

2008-09 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DECEMBER 4, 2008

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

The second meeting of the Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, December 4, 2008, at 2:35 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by phone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 117 faculty/faculty-like academic professional members. President Bruininks presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS
Information

University Senate

Academic Misconduct Policy

Approved by the: University Senate October 2, 2008

Approved by the: Administration October 29, 2008

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Copyright Ownership Policy

Approved by the: University Senate October 2, 2008

Approved by the: Administration October 29, 2008

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Alfred Aepli

Professor

Mathematics

1928 – 2008

Sharon Beckes

Academic Professional

University of Minnesota Extension

1946 – 2008

Peter W. Firchow

Professor

English

1937 – 2008

Helene Horwitz

Associate Dean

Medical School

1942 – 2008

Paul J. Maupin

Academic Professional
Health Sciences Building Projects
1932 – 2008

Lawrence C. Merriam
Professor
Forest Resources
1923 – 2008

Chester Schultz, Jr.
Professor
Dentistry
1931 – 2008

Allan H. Spear
Professor
History
1937 – 2008

STUDENTS

John B. Eckholdt
College of Liberal Arts

Kelly L. Preusse
College of Continuing Education

3. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE Statement on the University of Minnesota, Rochester Personnel Plan Information for the Faculty Senate

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure cannot endorse the personnel plan proposed by the senior administrators at the University of Minnesota, Rochester. The Committee believes that the proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty is too low to provide the kind of liberal-arts education that merits awarding a University of Minnesota baccalaureate degree to the students who will matriculate at this campus.

The proposed plan has two groups of personnel participating in the teaching mission, tenured and tenure-track faculty as one group and "student-based" instructors (i.e., lecturers and teaching specialists) as the other, a large proportion of each group to be hired at the outset. The high proportion of personnel not tenured or on the tenure track in the plan represents a threat both to tenure and to academic freedom at the University of Minnesota, since non-tenured faculty cannot fully exercise academic freedom without some fear that their jobs may be in jeopardy, and many if not all would be reluctant to exercise it fully. Furthermore, a large proportion of personnel who are not tenured or on the tenure track whose primary responsibility is teaching (85%) would appear to provide an insufficient regular-faculty cohort to ensure that the research mission of a large research university is carried out and embodied in the instruction provided to the students. The Committee recommends that at least 75% of those hired be tenured or on the tenure track.¹

¹ This figure does not include those who might be hired on a temporary basis to cover for faculty members on leave.

Approved November 21, 2008

**TOM CLAYTON, CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

**4. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Statement on Budget Cuts
Information for the Faculty Senate**

If the University is faced with a situation that requires budget cuts, the Faculty Consultative Committee strongly urges that any percentage cuts in academic budgets be matched by comparable cuts in the non-academic units.

Approved October 16, 2008

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**5. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Bylaws for the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics
Information for the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation**

The Faculty Consultative Committee voted to approve the proposed bylaws for the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, of which the Faculty Senate is a member. Copies of the bylaws will be available at the meeting and are available on the web at:
<http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/COIA%20draft%20bylaws%2005%20Nov%2008.pdf>

Approved November 19, 2008

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**6. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Faculty Ombuds Service
Information for the Faculty Senate**

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) recommends that the President adopt at least on a trial basis the proposal of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs Subcommittee on Faculty Ombuds Services, made on September 8, 2008, to establish a Faculty Ombuds Service for the Twin Cities campus. (While the service might be available to faculty on all non-bargaining-unit campuses, the coordinate campus faculty members of FCC have expressed doubt that any of their colleagues would use a service based on the Twin Cities campus.) FCC suggests creating the service for a period of three years, after which its effectiveness will be evaluated by the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, the Office for Conflict Resolution, and the Vice President for Human Resources, in concert with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs. FCC believes the need for such a service is substantial and that the cost of establishing it will be relatively small, especially compared to the benefits to be gained. Given the likely economic conditions facing the University in the near future, FCC accepts the proposition that

establishment of the service should be cost-neutral so would be prepared to see funds drawn from some other fringe benefit program (e.g., Wellness) to fund this for the pilot period.

The subcommittee report did not address the administrative details of how to implement the recommendations, and FCC recommends they be worked out by a small group jointly appointed by the President (or his designee) and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

Approved November 17, 2008

FOR INFORMATION:

The report of the Subcommittee on Faculty Ombuds Services is available on the web at:
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/scfa/ombudsreport.pdf>

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**7. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 2, 2008
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/081002sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
FACULTY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

8. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Emily Hoover, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committees (FCC), said that FCC has been meeting regularly with senior administrators, such as President Bruininks, Provost Sullivan, and Senior Vice Presidents Jones and Cerra. Topics for these meetings have included the budget, issues of academic freedom and tenure, and updates on strategic positioning. A conversation was also held with Chancellor Lehmkuhle, from the Rochester Campus, to discuss development of that campus. Discussions also continue with the Twin Cities Deans Council on issues of mutual interest. FCC also spent time this fall listening to department leaders regarding on-going challenges within their units.

University leadership in consultation with Senate governance has been working on establishing a protocol for creating and reviewing University policies. The first group of these policies, from the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), will be brought late today for discussion. Educational policies will continue to be looked at throughout the year. Research, financial, and human resources policies are also being looked at to consider their path of review.

Twice each year, FCC holds a discussion on the intellectual future of the University. The first for this year was held in November and dealt with the intellectual future of the public research university. Members read an article titled, "The research university in transition," which described the attributes of the merging global model for universities and how the University fits into that model. This topic merits deliberate and sustained deliberation by faculty, administrators, and anyone else in the state who cares about higher education.

Lastly, FCC continues to discuss the University's financial situation and the steady slide in state resources. Faculty might be called upon this year to support the University's legislative request.

9. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE

Professor Martin Sampson, a Faculty Legislative Liaison, referred senators to the blue handout which reports the news that the state economist delivered today, which is a substantial shortfall and implications for monies that were already appropriated for this fiscal year.

He expects that, as a result of the budget issues, this session will have unprecedented debate about the nature of the University, its priorities, and its organization. He believes that this level of inquiry is fair, but the problem is that society looks at higher education in the same way as the auto industry – that there are huge inefficiencies.

The reality is that the United States' higher education system is the envy of the rest of the world. It is deeply important that higher education maintains this status, while improving the model under unwanted budget circumstances. Vigorous support must also be given to the values and practices in this system.

MOTION A Consent Agenda Action by the Faculty Senate

Agenda Items 10. and 11. involve the same change to the same committee and 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. As Item 10. is 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.

10. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 5(E) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (new language is underlined):

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 Director of Academic Counseling, the Director of Academic Support Resources, and the Director of Compliance are ex officio members, without vote. The Committee will hold at least one meeting each semester without the presence of the ex officio members.

...

COMMENT:

Currently the director of the McNamara Academic Center for Student-athletes and the director of Compliance serve as ex officio. The members of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA) believe that it would be appropriate and helpful to have the Director of Academic Support Resources, formerly the Registrar, at the table on a regular basis since she/he has the responsibility of the certification of eligibility of students who participate in varsity athletics programs.

Note: The FAOCIA is responsible for the oversight of the certification of the eligibility of student-athletes.

**TIMOTHY JOHNSON, CHAIR
FACULTY ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

**11. FACULTY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT
Ex Officio Membership**

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 1 of the Faculty Senate Rules as follows (new language is underlined):

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

1. Ex Officio Members of Faculty Senate Committees

...

- **Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics**--Director of Academic Counseling; Director of Athletic Compliance; Director, Academic Support Resources

...

COMMENT:

Currently the director of the McNamara Academic Center for Student-athletes and the director of Compliance serve as ex officio. The members of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA) believe that it would be appropriate and helpful to have the Director of Academic Support Resources, formerly the Registrar, at the table on a regular basis since she/he has the responsibility of the certification of eligibility of students who participate in varsity athletics programs.

Note: The FAOCIA is responsible for the oversight of the certification of the eligibility of student-athletes.

**TIMOTHY JOHNSON, CHAIR
FACULTY ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 95 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

END OF MOTION A

**12. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Health Care Savings Plan
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate advises the President that it revises its motion of May 1, 2008, which read as follows:

"The Faculty Senate recommends to the President that the University adopt a Health Care Savings Plan for the faculty that uses the 0.5% of the 2.5% faculty contribution to the Faculty Retirement Plan. If there are questions about the details of the plan, the administration will consult with the appropriate Faculty Senate committees and the Faculty Senate."

The Faculty Senate now recommends that the full 2.5% contribution to the Faculty Retirement Plan be retained, as at present, and that an additional 0.5% of salary be deducted for contribution to a Health Care Savings Plan.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) was informed by Jackie Singer, Director of Retirement Benefits, that the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), the representative governance body for the academic professional and administrative (P&A) staff, had voted to add the 0.5% as an additional deduction from salary, rather than reduce the contribution to the Faculty Retirement Plan (as the Faculty Senate voted to do last spring). While it is legally possible for the University to make different deductions for different classes of

employees, there are costs to doing so. There are a fairly large number of people (in excess of 200) who have P&A titles at present but who also hold tenured faculty appointments (e.g., the President, the deans, some of the vice presidents) or who go back and forth between faculty and P&A appointments.

More importantly, however, both SCFA and the Faculty Consultative Committee believe that the proposal from CAPA makes sense. The Health Care Savings Plan is the only fringe benefit program that allows tax-exempt contributions and tax-exempt withdrawals. Rather than reduce our retirement contributions, both FCC and SCFA recommend to the Faculty Senate that it adopt a recommendation that there be an additional 0.5% salary deduction that is a contribution to a Health Care Savings Plan resulting in an increase in the total deduction from 2.5 to 3.0%.

**KATHRYN HANNA, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

This item was withdrawn from the agenda and will be brought back to the Faculty Senate spring semester.

WITHDRAWN

**13. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE
Amendment to Policy and Protocol on the Student Rating and
Peer Evaluation of Instruction
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Faculty Senate Policy and Protocol on the Student Rating and Peer Evaluation of Instruction as follows (language is underlined):

...

PROTOCOL

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.

--The disposition of written comments on student-rating forms shall be decided by each college or campus. In units where all written comments on students' evaluations are routinely sent to the chair and/or to reviewing-bodies and included in the file, unfairly prejudicial comments should be withheld from the file upon request of the instructor concerned. The decision whether particular comments are unfairly prejudicial should be made by the chair, a senior faculty member designated through a process determined by the department, or a standing or ad-hoc committee. This provision is intended to cover scurrilous, racist, sexist, homophobic, and other personal comments, and is not intended to exclude from the file negative comments directly related to the course.

...

COMMENT:

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) noted the difference of opinion between the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs about the disposition of written comments on student-rating forms when the most recent version of the Senate policy was adopted. AF&T concurs with the concern expressed by SCFA about the potential impact of inappropriate comments made about instructors on written or online rating forms used in promotion, tenure, and merit decisions. After reviewing the comments provided to SCFA by Professor Marti Gonzales on the social-psychological research that demonstrates the disproportionate effect of even a single negative comment, AF&T recommends the changes indicated above. Be it noted that this policy does not include the excision of negative comments directed to the content or pedagogy of a course. Speaking not of slurs but of traits, Shakespeare's Hamlet noted a very similar effect:

So oft it chanceth in particular men that, . . .
Carrying, I say, the stamp of one defect,
Being nature's livery, or fortune's star,
Their virtues else—be they as pure as grace,
As infinite as man may undergo—
Shall in the general censure take corruption
From that particular fault.

**TOM CLAYTON, CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Tom Clayton, Chair of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AF&T), said that the only disagreement on this amendment was whether all comments should be forwarded to the appropriate bodies or just those comments that were not unfairly prejudicial. A clear majority of individuals feel that unfavorable, prejudicial comments should be suppressed.

A senator spoke against the amendment. She said that college promotion and tenure (P&T) committees read all student evaluations and then discriminates between evaluations with stigmatizing comments. With these comments redacted, the committee would not be able to see the basis for comments and scores, which could be most harmful in the long-run.

Professor Marti Gonzales, from the Psychology department, said that despite people's best efforts and their beliefs that they are unaffected by negative comments, research shows that negative comments do have an effect, including construing neutral or ambiguous information in a less positive light than it would have been evaluated had they not been exposed to the comments. Another ironic aspect is that the harder people try not to let these comments affect their judgments, the greater the likelihood that their monitoring system will breakdown and will be influenced.

A senator then said that this can be a serious problem but she still supports the P&T committee seeing all the written comments. Without seeing these comments, there is no basis for the numerical rankings.

Another senator expressed concern about the practicality of redacting these comments. The proposal would leave the responsibility for designing procedures to each unit which would lead

to questions of fairness and equivalency across the University. Also, if a candidate felt that not enough was redacted, it could lead to legal action.

A senator then noted that the amendment states that comments are only redacted if requested by the candidate, so that person makes the initial determination. If the candidate trusts the P&T committee in their unit, then they might not ask to have comments redacted.

Q: If a college P&T committee requests all the comments on a candidate, would they receive the unredacted version?

A: No.

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

APPROVED

**14. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE
Statement on University Responsibility to Researchers
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate adopt the following statement (new statement, new language since October 4 Senate meeting underlined, language to be deleted ~~struck-out~~):

The Faculty Senate and the President affirm their mutual understanding that, in cases of unpreventable major adversity affecting faculty members, whether due to accident, the weather, building collapse, or any other external cause, the relevant administrations will immediately do all in ~~its~~ their power to enable faculty members affected to resume their professional activities as soon as possible; and will ensure that they will not be held responsible for professional performance to the extent that their professional activities are disrupted through no fault of their own.

COMMENT:

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) heard reports about the impact of the collapse of the 35W bridge on research being conducted in a building near the site of the bridge. Our general concern was the potential impact on review of individuals for promotion, tenure, and merit in the case when research facilities are disrupted because of natural disaster or other causes beyond the control of the faculty member. After several discussions, including a discussion with Vice President for Research Tim Mulcahy, we concluded that a general statement, to be embraced by the President as well as the Faculty Senate, would establish expectations without binding anyone to particular solutions. The range of possible problems precludes the adoption of a more specific policy, so AF&T recommends this general statement.

This version reflects a change suggested at the October 4 Senate meeting: the "administration" responsible for responding should include the colleges and departments as well as central administration, and AF&T agrees.

**TOM CLAYTON, CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

15. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE
Border Searches of Electronic Materials
Discussion by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To send the following to the Minnesota Congressional Delegation:

The Members of the Faculty Senate of the University of Minnesota write to express their grave concern at the change in Department of Home Security policy that enables Customs and Border Patrol Agents to seize and copy electronic and printed materials at will, without even "suspicion of illegal activity" ("probable cause"), by which their efforts were limited until July 2008. We believe that what today affects only border crossings, tomorrow could spread internally and very likely would. This freely invasive practice is a threat to the integrity of the research of all scientists and other scholars who cross borders and, often, collaborate with scientists and scholars abroad. We urge you to do all you can to restore to Agents' practice the entirely reasonable requirement of "suspicion of illegal activity" that previously obtained.

COMMENT:

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure received the following information from the national office of the American Association of University Professors, and in response, recommends the motion for adoption by the Faculty Senate, to be forwarded to the members of the Minnesota Congressional delegation.

Subject: AAUP Legislative Alert: Border Searches of Electronic Materials

October 14, 2008

Over the past few months there has been a great deal of publicity surrounding the searches of electronic materials at the border. Until recently, Customs and Border Patrol agents could seize and copy electronic and printed materials if they had probable cause to believe that the law was being broken. In July 2008, the Department of Homeland Security revealed that its internal policies no longer require any suspicion of illegal activity to search and seize travelers' materials. While privacy issues are everyone's concern, and all citizens should actively defend their civil liberties, faculty members have particular areas of concern about this policy due to their research and collaboration with colleagues around the world. Below, we offer links to press coverage and a congressional hearing on the issue.

Please consider calling your representatives and senators to express your concerns about this issue.

Talking points are directly below.

Obtain the contact information for your elected officials, as well as some general pointers on grassroots advocacy by visiting the AAUP's online advocacy center.

You could also call or e-mail the offices of Senator Russ Feingold and Senator Patrick Leahy to thank them for convening a hearing on this vital issue and encourage them to continue their oversight work.

Talking Points

-- Professors commonly collaborate on research with colleagues in other countries. In places with restrictive governments, researchers and scholars may be taking risks to work on certain projects. Knowing that such collaboration will no longer be kept confidential may have a chilling effect on collaboration across borders.

-- Similarly, faculty working in areas such as human rights may have a much more difficult time making contacts or finding sources, if they cannot guarantee the anonymity of sources of information. This would greatly impede the amount and quality of information obtained about various political and socio-economic situations around the world, of which academics are a vital source.

-- There is little or no information about how information that is copied and kept by Homeland Security will be kept secure, leading to concerns about the protection of original research. This extends to projects that may have patents pending or are in an otherwise precarious stage of development.

-- It is unlikely that the Customs and Border Protection agents conducting such searches at the border would have the specialized knowledge to determine whether or not certain types of data, particularly in areas of science such as engineering or biochemistry, pose a genuine threat.

-- The invasion of privacy may extend well beyond the individual whose possessions are being searched. Many faculty members have outside practices or jobs. An adjunct at a school of law may have confidential client records. An instructor from a psychology department may have patient records. Thus, obligations of confidentiality may be breached through no fault of the professional's own under these searches.

Press coverage of this issue:

"Expanded Powers to Search Travelers at Border Detailed" Washington Post, 9/23/08

"Search and Replace" [editorial], Washington Post, 8/13/08

"US Border Agency Says It Can Seize Laptops" PC World, 8/3/08

"Travelers' Laptops May Be Detained At Border: No Suspicion Required Under DHS Policies" Washington Post, 8/1/08

Congressional Hearing: Senate Judiciary Committee, "Laptop Searches and Other Violations of Privacy Faced by Americans Returning from Overseas Travel"

Sincerely,
Cary Nelson, AAUP president
Nicole Byrd, AAUP government relations associate

**TOM CLAYTON, CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Q: Was the phrase 'suspicion of illegal activity' removed from the current version?

A: Yes.

16. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Revised Educational Policies
Discussion by the Faculty Senate

The following policies were presented for discussion by the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP):

- Academic Calendars: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Academic Authority over the Curriculum and Major & Minor Requirements: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Appropriate Student Use of Class Notes and Course Materials: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Campus-Specific Credits Requirements for Undergraduates (Baccalaureate) Degrees: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Course Numbering: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Credit and Grade Point Requirements for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Educational Materials Conflict of Interest: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Enrolling in Overlapping or Back-to-Back Classes: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Enrollment Limits for Course Sections
- Establishing, Enforcing, and Waiving Prerequisites: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Evaluation of Teaching: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Expected Student Academic Work per Credit: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Faculty Role in Undergraduate Advising on the Curriculum: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Grading and Transcripts: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- High School Preparation Requirements: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester
- Leave of Absence and Readmission for Undergraduates: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester

CATHERINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Cathrine Wambach, SCEP Chair, said that a year ago a subcommittee was created to begin looking at educational policies with the goals of rewriting them in a form that was suitable to the new policy library, clarify policies in areas where problems had been reported, and make the policies easier to find amid the verbiage.

The revisions were brought to SCEP at regular intervals for input. Comments were also received from FCC, three open forums, a posting on the policy library website, the Registrar's group, and the administrative Policy Advisory Committee.

She then presented the list of policies for review at today's meeting. The goal is to present the policies to the Faculty Senate in pieces to gather comments and then present the full set of policies spring semester for approval.

There was discussion on the following policies:

Campus-Specific Credits Requirements for Undergraduates (Baccalaureate) Degrees: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester

Q: Is it a change that a 'D' grade does not count towards a degree?

A: No, this has always been the policy, but it is not always known. There has been controversy on this issue, but the subcommittee is not proposing a change.

Q: Is there a separate policy for AHC units?

A: If there is a policy, or a part of a policy, that does not pertain to the AHC, then it is noted in the policy. If there is no notation, then it does apply.

Credit and Grade Point Requirements for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester

A senator noted that section 8 discusses limits on skills credits, but there is a separate limit at Morris. She asked that this be incorporated into the policy.

Enrolling in Overlapping or Back-to-Back Classes: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester

A senator noted that a student can be penalized for being late due to overlapping courses, but not if tardiness is their natural habit.

Professor Wambach replied that a faculty member can penalize students in this situation.

Enrollment Limits for Course Sections

Q: Why was the language on 'appropriate academic officer' added? Who would this be besides a dean?

A: There are not departments on all the campuses, so the title of 'dean' is also not used. This language has been changed throughout all the documents to make them more applicable.

A senator said that this new term is unclear, so clarification should be provided.

Professor Wambach said that it could be added to the definition section of the policy.

Q: Is this policy meant to address the micromanaging of courses and sections due to less-than-full enrollment?

A: This was discussed by SCEP, both in terms of offering instruction that is cost-effective and allowing students to make progress towards a degree when a course is required. SCEP tried to address both needs in this statement. Another practice brought to SCEP's attention was the late cancellation of courses. This policy encourages cancellation decisions to be made earlier so students can sign up for another course.

Evaluation of Teaching: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester

Professor Wambach noted that in Section 4, the restriction for evaluations in small courses has been eliminated. SCEP had heard from several faculty who sent their forms to the Office of Measurement Services at the end of spring semester, but did not get them returned based on the restriction in this policy. SCEP then discussed the loss of confidentiality for students in conjunction with these evaluations being the only mechanism to evaluate courses that might routinely have low enrollment. Without these evaluations, faculty who teach these courses have data missing for the promotion and tenure, and annual merit review processes.

A senator questioned the language in this section, since it seems to imply that all courses must be evaluated, except that a few types of courses, which are listed, cannot be evaluated.

Another senator interpreted the language to mean that the exception courses can still be evaluated, but just not be using the standard form. She suggested that the language be clarified to make this intention clearer.

A senator then commented that while anonymous evaluations are an established practice in the evaluation of faculty, they are not allowed when evaluating administrators.

Another senator stated that evaluations should not be required for classes with a small number of students, especially for Ph.D. students, since many times the faculty member teaching the course is their advisor or writing recommendation letters.

Q: Why does it state that student release questions (SRQs) 'may not' be used for promotion and tenure purposes?

A: SRQs were designed to provide information to students when registering for courses, not to evaluate instruction.

A senator stated that she misses some of the questions that were on the previous form, such as would the student take another course from the instructor.

Another senator said that when the SRQs were redesigned, students were informed that if the questions contained evaluative aspects, then they would be considered private data and only released with faculty consent.

A senator then said that she initially missed the first question from the previous form, but feels that the numerical result from this question is less useful in promotion and tenure cases.

Professor Wambach said that after years of work, the new form was used last spring. She has just seen the analysis, and is pleased at the positive rating of faculty on this form. The question with the highest rating was that the student was treated with respect by the instructor.

Grading and Transcripts: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester

Q: Section VI, 2c, of the policy states that a student 'may not sit in on a course without registering for it.' How will this be implemented?

A: Faculty are sometimes asked to allow a student to sit-in on a course for the first week to see if the student wants to register for it, and this seems like a reasonable request. However, there is concern when the student is still in the class later in the semester without being registered, but taking exams and doing the work. Many times the student has a financial constraint which prevents them from registering. At the end of the semester, the faculty would try to award a grade, but the student is not on the class roster. This can present legal concerns for the University.

Professor Wambach pointed out some of the new language in this policy. Section II contains new language based on a question from a student ombudsman who wanted to know if a student had a right to know who graded their work. SCEP decided that the instructor of record should be responsible for dealing with a student issue. This change was then added to the policy.

She then stated that Section VII, 6d, also includes a clarification to close a loophole in the grading policy. Currently, if a student retakes a course, the second grade brackets the first grade. SCEP was informed that some students who receive an 'F' in a course reregistering for it under the 'S-N' grading scale. The student has no intention of taking the course, but the 'F' is bracketed by an 'N', which does not count in a student's GPA. Due to tuition banding, the student can reregister for this course without having to pay for it. While this has not been done often, it can be viewed as a form of academic dishonesty.

Q: The new language in Section II deals with a grade appeal. Is this section meant to explain a student not getting any explanation or just an explanation that does not satisfy the student? What is the process and scope?

A: Students cannot appeal a grade. They can only ask questions, try to seek further information, or go to a department chair or dean to complain about grading standards, but the only person who has control over the grade is the instructor. SCEP was trying to write this section in a way that a student would know what to do and the process, but would not imply a grade appeal.

A senator said that this language is confusing and invites any student not satisfied with their grade to go to the Student Conflict Resolution Center. He suggested revising the wording.

Q: Can the department chair override the faculty member's decision on a grade? Is this stated in the document? If not, can it be added?

A: A chair cannot override a faculty member, but it is not stated in this document.

A senator suggested revised language to state that an instructor must provide an explanation, however they need not change the grade.

In closing, Professor Wambach said that any further comments can be forwarded to her and Gary Engstrand.

17. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks stated that he finds it disheartening to be talking about the budget in these times, and the global economy, but the University needs to pay attention to the issues that surround it.

He reminded senators of some of the good things that happen at a great academic institution. It was his pleasure to introduce four new Regents Professors to the Regents this fall – Professors Allen Goldman, Steven Ruggles, Eric Sheppard, and Madelon Sprengnether. This program was limited to 20 faculty, but he asked that it be increased to 30 members, which represents about one percent of the faculty. The stipend was also \$10,000 per year, which has been increased to \$50,000 with increased flexibility for its use.

President Bruininks also said that Doug Arnold and Kathryn Sikkink were awarded McKnight Presidential appointments.

He then addressed what the University is doing to become a more sustainable system. He made a President's climate commitment and the University joined the Chicago Climate Exchange. Today, this is one of the leading carbon-credit exchanges in the country and has earned the University \$750,000. The University has been recognized for its institutional sustainability initiatives. A system was developed to evaluate these efforts across institutions, and the University received the highest ranking in the Big 10.

Morris also receive a national campus excellence award for outstanding use of renewable energy. A new biomass facility will provide 80 percent of the campus's heating and cooling needs. With a single windmill, the campus also provides 60 percent of its electrical power and makes a small profit by selling the remaining energy to the city.

Through all these efforts, the University saved \$8 million last year in fuel costs at a time when these costs were increasing. He is most pleased that faculty and students are doing research on these initiatives.

He said that last month he was able to announce the Promise for Tomorrow Scholarship initiative. Five years ago, the University was way behind its peer groups in raising private funds for fellowships and scholarships. \$1.8 billion was then raised in the last capital campaign, of which only \$50 million was designated for these efforts.

He said that the University then did two things – told people that this effort was important and announced matching funds availability. Last month, this fund exceeded \$250 million, which was the original goal. This allowed the University to double the number and the amount of scholarships and fellowships in five years. He said that he wants to keep fundraising since unless there is better financial support, it will be harder to keep higher education accessible and affordable.

President Bruininks said that a statement is being sent today to faculty and staff, which is available to senators on the blue handout, to announce the current situation, the state's financial crisis, and what this may mean for the University. Today the state issued a revised forecast, which was grim. For the remainder of this budget cycle, there is a \$425 million projected deficit which could lead to budget adjustments or a rescission during this year. The proportionate share for the University would be \$17 million. He is hoping that the legislature will find other solutions for this year.

The main problem, however, is a \$4.8 billion shortfall, which is slightly more than the \$4.5 billion shortfall that the state had six years ago. While the University will not know the extent of the problem until the February forecast is issued, a proportionate reduction of 14 percent would be \$700 million per year in the biennium. However, when the state needs to cut budgets, higher education usually gets a higher-than-proportionate cut. This is one of the reasons that the University needs to slow down on hiring, why capital projects have been delayed, and executive salaries have been frozen.

He said that since this is the second time in six years that the University has faced this situation, he is optimistic that the University can find ways to cope, but it will be very difficult. He knows that many units are dealing with the implications of the hiring pause. One reason that the University did not do a hiring freeze is that it ties the hands of the University, makes it difficult to take advantage of opportunities that may exist, and does not allow planning for transitions. He wants units to reflect on whether a replacement is needed, develop an overall personnel plan, and be creative in restructuring the workload. The retirement incentive plan was put into place for the purpose of creating flexibility in units and allowing employees to plan their retirement. It was also a way to avoid layoffs through natural attrition while maintaining the academic progress of the University, maintaining a quality workforce, and keeping higher education accessible and affordable.

President Bruininks said that six years ago, some big changes were made and costs were cut. Cost reduction and efficiency will be a priority again this time, but there is only so much that can be done. He urged units to start working now so a plan is in place in a few months.

He will be meeting with the deans on Monday and the chancellors on Wednesday to talk about positive changes. However, unless the state increases revenues, which the governor opposes, there will be some challenging circumstances ahead.

In closing, he said that the faculty legislative liaisons and the University Relations are constantly working on these issues to position the University in the strongest possible way.

18. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: Regarding the hiring pause, it is possible to have the people making these decisions understand that people hired on federal grant funds need to be considered separately and quickly so the University does not lose the indirect cost recovery dollars?

A: This situation was brought to the University's attention a few days ago, and it is being fixed. He would ask that if there is an open position, someone else who is already employed be considered for the position that has federal funding, although this will not work for all positions.

A senator stated that the University should publicize its Founder's Scholarship Program since most people in the community do not understand how much funding is available for students.

President Bruininks said that the University will soon be issuing a two-page summary of talking points on this issue and he encouraged faculty to read it and send any comments.

Q: How is the University understanding this budget situation in relation to six years ago? Is it possible to speak about this moment in a different way? Uncertainty exists for graduate students applying for positions and for faculty productivity in an environment where funding does not exist. Will this situation lead to more competition between faculty or should the administration be saying that the faculty need more cooperation and sharing? Faculty need to hear a message about the shape of the new University from the leadership.

A: While there is no one who is able to fully address these concerns, he will be speaking on many of these issues. A more persuasive case needs to be made for public investment in higher education and research and development. Internally, circumstances have dramatically changed and the University needs to convene discussions on these issues for the future of the University, the state, and the nation. The University cannot be defensive or competitive, but needs to do what it has done many times – collaborate, increase partnerships with the community, and be creative with its resources. He said that the nation and the state are on an unsustainable path and they need to realize that private gifts cannot make up this gap in funding. A long-term budgeting perspective and strategy for the University needs to be developed, but he does not see a commitment from the legislature on this topic. He is open to any comments and suggestions from inside and outside the University.

Q: Many administrators in units have taken the retirement incentive plan, which has led to hard times in some units. Does the University envision a time when this situation will improve? Will the administration guarantee that when funding improves, unit deficits will be restored?

A: The University had more administration than it needs, not by the people doing the work, but the administration that is sometimes built into certain processes, which could be simplified to reduce the daily workload for individuals and unnecessary costs. The University needs to look at whether it needs all the administration at all the levels, or are their ways to streamline. He does agree that basic costs need to be restored to departments and colleges. The University is trying to raise funds in other ways, but this is a hard time for private fundraising efforts. The University needs to get people in the habit of contributing each year, to increase the yearly total from \$8 million to \$50-100 million. He is happy to meet with anyone who wants to know about the University. For this year, there are no simple solutions to cut large amounts and the University cannot have double-digit tuition increases again. Politically, the University will be hard-pressed to even have an increase in the high single digits. After this situation, there will also be a high demand for public resources to solve deep structural issues. He hopes the University will be part of this solution.

19. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

20. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

21. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2008-09 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DECEMBER 4, 2008

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2008-09 was convened in Studio C, Rarig Center, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, December 4, 2008, at 11:30 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 40 student members. Chair Ryan Kennedy presided.

**1. STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING SUBCOMMITTEE
Approval of Appointed Senators
Action**

MOTION:

That the Student Senate approve the appointment of the following Twin Cities student senators:

LeAnn Alstadt – College of Liberal Arts
Theresa Chan – College of Design
Haley Dochwat – College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences
Jonathan Fritz – College of Continuing Education
Will Geng – Medical School
Jay Harmer – College of Pharmacy
Andrew Heairet – Institute of Technology
Kristina Hefty – College of Education and Human Development
Nathaniel Hoffman – College of Liberal Arts
Thomas Hull – Graduate School
Randi Jundt – College of Biological Sciences
Yun Li – Graduate School
Tim McDevitt – Carlson School of Management
Angelique McDonald – College of Liberal Arts
Alexander Schostag – Institute of Technology

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

2. CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE UPDATE

Susan Cable, Chair of the Civil Service Committee (CSC), said that the CSC is the governance body for civil service employees at the University. At the July retreat, the committee kicked off a year-long leadership development series, with a portion of each CSC meeting devoted to this topic. Senior administrators are then invited to participate in this series. President Bruininks was at the July meeting to discuss leadership ideas, challenges, and how to interact with many groups.

She then said that CSC has issues in common with other campus groups, such as facing the budget shortfall and tuition increases. Issues for CSC this year include positions not being filled when people accepted the retirement option, the new financial system, a job family study and

new classifications, and a revised CSC search committee process since there are no alternates currently serving on CSC.

Long-term goals for CSC include continued leadership development, governance, and service; short-term goals are dealing with the budget crisis, job classifications leading to conflict resolution, and personal meetings with small groups of civil service employees. She then invited students to attend CSC meetings held each month.

3. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

There was no report

4. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

There were no updates

5. 2008 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST Discussion

Donna Peterson, Associate Vice President in the Office of University Relations, joined the meeting to speak about the 2008 biennial budget request to the legislature. The University receives about 27 percent of its budget from the state. The request this year is modest, based on the state's financial challenges, and requests funding for salary increase needs, middle-class scholarships, and research enhancements. These items would maintain the momentum and makes clear the needs of the University.

Today it was announced that the state is facing a huge budget deficit. The forecast is for a shortfall of \$4.8 billion for the next biennium and \$426 million for the current year. Since the University receives seven percent of the state's budget, the University's cut would be between \$150-200 million. This is a significant amount considering that 70 percent of the funding that the University receives is used for salaries. An example being used by the University is that a \$70 million cut would amount to a loss of 800 positions, based on an average salary of \$60,000.

The press conference to announce this forecast was starting at the same time as this meeting, so this body will need to hear how this will be resolved. In past years, the Governor has not been willing to raise taxes, so then the only option is cutting costs.

The Governor's budget will be released on January 15 and then there is another budget forecast at the end of February which helps the legislature craft their bills. It is possible that the February forecast will be worse than the one today.

She said that six years ago the state also experienced a budget shortfall, which amounted to a \$185 million cut to the University. That year there were no salary increases, employees were charged more for their health insurance, and tuition increased sharply. Efforts were also made to be more efficient, so this will not be an easy option this time.

Q: What is the state's biennial operating budget?

A: It is about \$35 billion, so this shortfall is about 13 percent.

Q: Does the University have a strategy to increase state appropriations in the long-term?

A: Yes. The University's strategy after the last shortfall was to come back in subsequent years with a strong case for increased funding. A challenge this year is that the United States is in the same situation as the state, so it is harder to know when and how all levels will recover. It is possible that the budget projections will not be better for the next biennium.

Q: Is there a sense of the Governor's projected budget?

A: The question will be that if the Governor does not raise any revenue, then where will cuts be made. The University's grassroots efforts will be trying to engage faculty, staff, students, and outside community members to contact the Governor and legislators to make the case for the University.

Q: In the past, has the Governor spared the University from major cuts?

A: No. In the budget shortfall of about \$4.2 billion six years ago the University did receive a \$185 million cut to funding.

Q: If the University does not receive its entire appropriation, then how will it fund these initiatives?

A: The University will have limited options, as the only way to make up these funds are through cutting jobs and programs or increasing tuition. When the state has not kept up with the needs of the University in the last 10-15 years, tuition has increased.

Q: Is the state required to balance its budget?

A: Yes, each biennium it needs to be balanced.

Q: Will the University return to double-digit tuition increases?

A: This depends on the amount of the cut that the University receives and how the University determines how to best handle these cuts, either through loss of jobs and programs or tuition increases.

Q: Have University endowments decreased?

A: This is a huge issue for many endowments. Fundraising is hard in these times, and cannot be used to replace state funds.

Donna Peterson thanked the Student Senate for the opportunity to address the biennium and said that she would return spring semester once the Governor's budget is released.

6. STUDENT SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT Removal of Twin Cities Undergraduate Senators Action

Whereas, The Minnesota Student Association (MSA) does not have the power to revoke the membership of inactive undergraduate Twin Cities Senators, leaving many spots on MSA unfilled; and

Whereas, Full membership is integral to the functioning of MSA and their role as representatives of the entire undergraduate student population of the Twin Cities Campus; and

Whereas, The Crookston, Duluth, and Morris campuses already have mechanisms to revoke the membership of senators who do not participate in both Student Senate and their student assemblies; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the University of Minnesota Student Senate will have the power to revoke the membership of Twin Cities undergraduate student senators who do not participate in MSA, and that the Student Senate Bylaws will be appropriately changed to reflect this.

**MISSY GETTEL, MEMBER
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Q: What is the average attendance by non-MSA members at forum meetings?

A: At the last meeting, of the 50-60 MSA members present, only 12 were senators. Senators can opt-out of attending MSA meetings, so are not counted towards MSA's quorum, but they leave their college without representation at MSA.

Q: What would be the method for removing senators?

A: If a senator would not follow the MSA attendance policy, they would be removed from their Senate position. The current MSA procedure is to send a student an email after two missed meetings to see if the student has an excuse for missing the meetings. After the third missed meeting, the MSA Speaker of Forum then recommends to the Executive Board that the member be removed. A unanimous vote is required to remove the member.

Q: Can MSA currently remove senators?

A: MSA can remove a senator's rights to be a member of MSA, but cannot actually remove their Senate seat and fill it with another interested student.

Q: Why does the Student Senate need to make a change?

A: Students are actually elected by their college, so at this time MSA does not have the power to remove senators. The Student Senate needs to change its Bylaws to provide this authority to MSA.

Q: How does this change affect graduate students?

A: It does not since graduate and professional students are not voting members of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA). Student boards, however, always have the authority to remove their own members.

Q: Does this amendment change the election process?

A: No.

Q: If senators are already missing meetings, should another requirement, attendance at MSA meetings, be added?

A: Twin Cities undergraduate senators are already required to attend MSA meetings, so this amendment does not add any requirements.

Q: Do only Twin Cities undergraduate senators vote on this amendment?

A: No. Since it is a Bylaw amendment, it will require approval from the entire Student Senate.

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

APPROVED

7. RESOLUTION ON A TUITION CAP Action

Whereas, The University's and state's average student debt is higher than the national average which gives Minnesota the fifth-highest student debt² in the nation at an average of \$24,995 per student³; and

Whereas, Even Though student loans are likely to go unaffected by the recent economic crisis⁴, students' financial situations are bound to suffer in ways outside of loans for the next few years; and

Whereas, University of Minnesota President Robert Bruininks acknowledged that "we're headed for a difficult situation"⁵ in regards to tuition in the struggling economy and that he was "somewhat disappointed that we didn't have the ability to drive down tuition more for students"⁶; and

Whereas, There is currently limited student input in the tuition process and there is no formal stance to which students might rally around; and

Whereas, Students must be protected from the potential hazards of the recent economic crash and opportunist loan companies; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the University of Minnesota Student Senate endorses a 5.5% yearly tuition increase cap in order to protect students from the backlash of the economic problems, limit the amount of interaction students have with loan companies, and to slow the steady incline of tuition over the past several years; and be it further

RESOLVED That the University of Minnesota Student Senate supports the 5.5% cap expiring after two years in order to leave future flexibility for both students and administrators and so that there is continual motivation to re-negotiate and improve the tuition status so that by revisiting the cap, oversight is provided for students as to the reasons for increases or decreases in the tuition thus keeping

² http://projectonstudentdebt.org/state_by_state-data.php

³ <http://mndaily.com/2008/09/29/fighting-rising-tuition-and-student-debt>

⁴ <http://mndaily.com/2008/09/25/student-loans-not-likely-affected-bailout>

⁵ <http://mndaily.com/2008/09/26/gapsa-looks-tackle-student-tuition-debt>

⁶ <http://mndaily.com/2008/10/06/tuition-campaign>

students informed on the needs of the University and keeping administrators aware of the concerns of their students.

RYAN KENNEDY, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Q: Who has approved this resolution?

A: It was approved by the Minnesota Student Association, the Crookston Student Association, and the University of Minnesota Duluth Student Association as written. The Morris Campus Student Association amended the resolution.

Q: If the resolution is approved, but tuition is still increased above the cap, then what will be the response?

A: Options, such as letters to the editors of the school newspapers, would be considered closer to when the decision is made. The response will depend on the situation at the time.

Q: Will a meeting be held with the President?

A: A meeting has not been scheduled. However, the Student Representatives to the Regents are talking about this resolution with the Regents next week on this topic.

Q: What is the Student Senate trying to achieve in these challenging times?

A: Tuition increased 7.25 percent last year and 13-14 percent during the last budget shortfall. However in 2000 and 2001, tuition increased .5 to 2.5 percent. When the University made its budget proposal, it was based on a 4.5 percent increase. This resolution does provide some room for a slightly greater increase than what was proposed.

Q: Has the Student Senate ever passed a resolution capping tuition increases?

A: Not in the last 15 years.

Q: When tuition has increased, has enrollment decreased?

A: No.

Q: In light of the budget summary, is the proposed cap unreasonable? Should the Student Senate be arbitrarily picking an amount for the cap or should it be based on a national average?

A: It is not unreasonable or arbitrary since it is based on the University's projected increase, and is specific to the circumstances in this state.

A senator said that students need to talk with the administration, but also concentrate efforts on the state legislature and the Governor.

Q: What is the likelihood that the University will actually follow what is being proposed if standards will decrease?

A: This is not known, but the resolution is meant to create a point around which students can rally and draws a line that can be explained to the legislature. The University will not let quality decrease.

Q: What is the total increase in tuition since 2001? What is the total percentage in state cuts during that same period?

A: Tuition has increased 119 percent in eight years for the Twin Cities. The state's appropriation to the University has not decreased, but the University's portion of the total state budget has.

Q: Where are tuition dollars spent? Can the University be more efficient with these funds?

A: This spending is not completely transparent, so it is hard to identify inefficiencies.

With the time for this issue at an end, a motion was made and seconded to extend debate by 10 minutes. The motion to extend debate was approved.

A senator said that the state should assume responsibility for research at the University; these expenses cannot be covered by the students. A message needs to be sent to the state legislature that students cannot afford these costs. The resolution should also take inflation into account. A friendly amendment was proposed to the first resolved cost to read, "...endorses a 5.5% yearly tuition increase cap, adjusted based on a 2% inflation increase, in order to..."

This was not accepted as a friendly amendment. The motion was seconded and a vote was taken. The motion was not approved.

A senator stated that this resolution should be challenging for the University and the legislature to abide by since it is a unified message from the students.

Another senator said that students should focus their attention on the legislature and the Governor to make this statement. Students should work to fight the battle collaboratively with the administration.

A senator then stated that this amendment was not proposed to the general Morris student body for action.

Another senator noted that students should not be naïve since the University only has two options, cut spending or increase tuition.

A senator then proposed a friendly amendment to the first resolved clause to read, "...5.5% combined yearly tuition and fees cap..."

This was not accepted as a friendly amendment. The motion was seconded and a vote was taken. The motion was not approved.

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

APPROVED

8. RESOLUTION ON TEXTBOOKS

Action

Whereas, Rising textbook costs have become a large burden for many University of Minnesota students already facing increasing tuition costs; and

Whereas, Professors and departments have a majority of the control over textbook publishers with their purchasing power; and

Whereas, The Minnesota Public Interest Research Group (MPIRG) has created a textbook affordability campaign that asks professors to sign a pledge to take specific steps towards lowering textbook costs for students. The campaign will also put out a brochure for students with information for saving money when buying textbooks; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the University of Minnesota Student Senate endorses the textbook affordability campaign of MPIRG.

**RYAN KENNEDY, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

WITHDRAWN

**9. STATEMENT ON STUDENT ACCESS TO STUDENT RELEASE QUESTION DATA
Action**

The University of Minnesota Student Senate has been working on the Student Release Questions, which are asked during the end-of-semester assessment of a professor's performance, with the idea that the results from these questions would be released to the students. Currently, in order for these results to be released, a professor must take initiative to release their results, which has only been done by about 50 professors from spring semester 2008.

For this process to be automatic, and for all of the results to be released without requiring the professors to sign up individually, the questions to be categorized as public information according to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act. The Student Senate supports this action, and asking the Faculty Senate, and possibly University Senate, for support as well spring semester.

**RYAN KENNEDY, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Ryan Kennedy, Chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), said that the SSCC heard from the Office of Measurement Services on the results from the new student release questions (SRQs). Currently, professors need to allow these results to be released. This resolution asks that the SRQ results be made available without faculty consent since they are not supposed to be used for promotion and tenure or annual reviews.

Q: Will results still be anonymous?

A: Yes.

Q: How will students access the results?

A: They will be posted on the One-stop website, linked from the course guide.

Q: Who created the SRQs?

A: The Student Senate created these questions, which were finalized last year.

Q: What is the faculty reaction to this resolution?

A: Faculty reaction has not been requested, but students responses to the SRQs have been overwhelmingly positive.

A senator said that these results would be useful when speaking with legislators since it reflects student satisfaction with their instructors.

Another senator then proposed a friendly amendment to the last sentence to read, " The Student Senate supports this action, and asking the Faculty Senate, and University Senate is needed, for support as well spring semester."

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

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

APPROVED

10. TWIN CITIES SMOKING BAN

Discussion

Ryan Kennedy, Chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), said that this has been a hot issue at the Twin Cities Campus and there have been many presentations on the topic. Therefore, at this meeting, he would like to hear how the policies are working at Crookston and Duluth.

Duluth has been a smoke-free campus since September 1, 2007, although the residence halls just became smoke-free at the start of this academic year. While there is a policy, there is no enforcement, so the student government is looking into how this policy can be enforced. Signs and posters have been added to campus, but people are still smoking on campus. This creates a bigger problem since receptacles have been removed, which means that cigarette butts just litter the ground in the same areas where people used to smoke. When the policy was proposed, it was discussed in terms of a culture change on campus, not an enforcement of the policy, however this has not been the case.

Q: Are students and staff still smoking on campus?

A: In the first year, the policy was more closely followed and there were fewer people smoking on campus. This year, however, it is starting to get worse since people realize that there are no consequences. At the residence halls, it is a big problem.

Q: Has a culture change been seen?

A: There was a little change, most obvious the first semester. If work is not done long-term, it disappears very quickly.

The Crookston campus will be a tobacco-free campus in three weeks, but there will be formal policing of the policy. The student association does envision a problem after the first semester if there is no penalty. The campus also has a large international population who are not accustomed to this ban. Further complicating the issue is that the Northwest Regional Research Center is located 10 feet from campus, and this facility is not tobacco-free.

Ryan Kennedy said that when a representative from the Office of Student Affairs on the Twin Cities campus spoke to the Minnesota Student Association, he was asked about enforcement. His response was that the University has no way to enforce the policy and cannot write tickets.

A senator said that Century College has implemented a similar policy, but with designated smoking areas. If someone is smoking in an undesignated area, then a ticket is issued.

Another senator said that the College of Biological Sciences Student Board has also considered designated areas.

A senator stated that smoking is a dependency problem, but banning this action does not solve that problem. Action should be channeled to increased awareness and facilities.

Another senator noted that designated smoking areas would create a better response from the community. A further recommendation would be the inclusion of shelters at the designated sites.

Q: What was the response from smokers at Century College when designated smoking areas were created?

A: A smaller campus makes the policy easier to enforce, but most times the enforcement is simply to ask the person to go to a designated area. Smokers seemed pleased with having somewhere to go that provided shelter.

A senator said that most smokers respect the rights of community members by obeying the current regulations. However, smokers have rights as well that need to be respected.

Another senator said that he is reluctant to recommend creating shelters on campus.

Ryan Kennedy said that since a decision will be forwarded to the administration in early 2009, he suggested that the Student Senate adopt a recommendation in favor of designated smoking areas instead of a campus ban.

A senator suggested that a subcommittee be created to draft a resolution. This would be presented to SSCC next week for review and revision, and then be sent to senators for approval.

11. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

12. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

13. ADJOURNMENT

The Student Senate was adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor