded to them.

Q: For question two, what responses are expected from students besides study more or attend all the classes?

A: The question is meant to put agency on the student to express things that they themselves and the instructor might have done to help them be a better learner. SCEP is also interested in how responses change depending on the level of the student.

A senator said that while these questions are much better, they are not perfect. SCEP and SCFA can look at the questions again in a few years and make additional revisions based on responses received on the questions. He noted that student ratings are only one piece of the teaching evaluation process. Lastly, he said that the on-line evaluations will not be mandated due to low participation rates. The policy does allow for incentives to complete on-line evaluations, or providing access to grades as in the AHC.

Q: Health sciences has specific standards for accreditation that must be included in the rating questions. How do these revision affect the AHC?

A: The AHC is exempt from using this form.

A senator noted that there are two paragraphs in the policy that deals with peer evaluations and while details are provided for the student rating forms, the same level of detail is missing from peer evaluations. She suggested that additional language and guidance be provided to departments to implement the peer-review process in a meaningful manner.

Q: Can language be included to inform students that they are supposed to complete the evaluations independently, without discussion or caucusing in the classroom?

A: SCFA feels that a best practices guide needs to be developed to deal with how forms are filled out and how the forms are used. A committee from the Vice Provost's office will be addressing these issues.

Q: Can an additional open questions be added that would ask students what they would like to see improved in the course?

A: The back page has a large space for other student comments. SCEP and SCFA will watch how this space is being used.

Q: This policy includes language on evaluating the relationship between an instructor and their graduate student, which seems like a different topic from the rest of the document. Should this language be in a separate policy with guidance on how to evaluate a dissertation?

A: Please email this topic to Professor Sirc for SCFA to address since these statements are not part of the document being revised at this time.

Q: Is there any communication to students about the purpose of evaluations?

A: Language will be added to the form, but faculty also need to take the time to educate students in their classes about the use of evaluations for salary, promotion, and tenure decisions.

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

APPROVED

**19. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Copyright Policy
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

DRAFT: November 8, 2007

University of Minnesota Board of Regents Policy
Supersedes: Portions of *Intellectual Property* adopted October 8, 1999

COPYRIGHT

SECTION I. SCOPE

This policy applies to copyrighted works created by faculty; post-doctoral fellows, researchers, and scholars; students; and other employees of the University of Minnesota (University).

SECTION II. DEFINITIONS.

Subd. 1. Copyright Protection. *Copyright protection* subsists in original works of authorship fixed in a tangible medium of expression, as defined by United States copyright law.

Subd. 2. Work. *Work* shall mean a work protected under United States copyright law.

Subd. 3. Academic Work. *Academic work* shall mean a scholarly, pedagogical, or creative work, such as an article, book, textbook, novel, work of visual art, dramatic work, musical composition, course syllabus, test, or class notes.

Subd. 4. Faculty. *Faculty* shall mean members of the faculty as defined by Board of Regents Policy: *Employee Group Definitions*, along with individuals who are not so defined but who are University employees having faculty-like appointments (namely., University employees who teach or conduct research at the University with a level of responsibility and self-direction similar to that exercised and enjoyed by faculty in a similar activity). Post-doctoral fellows, researchers, and scholars shall have the same ownership rights as faculty. And are covered under this policy.

Subd. 5. Student. *Student* shall mean a registered student at the University.

Subd. 6. Directed Work. *Directed work* shall mean a work agreed upon between the University and faculty creator(s), the creation of which is based on a specific request by the University and which is supported by substantial University resources beyond those customarily provided to faculty in the respective discipline and University unit.

SECTION III. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- a) The University's mission articulates a commitment to sharing knowledge through education for a diverse community and application of that knowledge to benefit the people of the state, the nation, and the world. In this spirit, the University encourages faculty and students to exercise their interests in ownership and use of their copyrighted works in a manner that ensures the greatest possible scholarly and public access to their work.
- b) The University shall maintain the strong academic tradition that vests copyright ownership of academic works in the faculty.
- c) The University recognizes the importance of intellectual freedom and autonomy in the creation, use, and dissemination of scholarly works.
- d) The University is committed to promoting a culture in which access, exchange, and lawful use of materials is regarded as fundamental to both the process and goals of scholarly inquiry.

SECTION IV. COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP.

Subd. 1. Ownership of Academic Works. In accordance with academic tradition, University faculty and students shall own the copyright in the academic works they create, except for academic works described below in section IV, subd. 2(b)-(e), or unless otherwise provided in a written agreement between the creator(s) and the University.

Subd. 2. University Ownership. The University shall own the copyright in the following works created by University faculty, other employees, or students, acting individually or jointly with others:

- a) works created by University employees acting within the scope of their employment, except for academic works created and owned by faculty under this policy;
- b) directed works;
- c) works specially ordered or commissioned by the University and for which the University has agreed, in writing, to specially compensate or provide other support to the creator(s);
- d) works created in connection with the administration of the University; and

- e) works created pursuant to a contract with an outside sponsor that provides that the University will own the copyrights in the works.

Subd. 3. Written Acknowledgments. The University and University faculty, other employees, and students shall execute necessary or desirable written instruments or agreements to evidence and protect ownership of copyright and copyright licenses in accordance with this policy.

Subd. 4. Ownership under Sponsored and other Outside Funded Agreements. The ownership of copyright in works created under an agreement with an outside sponsor shall be determined consistent with the terms of the agreement and applicable law.

Subd. 5. Works Created by Independent Contractors. Copyright ownership in works created by independent contractors shall be determined in accordance with applicable law and the contract between the University and the independent contractor. In most instances, the University shall enter into appropriate written contracts with independent contractors before services are provided to the University that may result in the creation of copyrighted works.

SECTION V. EXCLUSIONS.

Nothing in this policy shall be construed to preclude the University and faculty and students from entering into written agreements governing the use, licensing, or sharing of licensing revenues with each other with respect to works, whether such works are owned by the University, the faculty, or students under this policy.

SECTION VI. IMPLEMENTATION.

The president or delegate shall administer this policy and maintain appropriate policies and procedures to administer it.

DISCUSSION:

Professor Gary Balas, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), informed senators of what has happened since the October Senate meeting. Based on the input from the meeting, the copyright committee established a website to allow feedback and questions to the committee. This site is still open for input.

From these comments it was clear that there was a need for faculty representation on an advisory group to draft the administrative procedures.

The policy was presented to the Educational Planning Committee of the Regents for information a few weeks ago with strong support of the faculty's position. The policy did change from what was presented to the Senate to what went to the Regents. The policy is up for approval at the December Regents meeting, after which the administrative procedures will be drafted.

A senator commented that he heard that questions directed to the website were not answered.

Professor Balas said that this was not his experience and he had not heard this comment before.

Q: The policy defines students as people who are enrolled at the University, but how is this defined in a timeframe? Do students lose rights when they are no longer enrolled?

A: Students are covered by the policy when they are registered and they retain the copyright in perpetuity, but the policy would no longer apply to new material created once a student leaves or graduates.

A senator is concerned that the administrative procedures were not created at the same time as the policy, and that certain aspects were not addressed in the policy. Faculty have spent significant time on this issue and have not seen much change.

A senator commented that everyone who reads this policy has a different interpretation, which is why the administrative procedures should already be drafted.

A senator then said that faculty governance needs to pay attention going forward since faculty are not the only party involved.

20. COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION Revised Liberal Education Requirements Discussion by the Faculty Senate

The revised Liberal Education requirements are available on the web at:
<http://www.myu.umn.edu/public/cle.html>

DISCUSSION:

Professor Leslie Schiff, Chair of the Council on Liberal Education (CLE), said that last year Vice Provost Craig Swan charged the CLE to review the liberal education requirements since there has not been a systematic review since 1991. The process involved analyzing models from other institutions, getting feedback from faculty, staff, and students, and reviewing the minutes of CLE and the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) with respect to implementation issues.

A proposal was developed last year, revised this fall, and then presented to SCEP in October. The proposal was then presented for one month University-wide for feedback. During this process there were four forums and a link to the University portal. CLE met this week for the first time to review the feedback, which amounts to 26 pages. CLE is now meeting to revise the draft document.

CLE, which is composed of 21 individuals, was able to unanimously agree on only one point – that they support the value of liberal education for the University. During the analysis, CLE found no compelling reason to conclude that the current design of the requirements is flawed or out of line with what other institutions are doing, but the Council did consider radical departures.

One area that required improvement was the institutional face of liberal education. The website is not inspiring and falls below the quality at other institutions. Communication on this issue needs to be strengthened, followed by implementation of outcomes and accountability.

The proposal still includes a core and themes, but the focus of the core will shift to ways of knowing information and allow students to do the work of the discipline. There will be seven cores – arts and humanities, biological sciences, historical perspectives, literature, mathematical thinking, physical sciences, and social sciences – which is one less social science than what is now required. One extra theme course will then be required to address this loss. Feedback has been received on the arts and humanities core regarding its distinctive characteristics, so this section will be revised.

Regarding themes, CLE did discuss their elimination, but themes challenge students to consider issues that are at the heart of decisions that they will make to be good citizens, so a decision was made to retain them. A major implementation change is that in order to raise the visibility of liberal education, and to address double dipping, a theme needs to be fully integrated in a course.

A senator then said that information literacy is approaching information science and computational thought, that is not addressed. When students can pull information from many digital sources, they need to be able to weigh the source itself.

Q: Do these standards apply to all undergraduate students?

A: Yes, on the Twin Cities Campus.

A senator stated that this is a lengthy document that includes some aspects of thought police. He suggested that more care should be taken in answers to some of the questions. He then said that the list of seven cores is arbitrary and does not address why some areas are over-emphasized and others are ignored. Lastly, the document contains specific directives for resource allocation and class size which faculty need to understand.

Another senator then expressed concern that the cores reaffirmed disciplinary silos of knowledge and that diversity does not address power and privilege.

A senator said that the message to students seems to be that if they want to know a subject, then they need to take an integrative course and not a regular course. Tightening the requirements leads to faculty spending more time on proposals, which might change once the course is taught if there is a different instructor from the one who created the proposal.

Professor Schiff noted that CLE believes that there is something special about liberal education courses, but that students should be able to thoughtfully choose from the available courses to create their own liberal education plan. Language will be added to the next draft to address this issue.

A senator then commented that the world that students are moving into and how they are being trained for the future has been omitted from this draft. Students will need to think critically and there is little context included. The University also needs to have a corresponding discussion about the changes in the world and their relation to liberal education, as well as the role of the instructor in inspiring students to think about the future.

Another senator said that he did not see the progress that has been made since 1991. Students are living in a different world in terms of communication, which is now mostly electronic. How electronic information is mediated is an entirely different world of knowledge than what is in the library. The document does not address tools that are needed to deal with this knowledge. Globalization of life is also not addressed.

Professor Schiff responded that study abroad is recommended to count for the global perspective theme. Service opportunities will also be emphasized for the themes. CLE did struggle with how information has changed and noted that within the cores and themes it will be important to teach students how to analyze information.

A senator said that this document addresses sciences and humanities, while not addressing engineering, design, or complex systems.

Another senator noted that because something is an electronic resource does not mean that it is a quality resource. Information literacy needs to be included in the curriculum.

In closing Professor Schiff noted that this document is still being revised and additional comments can be emailed to her. A revised version will be presented to SCEP in February or March, and then brought back to the Faculty Senate.

21. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

22. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

23. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 pm.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2007-08 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

NOVEMBER 29, 2007

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2007-08 was convened in Studio C, Rarig Center, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 29, 2007, at 11:33 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 19 student members. Chair Ronald Miller presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

Resolution on a Central Corridor Tunnel

Approved by the: Student Senate October 4, 2007

Approved by the: Administration October 31, 2007*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no response required

* The safety of the University of Minnesota's students, faculty, staff, and visitors has always been, and will remain, a top priority. The University supports the construction of an underground tunnel in the design of a central corridor light rail line on Washington Avenue, and the resolution aligns well with the University's central corridor design principle that states, "Safety is fundamental to the successful operations of the Central Corridor."

2. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS UPDATE

Pamela Stenhjem, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is considering an academic professional (P&A) representative on the committee. CAPA is also involved in retiree benefits discussions. A resolution is coming to the University Senate today for action. CAPA wrote a letter of support, but also urges that the dialogue not just focus on faculty but all retired employee groups.

Lastly, CAPA did a survey last spring on work done by P&A employees. The preliminary results show that P&A are being asked to do more work as faculty are provided more time for teaching and research. P&A employees want to be more engaged, but most do not have time. CAPA is hoping that the University will conduct a similar survey in future years instead of CAPA being required to do it themselves. Once the results are finalized they will be shared with all groups.

3. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Ronald Miller, Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that the Student Advisory Committee for the Higher Education Services Office recently discussed the new federal regulations on student financial aid and textbook cost changes, of which the second item is on today's agenda for action. SSCC discussed two items for today's agenda, student release questions and Senate attendance.

4. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston - Katie Jeremiason stated that CSA is sending an email survey tomorrow to students and faculty regarding the proposed smoke-free policy and then a forum will be held on December 5. December 7 is the city's Winter Wonderland, during which CSA will be running a Santaland.

Duluth – Jeni Kiewatt said that UMDSA received a student service fees presentation and is working on the top 10 initiatives from the Chancellor.

Morris – Jeffrey Wencl said that campus is proposing to add an environmental studies major. There is also a discussion about a Morris regulation that of the 60 upper division credits, no more than 48 can be within a student's major. This means that there are 12 credits that students must take outside their major, and the regulation also prohibit a students from taking additional courses in their major when they have room in their schedule. The campus assembly will be voting on removing this restriction.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly – There was no report.

Minnesota Student Association - Mark Lewandowski noted that MSA approved a resolution on textbook cost reform. Other projects are the MSA Express van, a presidential primary party, Support the U day spring semester, Lend a Hand Hear the Band concert, and a student forum to hear concerns.

5. RESOLUTION ON FAIR TRADE COFFEE Action

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on Fair Trade Coffee

Whereas, Coffee is the second-largest legally traded commodity in the world market only behind oil; and

Whereas, Coffee is generally produced in developing countries where workers and farmers suffer from exploitative conditions as well as a lack of access to market information; and

Whereas, farmers are forced to sell their coffee below market value at less than the cost of production and subsequently pushing them into severe hardship or leaving no option but to sell and leave their land; and

Whereas, with Fair Trade Certified coffee farmers obtain prices of 100-200% higher in comparison to non-Fair Trade; and

Whereas, workers on Fair Trade farms have safe working conditions, equity for women, freedom of association, and strict prohibitions on child labor; and

Whereas, the Fair Trade system works within cooperatives where long-term trading partnerships are established allowing farmers to get advance credit on coffee purchases to ensure that farmers can avoid insecurity surrounding the next harvest; and

Whereas, Fair Trade cooperatives are committed to community development and democratically decide on how to invest Fair Trade revenues in infrastructure such as healthcare and education; and

Whereas, Fair Trade coffee uses sustainable production practices, and is often Organic and Shade Grown improving the health of the environment and consumers alike; and

Whereas, the Minnesota Public Interest Research Group (MPIRG) surveyed students in 2005 at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities, Duluth, and Morris campuses and found that 85.8% students felt that it was important to have Fair Trade products provided on campus; therefore be it

RESOLVED that the University of Minnesota require in all food service contracts it signs into with food service providers that all coffee sold on its campus' (Twin Cities, Morris, Duluth and Crookston) must be 100% Fair Trade Certified including all coffee retail locations, catering operations, and residence halls; and be it further

RESOLVED that whenever possible, this coffee be Organic, Shade Grown, and purchased from a local roaster.

COMMENT:

The Minnesota Public Interest Research Group (MPIRG) looks forward to bringing the issue of Fair Trade Certified coffee at the University of Minnesota campuses to your attention and it is MPIRG's hope that the Student Senate will endorse this resolution.

In 2005 the Social Concerns Committee passed a resolution on Fair Trade coffee stating that Fair Trade should be offered on campus and that when possible, it be Organic, Shade Grown, and purchased from a local roaster. After meeting with University Dining Services/Aramark MPIRG learned that the one Fair Trade coffee option at all of their locations amounts to approximately only 8% of the total coffee on campus. MPIRG hopes that the Student Senate will consider this resolution that takes the motions of the 2005 resolution a step further by requiring that all contracts have 100% of the coffee served and sold at the University of Minnesota be Fair Trade Certified.

It is MPIRG's belief that this is a step that students and faculty of the University of Minnesota support and demand. At the University of Minnesota Morris over 300 student petition signatures have been collected in support of 100% Fair Trade coffee. The University of Minnesota Duluth just began a petition drive on November 9 and they already have 75 student signatures. The University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus has collected 1,460 student petition signatures, 56 faculty signatures, and 15 student group endorsements including Oromia Student Union, University Pro-Choice Coalition, The Wake, Campus Atheists and Secular Humanists, Women's Student Activist Collective, Anti-War Organizing League, Minnesota Public Interest Research Group, La Raza Student Cultural Center, EcoWatch, Vietnamese Student Association of Minnesota, Students United for Corporate Responsibility and Ethics (SUCRE), STAND: A Student Anti-Genocide Organization, Democracy Matters, Amnesty International, and Students Against Youth AIDS.

Fair Trade Certification is a viable alternative to the injustices of our current trade system; as stated in the resolution Fair Trade benefits farmers, their communities, and it is better for the environment as well as (U of M) consumers. It is time for the University of Minnesota to exemplify the principles of its students and faculty and become a participant in the Fair Trade movement. MPIRG hopes that the Student Senate will assist efforts in making the University fair and just.

**RONALD MILLER, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Ryan Kennedy, from the Minnesota Public Interest Research Group (MPIRG), began by noting that MPIRG is a student-led, student-directed, non-partisan group that works on issues of public interest. MPIRG would like the Student Senate's approval of this resolution. Similar efforts are in place at eight other campuses. For the Twin Cities, efforts began in 2005 with a survey that showed overwhelming support for 100 percent fair-trade coffee on campus.

Coffee is the target of MPIRG efforts since it is the second largest commodity behind oil. Fair-trade efforts provide a livable wage to workers for their product as a way to break the cycle of poverty. Money is also invested locally in community development.

MPIRG is working on three campuses. For the Twin Cities, 76 faculty, 1486 students, and 15 student groups have signed onto this resolution. At Duluth, 365 students and 15 faculty have agreed. For the Morris campus, 234 students, 13 faculty, and 7 student groups are in agreement.

Q: What actions have been taken at other institutions?

A: Macalester and St. Catherine are 100 percent fair-trade without seeing a price increase. Morris is also 100 percent fair-trade.

Q: Is the cost of fair-trade coffee feasible?

A: The cost is comparable to other gourmet coffee. Fair-trade also controls costs by eliminating the middle man.

Q: Who overseas fair-trade coffee co-ops?

A: Members of the cooperative farms.

Q: Does the weakening dollar lessen the impact for farmers?

A: No since there are many organizations involved in purchasing fair-trade coffee.

Q: How does fair-trade coffee improve working conditions for free-trade producers?

A: While the process does not improve conditions for free-trade workers, these workers see the prices that fair-trade farmers achieve and the community development that is possible.

Q: Is it possible for Starbucks to only serve fair-trade coffee.

A: Starbucks supports fair-trade processes.

A senator then noted that there are costs to a system that certifies coffee as fair-trade.

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

APPROVED

**6. RESOLUTION ON A DESIGNATED SUPPLIERS PROGRAM
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Designated Supplier Program (DSP) Resolution
November 2007

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota must unequivocally insist upon safe, decent working conditions for those who manufacture University-licensed apparel; and

WHEREAS, academic institutions, together with international organizations, the United States government, human rights groups, and business and labor organizations must work together on concrete steps to ameliorate the dire conditions endured by garment workers in many countries around the world; and

WHEREAS, the University has adopted a Code of Conduct establishing standards of manufacturing for licensees producing University apparel, and affiliated with the Workers Rights Consortium (WRC) as a means of monitoring this production; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of the current Code of Conduct are not being adhered to by licensees, as evidenced by the December 2006 WRC Licensee Factory Report listing of the Hermosa factory of El Salvador as a producer of Minnesota clothing; and

WHEREAS, the University has been invited by the WRC to partake in a Working Group for development of the Designated Suppliers Program (DSP), an initiative designed to address problems of policy enforcement; and

WHEREAS, a central goal of the Working Group has been to identify key stakeholder concerns about the DSP and to develop ways to address these concerns in order to enhance the effectiveness of the program; and

WHEREAS, participation in the Working Group sends a strong message to licensees, students, and the community that the University is active in raising the labor standards of its licensed apparel manufacture; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of Minnesota shall accept the invitation to the Designated Suppliers Program Working Group, and move to adopt the Designated Suppliers Program to ensure that licensees are adhering to the standards set forth by the University.

COMMENT:

This resolution was approved by the Morris Campus Student Association on February 19, 2007.

**RONALD MILLER, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Matt Abbott, from the Minnesota Public Interest Research Group (MPIRG), stated that this resolution addresses the apparel and licensing process for the University with a goal of

responsible purchasing. The University signed a Vendor Code of Conduct in 2000 that would require manufacturers to address worker issues before being allowed to print University merchandise. Issues have been noted but the University has not taken the lead in addressing these issues.

A group called the Workers Rights Consortium (WRC) monitors manufacturers and has reported that several companies are not following the guidelines in the Vendor Code of Conduct. Companies are breaking local labor laws to achieve lower prices. When these companies are reported and fined their manufacturing costs increase. Many choose to leave an area and start a plant in a new location to keep prices low. The WRC and 38 other institutions are working to improve labor conditions and keep factories intact so that incoming funds are not removed from communities.

Q: Does this resolution limit the companies and/or locations that can produce University apparel?

A: No. This resolution still allows the University to purchase from these companies, but it requires basic working conditions in factories. Currently, the production cost is only one to three percent of the retail cost of an item.

Q: What is the University's incentive?

A: The University has an interest in enforcing its own Vendor Code of Conduct.

Q: If the University already has a contract in place with negligent companies, what changes can the University make?

A: Changes will be made by the University joining with other institutions that are requiring the same standards. New contracts should be reworded to included the designated suppliers program (DSP).

A senator noted that licensing agreements should include DSP language in writing so that it is easier to follow-up with companies.

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

APPROVED

7. RESOLUTION ON SYSTEM-WIDE COURSE BOOK COST REFORM Action

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on System-wide Course Book Cost Reform

Whereas, course book prices have risen at twice the rate of annual inflation over the last two decades, and

Whereas, the average estimated cost of books and supplies for full-time students is \$898 per academic year, and

Whereas, at least one University of Minnesota department has been successful in negotiating with publishers to reduce textbook costs, and

Whereas, many professors are not currently aware of the different measures that can be taken to decrease student book costs without hurting course quality or compromising academic freedom, and therefore:

Be it resolved that the Student Senate supports the promotion of lowering class book costs, and

Be it further resolved that the Student Senate supports ongoing programs to negotiate with textbook publishers, especially related to high enrollment courses, and

Be it further resolved that the Student Senate supports the implementation on a system-wide basis of the *Best Practices on Reducing Textbook Costs* written by the Textbook Cost Containment Review Committee at the University of Minnesota – Twin Cities campus.

COMMENT:

This resolution was approved by the Minnesota Student Association in October 2007 and is being brought to the Student Senate for system-wide approval. Following is the accompanying best practices guidelines.

Best Practices on Reducing Textbook Costs

The faculty must play a front line role in controlling textbook costs. This can be accomplished by considering cost, along with textbook quality and ancillary features, from the very beginning of the adoption process. The Best Practices outlined below can significantly lower the costs of textbooks to students. Most notably, faculty should work with the Bookstore to encourage price competition between publishers and to leverage the University's substantial buying power into cost reductions for students.

Best Practice #1:

Faculty should consider cost in addition to quality and other features when selecting textbooks

When selecting books, faculty should consider cost as an important factor from the beginning of the book selection process. Faculty should select books that deliver high quality course material at a reasonable cost to students. In some cases, textbooks with adequate illustrations should be selected over texts with superb graphics that cost more. Before choosing a book, faculty should weigh the instructional value of ancillary material provided for the instructor; for example: a CD containing the book's illustrations is useful, but a CD with pre-prepared PowerPoint lectures is superfluous.

Best Practice #2:

Negotiate with publishers for textbook costs

Faculty can have a significant impact on textbook costs through negotiations with publishers; this strategy can be particularly useful in large-enrollment courses. The University of Minnesota has some of the largest textbook accounts in the country and should use our buying power to negotiate lower prices. Highly successful negotiations have recently taken place in chemistry and technical writing/rhetoric, and the University Bookstore is prepared to dedicate a staff member to working exclusively on such negotiations if and when the demand increases. Departments and DUGS should help instructors reach a consensus on common text(s) for courses and to agree to use that text for an extended length of time. It is also recommended that during negotiations a firm price is set: "no price, no adoption."

Best Practice #3:

Raise awareness of why textbook costs are relevant and timely for faculty, and improve communication and processes through use of Directors of Undergraduate Studies

Some faculty members do not understand the implications of their textbook choices, and may not have been as informed as they have at the Department Chair level. We recommend that textbook selection decisions become the oversight of the DUGS to be certain that faculty have considered cost during the selection process. We expect departments to report to DUGS on their textbook selection process, whether other books were considered, whether they attempted to negotiate, and ultimately why a particular textbook was chosen. Members of this task force will meet with each college's DUGS during early Fall 2007 to share relevant data on textbook cost.

Best Practice #4:

Place textbook orders on time

The simplest way to impart change on textbook costs is to place orders on time with the University Bookstore. This is particularly relevant for large courses, the texts for which are often known early. We recommend that the Bookstore send periodic notices to the DUGS contacts detailing what percentage of their orders have been placed. On-time orders should be an expectation.

Best Practice #5:

Use packing/bundling only when it provides a cost benefit for students

Although some packaging of multiple books can provide a cost benefit for students, many times it does not – particularly if it involves books/items that are not necessary for the course. We recommend that the Bookstore (and this task force) develop a set of guidelines for faculty and departments to consider regarding bundling.

Best Practice #6:

Place textbooks on reserve in library

The library is happy to assist in placing textbooks on reserve. Although it has not been found that this service is used frequently, it can be helpful in instances in which students have chosen to share a text with a classmate or are opting not to purchase a non-essential text. Reference books especially should be placed on reserve in the library, not required for purchase.

Best Practice #7:

Course packet containment

Although not a “textbook” cost, the cost of course packets for students contribute greatly to their overall costs each term. Faculty members should work with the University Libraries to determine whether the University has electronic subscriptions to any of the articles included in the course packet. With University subscriptions, students would be able to link to the article for free instead of paying for royalties.

Best Practice #8:

Refrain from always using new editions

Constant use of new textbook editions increases text costs for students both in terms of the purchase of new textbooks and the decreased value for used books that are sold back to the Bookstore. We recommend that faculty allow the use of old editions and indicate the appropriate page numbers for multiple editions in their syllabi. The Bookstore also needs to be notified when faculty members will be using/allowing older editions, so they know those editions can be bought back at the end of the previous term.

Best Practice #9:

Communicate with students regarding textbook usage and cost

Faculty members can help students understand the textbook choices they have made and the cost implications of such. We recommend that a significant part of a required textbook be necessary

for the course, as well as that faculty take time on the first day of class to explain what each book is used for and why each book/piece is required.

**RONALD MILLER, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Q: What action will take place with approval of this resolution?

A: The University is already working with professors and the best practice list has been discussed with the Council of Undergraduate Deans as a way to implement processes within each college. Greater awareness by faculty is the biggest challenge. A letter to department chairs received a high response. MSA is working with the Twin Cities Bookstore to implement a student-to-student book exchange starting December 10. Unfortunately there is not one solution to this problem, but these best practices grant flexibility to departments and faculty.

A senator noted that Duluth already has a policy of this kind in place, with implementation set for fall 2008. There have been no problems on campus and faculty have been asking students for help on class materials.

Q: What impact does the Bookstore have?

A: The Bookstore does not make a profit from textbooks sales and only orders what faculty request. Therefore the areas to target are faculty and publishers.

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

APPROVED

**8. STUDENT RATING OF TEACHING
Discussion**

In spring 2006 the Student Senate and the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) approved the following set of student release questions.

Current Student Release Questions

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

0-2 hours per week

3-5 hours per week

6-9 hours per week

10-14 hours per week

15 or more hours per week

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

about the same.

more.

I have not taken other courses at this level.

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

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

4. I would recommend this course to other students.

Yes
 No

5. I would take another course from this instructor.

Yes
 No

6. Please rate your instructor in terms of the following characteristics.

	Good	Somewhat Good	Somewhat Poor	Poor	Do not know
A. Is approachable					
B. Is enthusiastic about course content					
C. Returns assignments in a timely fashion					
D. Is prepared for class					
E. Presents materials clearly					
F. Provides constructive feedback					
G. Encourages critical thinking					

7. How successfully or unsuccessfully does the instructor implement each instructional method?

	Successfully	Somewhat successfully	Somewhat unsuccessfully	Unsuccessfully	Does not apply
A. Class discussions					
B. Course readings					
C. Writing assignments					
D. Group work					
E. Labs					
F. Lectures					

After the student release questions were completed, the faculty decided to look at their five mandatory questions. They have proposed changes, which are on the Faculty Senate agenda for approval today, and have suggested that the Student Senate consider changes to the student release questions. The Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) discussed this topic at its October and November meetings and would like Student Senate feedback on the revised set of questions.

The changes are:

Question 1 was changed since the current question ask students at the end of the semester to approximate the number of hours per week spent on work for the class, which can vary significantly by week. SSCC instead is proposing a revised question.

Question 5 has been reworded to mirror Question 4.

Question 6 has been expanded to include some aspects of Question 7 and also ask about the grading method in the class. The scale has also been changed to mirror the seven-point scale being used on the faculty questions.

Question 7 has been eliminated since some questions were incorporated in Question 6 and others did not seem necessary.

Revised Student Release Questions

1. I put significant effort into learning the subject matter from this course.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Not Applicable

2. Compared to other courses at this level, the amount I have learned in this course is
 less.
 about the same.
 more.
 I have not taken other courses at this level.

3. Compared to other courses at this level, the difficulty of this course is
 less.
 about the same.
 more.
 I have not taken other courses at this level.

4. I would recommend this course to other students.
 Yes
 No

5. I would recommend this instructor to other students.
 Yes
 No

6. Please rate your instructor in terms of the following characteristics.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
A. Is approachable							
B. Is enthusiastic about course content							
C. Returns assignments in a timely fashion							
D. Is prepared for class							
E. Presents materials clearly							
F. Provides constructive feedback							

G. Encourages critical thinking							
H. Has grading methods that are fair and reasonable							
I. Makes effective use of course readings							
J. Creates worthwhile assignments							

DISCUSSION:

Ronald Miller, Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that after the Student Senate revised its student release questions the faculty decided to revise their set of questions. Their revision process has taken over a year, but a final set of questions will be presented to the Faculty Senate today for approval.

During this process, he spoke with Professor Cathrine Wambach, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), about making slight revisions to the student release questions. She met with SSCC and a revised set of questions were proposed. However, this set raised additional faculty concerns.

Therefore he is asking the Student Senate for their input on the two sets of questions in the agenda. If the Student Senate agrees with the current set, nothing else should be required. If the Student Senate wants to revise the questions, then they would require SCEP and University Senate approval before they could be used. The goal is to have a revised evaluation sheet available for use as soon as possible.

A senator noted that question 7 addresses areas that may not work in a class, but should refer to the class and not the instructor since the same instructor does not always teach each of these sections.

A member of SSCC stated that the revised set was proposed to reduce the number of questions being asked to make sure that students complete the entire section and to remove any confusion.

A senator noted that he likes current questions 1 and 7, since question 1 can help the professor assess the work load in the course.

Another senator felt that question 1 would not be helpful to faculty, just students.

Ron Miller reminded senators that these questions are intended to help students in course choice and are not structured to directly provide feedback to faculty.

Q: Do students see the results of these questions?

A: Currently, there is a set of ten questions that are seen by students if the faculty member agrees to release the results. The first set of the questions on the agenda, while approved, have not been used on evaluations sheets because the University was waiting for the faculty questions to do one re-printing. Faculty release will still be required on these questions, since it is a state statute. Duluth and Crookston are unionized so their results are not released.

A senator stated that question 3 is helpful since it asks about the difficulty in a course. However, the revised question 1 used the term 'significant,' which is vague.

A senator made a motion to make this an action item on the agenda. A vote was taken and the motion was approved.

A motion was then made and seconded to reaffirm approval of the student release questions labeled as current on the agenda. A vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

9. TWIN CITIES STUDENT SENATE ELECTIONS
Discussion by the Twin Cities Student Delegation

Ronald Miller, Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that the current process on the Twin Cities to elect senators is for a college to hold its own election or use the All-Campus Election Commission (ACEC) spring semester. Seats that are not filled spring semester, or when vacancies arise, are then the responsibility of the student board in each college.

Currently, many seats are going unfilled. This is due to college boards that exist but are not functional, or in some cases college boards do not exist.

SSCC has discussed this topic and would like to propose that any seats not filled by a date, such as August, would then be the responsibility of the Student Senate to fill. The Student Senate would send targeted emails to students in affected colleges to apply for the position. A committee would then meet to review applications and select senators. Final approval would rest with the Student Senate.

A senator stated that this does not seem to be a bad idea since college boards are working on their own issues and not worrying about filling Student Senate seats.

Ron Miller said that he would bring language back to the Student Senate in spring.

10. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

11. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:09 pm.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor