

2008-09 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APRIL 30, 2009

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 4 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 6 STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 5

The fourth meeting of the University Senate and the sixth meeting of the Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 30, 2009, at 2:37 p.m., as a joint meeting of the bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by phone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 17 academic professional members, 18 civil service members, 123 faculty/faculty-like academic professional members, and 27 student members. Vice Chair Carol Chomsky presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

Faculty Senate

Revised Set of Educational Policies

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 2, 2009

Approved by the: Administration April 17, 2009

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Board of Regents Academic Freedom and Responsibility Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 2, 2009

Approved by the: Administration April 17, 2009

Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING (review in May and action in June)

2013-14 Twin Cities Calendar

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 2, 2009

Approved by the: Administration April 17, 2009

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Paula J. Bowman

Professor

Epidemiology

1955 – 2009

Barbara L. Lee

Professor

Public Health

1931 – 2009

Barbara L. Lukermann

Professor

Center for Urban and Regional Affairs

1930 – 2009

Anna E. Smits
Professor
Curriculum and Instruction
1919 – 2009

Harriet E. Viksna
Professor
Liberal Arts – University of Minnesota Duluth
1920 – 2009

STUDENTS

Guadalupe Avendano
College of Continuing Education

Nhi T. Dao
College of Biological Sciences

Jeremy Windahl
University of Minnesota Crookston

3. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE **Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements** **Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

On February 18, 1999, in adopting a policy on "Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements," the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was required to provide to the Senate "data on the mean grade point average by designator and course level, on the percentage of As awarded by course level, and overall collegiate grade point averages . . . for grades awarded each Fall Semester." The policy also provides that "data should be reported for all undergraduate students."

COMMENT:

These data are also available on the web at: <http://www.irr.umn.edu/grades/>

SCEP Grading Distribution															
Fall 2008															
Report Run Date: 4/14/2009															
Data as of 1/30/2009															
	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Campus	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
UMNCR	3554	2.78	39.05%	715	2.58	26.57%	1681	2.94	42.36%	193	3.34	53.89%	23	2.76	30.43%
UMNDL	22006	2.78	34.97%	7127	2.83	32.51%	10337	3	37.63%	4211	3.19	46.97%	649	3.21	49.46%
UMNMO	3732	2.96	41.77%	1248	2.96	36.22%	1429	3.13	42.55%	550	3.45	51.45%			
UMNTC	51259	3.06	42.23%	10377	2.91	33.62%	44445	3.2	44.67%	15913	3.22	45.82%	5965	3.37	54.67%
SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group															
Fall 2008															
University of Minnesota, Crookston															
Report Run Date: 4/14/2009															
Data as of 1/30/2009															
	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Acad Grp	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
Acad Aff	3554	2.78	39.05%	715	2.58	26.57%	1681	2.94	42.36%	193	3.34	53.89%	23	2.76	30.43%
SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group															
Fall 2008															
University of Minnesota, Duluth															
Report Run Date: 4/14/2009															
Data as of 1/30/2009															
	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Acad Grp	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
Accad Supp	1546	3.49	63.32%				87	3.97	97.70%						
Bus/Econ	930	2.6	20.11%	1588	2.74	26.01%	2463	2.67	19.65%	915	2.86	23.61%			
Cont Ed				26	3.37	69.23%	10	3.58	60.00%						
Ed/Hum Srv	2894	2.96	43.85%	1221	3.12	48.16%	2884	3.1	47.28%	1060	3.53	61.60%	103	3.35	69.90%
Fine Arts	3620	2.97	45.66%	634	3.05	41.32%	592	3.3	60.14%	554	3.52	74.37%	14	3.49	57.14%
Lib Arts	7716	2.85	30.53%	1069	2.69	31.71%	2691	3.12	38.61%	639	3.32	49.45%	301	3.29	50.50%
Medicine													41	3.05	31.71%
Pharmacy	34	2.62	32.35%												
Sci/Eng	5136	2.53	22.66%	2571	2.62	26.88%	1343	2.91	32.76%	1041	2.99	36.60%	183	3.05	40.98%
UMD-Acad A	128	3.46	58.59%	18	3.32	33.33%	61	3.5	50.82%						
SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group															
Fall 2008															
University of Minnesota, Morris															
Report Run Date: 4/14/2009															
Data as of 1/30/2009															
	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Acad Grp	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
Acad Aff	549	3.25	47.72%	59	3.1	45.76%	84	3.4	29.76%	25	3.97	96.00%			
Div Educ	384	3.68	36.72%	179	3.27	48.04%	118	3.45	44.07%	255	3.67	50.20%			
Humanities	1325	3.2	57.28%	390	3.12	44.10%	378	3.3	54.50%	78	3.33	55.13%			
Sci/Math	865	2.71	25.90%	399	2.76	25.56%	182	2.94	34.62%	138	3.17	40.56%			
Social Sci	609	2.76	28.41%	221	2.85	29.41%	667	3.02	39.28%	54	3.53	59.26%			
SCEP Grading Distribution by Academic Group															
Fall 2008															
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities															
Report Run Date: 4/14/2009															
Data as of 1/30/2009															
	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Acad Grp	Grades	GPA	Pct A's												
AHCS	110	3.47	38.10%				18	3.63	66.67%	482	3.05	31.33%	173	3.79	63.01%
Bell Mus													13	3.4	23.08%
CBS	1964	2.74	24.44%	1064	3.2	36.09%	1286	2.95	34.29%	1516	3.05	38.52%	62	3.23	43.55%
CCE	28	3.52	67.86%	46	3.13	19.57%	622	3.24	30.42%	644	3.19	46.43%			
CDES	964	3.05	34.96%	455	3.26	38.02%	1145	3.35	49.96%	913	3.36	48.19%	96	3.33	46.88%
CFANS	2482	3.12	40.77%	264	3.22	47.35%	1969	3.15	44.18%	1016	3.35	51.57%	144	3.39	57.64%
CLA	26455	3.19	46.55%	615	3.17	48.62%	24493	3.24	47.87%	3506	3.26	49.32%	1769	3.45	60.77%
CSOM	405	3.17	31.85%	1492	2.98	32.17%	4646	3.16	28.13%	1531	3.34	44.81%	550	3.23	46.18%
Dent				72	3.34	36.11%	115	2.77	33.04%						
EHD	5542	3.31	63.06%	485	3.25	50.72%	3277	3.36	53.59%	1283	3.15	44.74%	1695	3.58	64.19%
Health Sci	181	3.58	76.24%												
HIPA	74	3.52	70.27%				67	3.59	73.13%	87	3.41	57.47%	40	3.37	25.00%
IT	11589	2.71	25.13%	5391	2.74	28.51%	3389	2.88	29.51%	3631	3	35.61%	1224	3.13	41.58%
Med	115	2.98	13.91%				1637	3.1	43.31%	152	3.3	48.68%	121	3.05	22.31%
Nursing	75	4	42.67%	158	3.31	52.53%	209	3.69	83.25%	860	3.66	76.28%	28	4	17.86%
Pharmacy	697	3.29	53.37%				86	3.55	60.60%				40	3.23	52.50%
Pub Health	245	3.35	56.73%				583	3.12	47.17%						
SRVPAA				123	3.73	78.86%	115	3.75	80.87%						
Ugrd Ed Ad	203	3.36	48.28%	25	3.29	12.00%	139	3.54	64.03%	60	3.57	45.00%			
VMed				182	2.38	12.09%				31	3.1	35.48%			
VP Sys Adm	130	3.26	47.69%				649	3.61	68.72%	201	3.9	96.52%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

**CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

4. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Emily Hoover, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that the SCC has spent much of this year discussing and approving the pathways for future policy reviews and approvals. The University has two sets of policies – one established by the Regents and a second through central administration. There are hundreds of policies covering a wide variety of topics for running the University.

Previous to these efforts, many of the policies were difficult to find and formatted differently with names that hid many of the provisions within them. A small subcommittee met to review the language and revise formatting for inclusion in the policy library.

At its April meeting, the SCC met with the Chief of Police and received an update on campus security, including the relationships that the University has with the neighboring police forces. It was an educational and enlightening discussion.

Professor Hoover then mentioned that the University community needs to stay flexible, if and when the flu arrives in the Twin Cities.

Today, the SCC is bringing forward the task force report on graduate education for discussion. She encouraged written comments during the next three weeks.

5. MINUTES FOR MARCH 5, 2009, AND APRIL 2, 2009

Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/090305sen.html>
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/090402sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

6. UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT

Ex Officio Membership Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 1 of the University Senate Rules as follows (new language is underlined). A simple majority vote is required for approval.

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

1. Ex Officio Members of University Senate Committees

...

- **Senate Consultative**--Vice chair of the University Senate (voting); past chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (voting if not otherwise a voting member); Chair of the Finance and Planning Committee; Chair of the Educational Policy Committee; elected representative from the Duluth faculty eligible to vote in Senate elections

...

COMMENT:

When the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules were amended in 2004, the intention was for the Educational Policy Committee chair to be included as a Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) member since it allows the chair to report to SCC on issues that affect students (and, on occasion, staff who teach). This amendment makes clear this intention.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

7. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT University Senate Term Limits Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To amend Article I, Section 2 of the University Senate Bylaws as follows (new language is underlined). As an amendment to the University Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the University Senate (129) 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 I. UNIVERSITY SENATE MEMBERSHIP AND OFFICERS (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the University Senate)

...

2. Elections

All members elected to the University Senate shall begin service on July 1 and shall serve for three years. Elected members of the University Senate shall not serve more than two consecutive terms, and shall be eligible for re-election only after a one-year interval of nonmembership in the University Senate.

...

[Subsequent sections will be renumbered]

COMMENT:

When the University Senate Constitution and Bylaws were rewritten, a statement on term limits was included for Faculty Senate and Student Senate members, but not for University Senate members (civil service and academic professionals). This language adds term limits for University Senate members and reflects the same term limit as Faculty Senate members.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 143 in favor, one opposed, and one abstention.

APPROVED

**8. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Report on the Graduate School
Discussion by the University Senate**

Draft Report — Committee on Graduate Education

“Recommendations on the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education at the University of Minnesota”

April 24, 2009

Committee Membership

Steven L. Crouch, Dean, Institute of Technology, Committee Chair
David A. Bernlohr, Distinguished McKnight University Professor and Head, Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, and Biophysics, College of Biological Sciences
Boyd D. Cothran, Vice President, Council of Graduate Students, Ph.D. candidate, Department of History, College of Liberal Arts
William K. Durfee, Vice Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee; Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Technology
Timothy J. Ebner, Professor and Head, Department of Neuroscience, Medical School
Lincoln A. Kallsen, Budget Officer, Office of Budget and Finance
Timothy J. Kehoe, Distinguished McKnight University Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Economics, College of Liberal Arts
Kristi L. Kremers, President, Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, Ph.D. student, Department of Educational Policy and Administration, College of Education and Human Development
Nita Krevans, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies, College of Liberal Arts
Mindy S. Kurzer, Professor, Department of Food Science and Nutrition, College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences, Director of Graduate Studies, Nutrition Graduate Program
Vince R. Magnuson, Vice Chancellor for Academic Administration, University of Minnesota

Duluth

Jennifer J. McComas, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development

Robert B. McMaster, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education

James A. Parente, Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Henning Schroeder, Professor and Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, College of Pharmacy

Kathryn A. Sikkink, Regents Professor, Department of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts

Cathrine A. Wambach, Chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy, Associate Professor, Department of Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, College of Education and Human Development

Elizabeth V. Wattenberg, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Division of Environmental Health Sciences, School of Public Health

I. Executive Summary

Committee Charge

The Committee on Graduate Education was given its initial charge by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan on February 20, 2009. Originally, the charge was to make recommendations for implementing the plan for restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education at the University of Minnesota that had been announced to the University community on February 9. At the outset the committee was referred to as the Implementation Team, but this name was eventually changed to Committee on Graduate Education — hereafter simply “the committee” — to reflect an evolving revision of the original charge, including the option of recommending a streamlined version of the current Graduate School instead of a new Office of Graduate Education, as called for in the February 9 restructuring plan.

Meetings: Procedures, Consultation

The committee held eight two-hour meetings between February 27 and April 17. These meetings were devoted to interviewing key Graduate School staff, discussing issues that had been identified by one or more committee members, reviewing the current budget for the Graduate School, and considering options for restructuring. The last two meetings were dedicated to a discussion of the committee’s recommendations and review of the draft report.

Members of the committee consulted broadly with the University community through meetings with individuals, directors of graduate studies (DGSs) and their assistants, department heads and chairs, Graduate School Staff, and students. In addition, three open meetings were held: one on the West Bank, one on the East Bank, and one on the St. Paul Campus. The latter two open meetings were Webcast.

The committee approached its assignment by asking (or otherwise seeking answers to) the following questions:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current arrangement (i.e., the existing Graduate School operations)?
2. Which activities/functions of the Graduate School should be administered centrally, and by which office?
3. Which activities/functions should be taken over by the colleges?
4. Which activities/functions should be discontinued?
5. What activities/functions that are not currently being done should we be doing?

These questions were used to frame the conversations at the open meetings as well as to guide the committee discussion throughout its deliberations.

Based on the totality of responses and suggestions received by the committee, 15 specific recommendations were developed for consideration by the University administration. It is the committee's understanding that the University community will have ample opportunity to comment on these recommendations before any decisions are made about the restructuring of graduate education at the University of Minnesota.

II. Recommendations

Based on conversations within the University community, as well as examination of administrative structures for graduate education at peer institutions, the committee concluded that a strong, central administrative entity is essential for oversight and support of quality graduate programs. At most universities this central entity is a Graduate School or a combined Graduate School and Office of Research.

The committee considered three possible organizational structures for administering graduate education at the University of Minnesota. The first of these is an Office of Graduate Education, led by a Vice Provost and Dean, and administratively housed within the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, as proposed in the February 9 restructuring plan. The second possibility is a recombination of the Graduate School with the Office of the Vice President for Research, led by a Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. Finally, the third possibility is a streamlined version of the existing Graduate School, henceforth called the "Graduate College" to differentiate it from the current Graduate School.

In discussing these possibilities, the committee decided not to recommend a combined Graduate School and Office of the Vice President for Research. The committee reasoned that the current Office of the Vice President for Research has done an excellent job of focusing attention on critical research-related matters such as technology transfer, regulatory issues, and expanded research opportunities, and the additional work associated with management of graduate education would inevitably detract from these efforts. In addition, it would probably be necessary to appoint a senior associate dean to oversee graduate education activities (as is done, for example, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Pennsylvania State University), so the leader of the office (the Vice President and Dean) would be more involved with research matters than with graduate student education. The committee does recommend, however, that certain current activities of the Graduate School most related to the research function of the University, including the Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship program and McKnight Awards be moved to the Office of the Vice President for Research.

The committee is divided on the question of whether the central entity responsible for oversight of graduate education at the University of Minnesota should be an Office of Graduate Education or a Graduate College (as defined above). In both cases the operations would be led by a Vice Provost and Dean who reports to the Provost and is responsible for oversight and leadership of issues related to graduate education. In the case of an Office of Graduate Education, however, the operation would be an administrative unit, parallel in structure to the existing Office of Undergraduate Education, and not an academic unit comparable to other colleges and professional schools. Resolving this issue will require University-wide consultation.

While the distinction might seem minor, some committee members (and many people in the University community) feel strongly that the presence of a Graduate College (School) gives graduate education at the University of Minnesota a more recognizable identity among peer

institutions. Other members of the committee believe that the name and reporting structure are less important than the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the unit responsible for oversight of graduate education functions.

Regardless of the administrative structure adopted for graduate education at the University of Minnesota, the committee recommends that a strong component of faculty and student governance be maintained. Faculty and student governance is particularly important in relation to matters of program oversight and review, policy, and allocation of student and faculty fellowships. Either structure, however, will need to be efficient and accountable in delivering excellent graduate education. While the Graduate College/Office will need to be more flexible and streamlined than the current Graduate School, the committee recommends that experienced Graduate School staff should be employed in the new unit.

General Recommendations

Central Oversight. The Graduate College/Office should administer the following services and programs:

- Graduate fellowships
- Admissions
- Student services, including conflict resolution, and student records
- Communications/Web presence
- Governance: Policy and Review Councils, Council of Graduate Students (COGS)
- Temporary graduate faculty appointments
- Career services
- Postdoctoral services
- New Director of Graduate Studies orientation
- Interdisciplinary graduate programs and initiatives
- Commencement for programs overseen by the Graduate College/Office

Central Oversight. The following services should be administered by other central University offices:

- Diversity; Community of Scholars; DOVE Fellowships
- Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship
- Faculty McKnight Awards
- 21st Century Fund
- University Press

Central Oversight. The following programs should be added to the Graduate College/Office's portfolio:

- Advising standards and training programs for University faculty
- Metrics for measuring progress in excellence of graduate education

Either Central or Local Oversight. Terminal (professional) master's and applied doctorates:

- Optional college control for these degrees
- Optional campus control (Duluth) for these degrees

Local Oversight. The following services should be provided by colleges or programs:

- Development (in cooperation with the University of Minnesota Foundation)
- Student orientation

- Ongoing graduate faculty appointments (automatic with tenure line)
- Award degrees
- Program review

Specific Recommendations (see Section IV for details)

Central Services

1. University-wide faculty committees are especially important in the award of graduate fellowships and block grants. A faculty committee should be charged with reviewing the current allocation processes for these awards, with a view to maintaining merit criteria while making the processes more efficient, transparent, and accountable, and recommending how they should be administered. This committee should be convened at the start of Fall Semester 2009 and asked to submit its recommendations in time for the new allocation processes to take effect during the 2009–10 academic year, for awards made for 2010–11.
2. Work should begin as soon as possible on development of a Web-based graduate admissions system using program-specific “smart forms” that eliminate any duplication or unnecessary information in the admissions process and facilitates other process improvements. The key feature of the system would be a greater focus on the needs of individual graduate programs. Models for such a system are in place at both the Pennsylvania State University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and these should be examined carefully before designing a system for the University of Minnesota. Ideally, ApplyYourself would be amended to facilitate such information. However, if ApplyYourself cannot be efficiently and cost-effectively updated, other systems should be considered when the University’s contract with the ApplyYourself vendor expires in 2012.
3. Work should also begin as soon as possible on evaluation of student services processes and development of a University-wide electronic system for initiating and/or revising, approving, and archiving student program plans, examination clearances, and other student records. (The committee understands that the Graduate School had started work in this area but suspended it because of other staffing priorities.) The Graduate College/Office should only be involved in reviewing forms, electronic or otherwise, where there are clear additions to value; primary academic oversight should be the responsibility of the Directors of Graduate Studies and the faculty.
4. The diversity functions within the Graduate School Diversity Office (GSDO) should be moved to the central University Office of Equity and Diversity (OED). Within OED, significant resources and efforts must be directed toward increasing diversity in graduate education, including an office and personnel dedicated solely to this goal. This office will need to work closely with the Graduate College/Office, and an evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of the move should be conducted after the first full year of operation.
5. The committee recommends that the faculty awards programs currently administered by the Graduate School — the Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship program, and the Distinguished McKnight University Professorship and the McKnight Land-Grant Professorship programs — be transferred to the Office of the Vice President for Research. Involvement of University-wide faculty selection committees in the selection processes for these awards is crucial, and must be maintained.
6. Interdisciplinary graduate programs must be protected. The Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate College/Office should be responsible for facilitating conversations among the

deans of units involved in all cross-college programs, resulting in formal memoranda of agreement regarding financial support for each program. Regular revenue streams and special funds are needed to support these programs, especially those whose students and faculty are on different campuses. Allocation of funds should be merit-based and competitive and the criteria for funding should be transparent. The Graduate School's Office of Interdisciplinary Initiatives should be maintained and supported by the new Graduate College/Office.

7. A centralized Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPDA) must be maintained based on the current and projected needs of the university. Postdocs are likely to play an increasing role in the research environment of the University in the future and a single-site organization is likely to be the best organizational structure. Moreover, the OPDA currently shares several structural functions with the Graduate School such that whatever unit manages graduate education should also include the OPDA.
8. Based on information for graduate school operations of comparable size at three peer institutions (Illinois, Penn State, and Wisconsin), the committee believes that it should be possible to reduce the staff complement of our current Graduate School by approximately 20 percent. A further reduction should be possible if terminal master's and applied doctorate degree programs are taken over by colleges. In suggesting this substantial downsizing, however, the committee wishes to emphasize that due regard must be given to maintaining acceptable levels of service to faculty, staff, and students in the graduate programs.
9. The quality and consistency of graduate and professional student advising, including supervision of research and teaching assistants, must be improved. The committee asks that the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate College/Office form a committee to study this issue further, work with Center for Teaching and Learning staff to help build curriculum, implement an advisor training program, create measures to evaluate the success of training, and continue to work with the Academy of Distinguished Teachers on this topic.
10. The quality of graduate education at the University must be measured and shared with the University community and administration. The new Graduate College/Office should be responsible for compiling these data in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). Suggested metrics are listed in Section IV, and are compiled primarily from the two strategic positioning task force reports on graduate education (2006). Ultimately, it is the faculty members who are responsible and accountable for the quality of graduate education in their programs, and the compilation of these data is essential for demonstrating that quality is, in fact, being maintained.
11. Faculty governance over matters of graduate education via the Policy and Review (P&R) Councils should be maintained, with administrative assistance from the Graduate College/Office. However, the Council review process is considered cumbersome and is often an impediment to rapid and effective change. The functions and processes linked to the Councils should be streamlined by removing the most minor, routine items from the review process and using subcommittees and e-votes to speed evaluation of more substantial proposals.
12. The Graduate College/Office should be responsible for conducting an all-University commencement ceremony for the graduate programs it administers, but there should be only one such ceremony each year rather than the two ceremonies currently held by the Graduate School.

Decentralized Services

13. Colleges should have the option — but not be required — to administer terminal (professional) master's and applied doctorate degree programs in-house. Other master's degree programs (i.e., M.S. and M.A. degrees) are often preparatory to the Ph.D. and should be administered centrally by the Graduate College/Office.
14. Graduate degree programs at the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) should continue to be administered by a central authority on the Twin Cities campus, whether this is an Office of Graduate Education or a Graduate College. Terminal master's degree programs at UMD may optionally be administered locally.
15. Before any graduate program that is currently under the auspices of the Graduate School is moved to a college, an analysis should be performed of the implications this has for the college's cost pool charges. At a minimum, this analysis should include a review of the original fund transfers that central administration made to the college when the new budget model was adopted in 2005–06. At that time, revenue-neutral adjustments were made to each college's budget to pay the initial cost pool charges, based on the prevailing head count of students and Graduate Faculty.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Emily Hoover, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), thanked the committee members for the hard work given to this issue and the high level of thoughtfulness and detail in this report. She looks forward to today's discussion.

Vice Chair Carol Chomsky then read a statement from President Bruininks.

First, the President wanted to express his appreciation for the discussion and debate about the graduate school resolutions at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Clearly, the University's faculty senators are a thoughtful and engaged community, and he thought that the many senators who spoke at that meeting made a number of excellent points.

He regrets that he is unable to attend the Senate meeting this Thursday (due to an important out-of-town commitment) and will miss what he is certain will be a robust discussion about the draft report from the Committee on Graduate Education. The University community should all join in thanking the members of the Committee for the extraordinary time and attention they devoted to this important analysis. He has reviewed the report and is pleased with the breadth of the recommendations the committee has developed for broader discussion.

The University is very interested in hearing the reaction of its faculty, staff, and students to the Committee recommendations over this public comment period. The University will also be engaging in additional consultation with key governance groups, such as the Faculty Consultative Committee, Twin Cities Deans, and graduate students, to discuss the Committee recommendations prior to making any final decisions.

President Bruininks understands that restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education is a somewhat challenging task for a University that has functioned under the same Graduate School model for many years. He wants to assure senators and the University community of his personal commitment to retaining key elements of the Graduate School structure that have been effective to date.

Graduate education is a hallmark of the University, and the University need to find ways to further enhance its graduate student services and support while at the same time reducing administrative overhead costs to meet the significant challenges it is facing with the current and future budget environment. As good stewards of public resources, he believes that the University is responsible – and accountable – for reevaluating systems and processes to ensure the highest degree of efficiency, effectiveness, and quality possible.

He is confident that in working together with the faculty, staff, and student communities, the University can and will meet these shared goals for graduate education.

A senator said that he appreciates the detailed work that was done for this report. As a former member of a strategic positioning task force on graduate education, there were a number of issues that were not addressed at that time but have been addressed now. He looks forward to future conversations on issues raised in this report.

A senator then stated the committee was divided on the option of a Graduate College or an Office for Graduate Education. Lines 94-96 of the report refer to operational efficiency and effectiveness. How does an Office for Graduate Education improve efficiency and effectiveness, since it is not addressed in the report?

Another senator felt that this is a fairly good report and has answered some of the previous concerns. However, facing these two options, she believes that a Graduate College should be retained to ensure faculty governance over the research and educational missions of the school. She is concerned that the diversity office is being incorporated in a central administrative unit, since a central mission of the Graduate School has been diversity. Without that unit within the Graduate College, the central office will have no power to ensure that diversity remains. She also does not agree that the DOVE Fellowships should be separated from the fellowships.

A senator said that the President's remarks mentioned the budget situation. It raises the question of how much money is actually being saved and if it is worth the effort. There has not been much discussion on this topic and is not addressed by the report.

A senator asked how the changes will affect the Duluth campus and the faculty on campus who are associated with the Twin Cities for their Master's and Ph.D. students.

A senator said that lines 217-220 deal with the budgetary savings which can be achieved by cutting the Graduate School staff by 20 percent.

Another senator noted that these staff reductions could be achieved within the current structure.

A senator then stated that the report is good, but he finds it suspicious that he has been told that there have been multiple reports of this nature over the years, but that this year the decision is quickly made to reform the Graduate School and everyone is in emergency mode for two months. He also noted that the Graduate School constitution states that amendments to the constitution need a vote by the Councils. He suggested that these Council receive the report and are allowed to vote before any further decisions are made.

A senator asked if there are minutes available to the task force meetings as well as a list of the DGSs who were contacted. Many faculty involved in graduate programs were surprised that they were not contacted.

Another senator questioned how any of the task force members completed any other work with the amount of consultation that took place. He is impressed with how transparently and

consultatively the committee worked with the University. This is a sharp contrast to what was done prior to February 9.

A senator said that she had a few questions after reading the report. One was the moving of degree-awarding to colleges. If these are University of Minnesota degrees, then who checks off on this process. The second is moving the management of the graduate roster to the programs. The report moves only tenure and tenure-track faculty, but some programs have academic professionals and outside faculty. This needs to be taken into account and a process put in place. Last, processing for graduate students needs to be seamless.

A senator commented that even if there are decreases in staff in the central unit, increasing responsibilities in the colleges may just shift costs instead of reducing them.

A senator said that it is interesting that the report came as a reaction to the February 9 memo and it gives new meaning to the phrase ‘Driven to Discover.’

Another senator said that he was pleasantly surprised that this report makes it conceivable that the Graduate School will survive. He is confused by items 3, 4, and 5 from the list of 15 since he cannot determine what problems they are trying to solve. For item 15, he is surprised that colleges may seek to draw back their professional master’s program into the college and of the conditions to be reviewed, quality and academics are not considered, just the cost pool.

A senator clarified a technical point in that all degrees are awarded by the Regents and not the colleges.

Professor Emily Hoover said that the 30-day comment period is open and then consultation will begin with respective Senate committees, including the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Educational Policy, and the Research Committee. Faculty governance will have input into the next steps in the process.

A senator said that a comment from students is moving the diversity office. Through the Community of Scholars program, all the professional development workshops that are available for graduate and post-doctoral students started in that program and have since moved out. Also, there are close linkages between programs now that promote synergy and it is hard to see how this will continue. Lastly, most of the discussion has been focusing on the structural problems, which do exist, but models need to be found at institutions who are doing the work well with a centralized college. Future work needs to focus on the excellence of the college as well as the efficiencies.

Another senator said that most of the comments today focused on retaining the Graduate School. He asked that anyone wanting to eliminate the Graduate School present that opinion.

A senator noted that any final product needs to be a college that represents the unified theme of graduate education.

9. RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE GRADUATE SCHOOL Action by the University Senate

Resolution on Central Administration’s Proposal to Abolish the Graduate School

WHEREAS: The University of Minnesota’s Policy on Reorganization requires that the Senate “be involved in any organizational or structural decision affecting an academic unit” (Preamble); further, that “the campus assembly (or analogous body) of an affected campus or collegiate unit

shall review and make recommendations on ... [the] elimination of existing collegiate units” (I); further, that “When the president contemplates (a) the establishment or elimination of senior administrative position(s) of high rank, or (b) a major reorganization of the central administration, he or she shall present a proposal to the Senate Consultative Committee ... for information and discussion,” and likewise when the provost contemplates such reorganization for a campus (III.2);

WHEREAS: The Provost’s plan to abolish the Graduate School, as publicly announced by the Provost in his e-mail of Feb. 9, 2009 to the University faculty, was adopted without any prior consultation or involvement of the University Senate, or any part or committee thereof, in violation of University policy;

WHEREAS: The “Implementation Committee” (eventually renamed the “Committee on Graduate Education”) appointed by and reporting to the Provost is not a “campus assembly (or analogous body)” and was constituted and charged only after the decision to abolish the Graduate School had already been made and publicly announced;

WHEREAS: The formal charge to the “Implementation Committee” (now “Committee on Graduate Education”) did not encompass review of the merits of the underlying decision to abolish the Graduate School, having instead been limited to consideration of how the Provost’s decision to abolish the Graduate School was to be implemented;

BE IT RESOLVED: That the University Senate of the University of Minnesota rejects the Provost’s decision to dissolve the Graduate School as illegitimate and demands that any proposal to dissolve or otherwise to restructure the Graduate School hereafter comply with the University of Minnesota Policy on Reorganization.

ANNA CLARK, SENATOR

HARVEY SARLES, SENATOR

DISCUSSION:

Professor Harvey Sarles, from Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature, said that at the last meeting, two resolutions were presented for discussion. However, due to the work of the committee, the second resolution is moot and has been withdrawn. The first motion is back today for action as it focuses on the procedure for developing and implementing a drastic reorganization. It is impossible to achieve an outcome whose substance is sound through a fundamentally flawed process. The resolution rejects the decision to reorganization as illegitimate since it was done in a manner that violates University policy and the principles of collective governance.

A senator agreed that the February 9 memo was inadequate in its consultation, but he takes issue with the claim of a lack of consultation since. The committee has gone to great lengths to listen to input from all avenues and has satisfied the requirements of the policy. He disagreed with the illegitimate nature of the resolution since the President has the authority to make this decision.

A senator then said that while she admires and appreciates the work of the committee, there is no guarantee that the recommendations will be accepted or followed since this decision will be made by the Provost. This is also the person who bypassed faculty and student governance in deciding on a plan to abolish the Graduate School. The purpose of the plan was not to enhance excellence nor cut funding. She believes that the real purpose of the reorganization was included in the February 9 memo which explicitly states that accountability for graduate education resides with the colleges, but control of funding resides in the Provost’s office. This plan is meant to

disempower the faculty and concentrate power in the hands of central administration. If the faculty want to retain control over their work and the substance and quality of graduate education, then any procedure that flaunts the faculty role in governance must be rejected.

Another senator commented that the committee was created after the decision was already made and it was given a limited task, how to implement the decision that was already made without consultation. This decision broke various University policies and the Graduate School's constitution. While the consultation is great now, it is derived from a process that has limited discussion about the process itself. If this resolution is not approved, it will set a precedent that allows future decisions to be in violation of University policy. The University Senate needs to stand by its commitment to shared governance and fulfill its purpose as a check and balance to the administration.

A senator stated that he would have supported this resolution if it had been introduced in February, however, the timing now makes it moot. Checks and balances are important, but the administration is not the enemy. Each group has the best interests of the University at heart, but brings different perspectives to the table. No one will disagree that the process started poorly, but the faculty governance system stepped in and corrections were made. The process now is good. The amount of consultation exceeds anything in the ambiguous language in the Policy on Reorganization. He sees this situation as a success of governance and process is on track.

Another senator said that Article VII, Section B of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents states that, "All matters relating to the education and administrative affairs of the University, consistent with actions or policies of the Regents of the University of Minnesota heretofore or hereafter taken or established and including those incident to the management of the student body are, for the purpose of effectuating the government of the University under and by the Regents, committed to the President, the University Senate, and the several faculties, as provided in the Senate Constitution and as amended from time to time." It is true that the President will make this decision and that the University Senate needs to be involved. The opinion of this body does count. During the strategic positioning process, task forces were assembled without student participation. When the issue was addressed by the administration, the response was that next time they would do better. This is the next time and the process was not better. Rules, and the protection they afford, are necessary in bad times, such as now.

A senator then said that the Policy on Reorganization was directed toward collegiate mergers without consultation. Then strategic positioning took place and this policy was not mentioned, but the process was unanimously approved by this body. A new way of doing things emerged from strategic positioning, which is to create a task force of members from across the University to create recommendations, allow comments, and then make a decision. This situation has provided a model of how to consult in difficult times.

A senator then said that he has two problems with the resolution. First is with the word 'illegitimate' in the final paragraph. Due to the size of the institution, the right to make certain decisions need to be granted to the administration. These decisions are not illegitimate if input is sought from faculty. Second, he objects to, 'the University Senate...rejects the Provost's decision to dissolve the Graduate School.' A memo was sent, but a decision has not yet been made.

Another senator stated that the committee members have not agreed on the decision for the Graduate School and that this question is open for comment. The University will be gathering advice on this question for the next month and he urged individuals or groups to weigh in.

A senator disagreed with a previous comment on the illegitimacy of the decision. Just because the University is large, more power is not acquiesced to administrators. The best decisions are

made with consultation between the faculty and administrators, instead of just by one group or the other. The illegitimate part is that once again the administration needs to be re-educated on the right way to do things.

Another senator understands the perspective that this resolution is too late, however, the process is not complete. His worry is that if the resolution is not approved, then the University Senate goes on record that it does not disapprove. He worries how the process will end if this is the decision made today. He urged senators to vote in favor of the resolution, no matter how imperfect some phrases might be.

A senator said that there is no question about who will make the final decision. Since the University is so big, the only way that the final decision can be informed by consultation is for the consultation to work. This resolution asks senators to approve of how the consultation went along the way.

A senator stated that the University Senate would have more power if it did not approve this resolution but held the administration accountable to listening to the report and feedback.

Another senator said that it is important to not vote on sentiment, but vote on the wording of the resolution. The first paragraph refers to steps of consultation. As of today, these steps have been taken even if the process has not been perfect. However the resolution does not refer to the process.

A senator reminded senators that the 'whereas' clauses have no meaning. What is being voted on is the language in the 'be it resolved' clause.

A senator then stated that the February 9 memo stated that the Graduate School would be abolished. There is no doubt that a decision was made. The committee was then appointed by the Provost, not the University Senate.

A senator said that he takes offense at the phrase, "...the University Senate...rejects the Provost's decision..." and for this reason he will not vote in favor.

Vice Chair Chomsky reminded senators that the President has repeatedly stated that a decision has not yet been made.

Q: Is the Provost's decision to be rejected the one referred to in the February 9 memo?

A: Yes.

A senator asked that instead of voting against the resolution based on the language, the wording in the 'be it resolved' clause be amended.

A motion was made and seconded to extend debate by 10 minutes. This motion was approved.

A senator proposed the following amendment to the 'be it resolved' clause, "...That the University Senate of the University of Minnesota disapproves of the Provost's plan to dissolve the Graduate School as stated in the February 9 memo..."

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Professor Clark said that while committee did an excellent job, it was not appointed by the University Senate. The resolution emphasizes that greater University Senate involvement, from the beginning, is what is required, rather than ex-post-facto consultation.

A senator proposed that the use of the word ‘decision’ throughout the resolution be changed to ‘plan.’

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

A senator proposed that there be a second ‘be it resolved’ clause which would read, “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that any proposal to dissolve or otherwise to restructure the Graduate School comply with the University of Minnesota Policy on Reorganization.”

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Q: Do the ‘whereas’ clauses remain in the final, published version of the resolution?

A: Yes. They are provided to frame the resolution.

A senator commented that he preferred that the words ‘demand’ and ‘reject’ not be removed from the final version.

Vice Chair Chomsky said that the University Senate does not have the authority to reject the plan, so the new wording fits better with the University Senate’s role in the process.

A senator said that the committee was told that a decision has been made and was not to revisit whether or not the decision was correct. Despite what the President has said, the decision was made.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion as amended was approved with 135 in favor, 17 opposed, and nine abstentions.

APPROVED

10. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

11. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

12. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate was recessed at 4:03 p.m.

13. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Emily Hoover, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that today’s comments will focus on legislative actions and the Policy on Reorganization. She expressed gratitude to Professors Martin Sampson and Caroline Hayes for serving as the Faculty Legislative Liaisons. They provide the faculty updates on legislative issues and advise the FCC on when it should become involved in issues.

One such issue arose last week with the discussion and vote in the House on changing the Regent Candidate Advisory Council (RCAC) process. Under the state constitution, the legislature appoints the Regents. The RCAC screens the candidates and conducts public interviews. This process was instituted to remove the selection of Regents partially from politics, to improve the quality of candidates, and to provide a public element to the selection process.

The Faculty Legislative Liaisons sit in on the legislative interviews, raise questions about candidates, and express views to the legislature. At the suggestion of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons, FCC approved a statement supporting the retention of the current process, which was distributed in today's materials.

Policy paths have been addressed this year. The Policy on Reorganization will be reviewed next fall by the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) due to its divergent interpretations in light of proposed changes to the Graduate School. The issue to be addressed is how to articulate the expectations about consultation on proposals for changes in units within the University.

Other topics for FCC have been a discussion with Vice President Brown on senior administrator reviews, the faculty role in the reorganization of the Academic Health Center, and the threat to the constitutional autonomy of the University vis-à-vis language in the federal stimulus bill.

FCC continues to consult with the President and Provost to convey the sentiment of the University community on graduate education and other topics. She encouraged senators to keep abreast of these discussion in the FCC minutes.

As this is Professor Hoover's final report, she stated that she enjoyed this experience and encouraged senators to stay involved in faculty governance because it does make a difference.

14. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE

Professor Caroline Hayes, a Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that the House and Senate have passed biennial budget bills and conference committees are now meeting to work out the differences. There have been several changes since the email update. One is that the biomedical buildings are back after funding was considered for removal. Second is that there is language in the House bill that net tuition increases must be less than \$300 per year for the biennium for Minnesota resident students. This bill also includes language that new Minnesota resident students, beginning fall 2010, must be offered the opportunity to participate in a stable tuition plan of up to four years. This provision is not in the Senate bill.

The joint committee on the bonding bill has yet to meet. The House and the Senate have both proposed HEAPR funding, the House bill proposes a solar testing lab, and the Senate bill contains funding for a new Bell Museum.

15. REPORT OF THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Delegation confirm the reappointment of two faculty members on the Nominating Committee. A simple majority is required for approval.

ARTHUR ERDMAN: Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: 1986-89, 1997-2000, 2004-10. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Advisory Committee on Athletics, 2000-05 (Chair, 2003-05), Capital Projects and Campus Master Planning Subcommittee, 2002-06 (Chair, 2004-06); Committee on Committees, 1988-89; Council on Liberal Education, 2001-04; Facilities Management, 1986-90 (Chair: 1988-90); Finance, 1988-89; Finance and Planning, 1989-90 (Ex Officio, 2002-06); Judicial, 1988-2001; Nominating, 2006-09; Support Services, 1990-93.

ANN MASTEN: Professor of Child Development, College of Education and Human Development. University Senate member: 1991-94. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Nominating, 2007-09.

INFORMATION:

The Nominating Committee Bylaws specify that the Faculty Committee on Committees each year shall submit to the Faculty Consultative Committee for its approval a proposed slate to be considered for election to the Nominating Committee. In those instances when an incumbent member of the Nominating Committee is eligible for re-election and is willing to serve, the Faculty Committee on Committees may present to Faculty Consultative Committee the name of that individual for confirmation of reappointment without another candidate on the ballot to fill the position.

**ELAINE CHALLACOMBE, CHAIR
FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**16. REPORT OF THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION
Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members**

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation approve the following slate of nominees to fill one 2009-12 Twin Cities faculty vacancy on the Nominating Committee. A simple majority is required for approval. Once the slate is approved, a ballot will be distributed for voting.

RICHARD LEPPERT: Regents Professor of Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1985-88, 1992-95. Senate Committee participation: None.

JOHN SULLIVAN: Regents Professor of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation: Computing and Information Systems, 1987-88; Consultative, 2004-07; Finance, 1983-85; Research, 1982-85, 1990-91 (Chair, 1984-85, 1990-91).

FOR INFORMATION:

The Nominating Committee Bylaws specify that the Faculty Committee on Committees will propose a slate composed of twice as many tenure-track or tenured faculty members as there are positions to be filled, each confirmed as willing to serve. The Faculty Committee on Committees will strive to include a diverse pool of candidates and, to ensure that the Nominating Committee as a whole will include balanced representation from across the Twin Cities campus, the Faculty Committee on Committees shall select candidates from appropriate academic units, and the slate of nominees, other than those for reappointment, shall pair candidates from related academic units. The slate and the proposed reappointments shall be submitted to the Faculty Consultative Committee for approval. In the event that additional nominations are made by members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee shall vote by secret ballot to reduce the slate to twice the number to be chosen through contested election, continuing to strive for appropriate balance on the slate. The final slate and the approved nominations for reappointment shall be announced in the Faculty Senate docket for a spring semester meeting.

Additional nominations of tenured or tenure-track faculty, confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting at which the slate is to be presented; (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. Such nominees may be named to run against a pair of candidates or against a candidate for reappointment. To ensure appropriate balanced representation on the Nominating Committee, any additional nominations shall specify against whom the nominee will run.

After a final slate is selected as specified above, the clerk of the Senate shall present the final slate to the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation for a vote. The election for contested seats will be conducted by secret ballot. The candidate receiving the most votes in each pair or group will be elected. Uncontested elections for reappointment may be conducted by voice vote.

In case of a tie in any Senate vote in the election process, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate(s) by lot.

The elected members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2009-10 are:

Jean Bauer, College of Education and Human Development
Susan Berry, Medical School
Daniel Feeney, College of Veterinary Medicine
Catherine French, Institute of Technology
Mindy Kurzer, College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences
Mary Jo Maynes, College of Liberal Arts

**ELAINE CHALLACOMBE, CHAIR
FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**17. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
FOR THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION
Action by TC Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members**

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Delegation confirm the appointment of the following faculty for the Committee on Committees. A simple majority is required for approval.

CARL ADAMS: Professor of Information/Decision Sciences, Carlson School of Management. University Senate member: 1984-87, 2005-06. Senate Committee participation (past and present): All-University Honors, 2007-10; Committee on Committees, 1991-92, 2000-06; Consultative, 1994-97 (Chair, 1995-96); Faculty Affairs, 1990-94 (Chair, 1992-94); Finance, 1986-87; Planning, 1985-88 (Chair, 1986-87).

ELIZABETH BOYLE: Associate Professor of Sociology, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 2006-09. Senate Committee participation (past and present): None.

JAMES CAREY: Associate Professor of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Medical School. University Senate member: 2005-08, 2008-11. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Disabilities Issues, 1996-2001 (Chair, 1998-2001).

WILLIAM GARRARD: Professor of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: 1996-99. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2008-09; Council on Liberal Education, 1995-98; Tenure, 2002-03 (Chair, 2002-03)

LOIS HELLER: Professor of Molecular Physiology, Medical School-Duluth. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation (past and present): AHC Faculty Consultative, 2002-08 (Chair, 2007-08; Vice Chair, 2005-07); All-University Honors, 2005-08; Consultative (Ex Officio, 2007-08).

JOAN HOWLAND: Professor of Law, Law School. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2005-09; Computing and Information Systems, 1996-97; Faculty Affairs, 2000-02; Judicial, 1996-2000, 2005-11; Library (Ex Officio, 1995-2009); ROTC Subcommittee, 2006-12; Student Behavior, 1993-96.

LINDA LINDEKE: Associate Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing. University Senate member: 2003-08. Senate Committee participation (past and present): None.

NATHAN SPRINGER: Assistant Professor of Plant Biology, College of Biological Sciences. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2008-09.

FOR INFORMATION:

The Nominating Committee Bylaws specify that it shall submit to the Faculty Consultative Committee for its approval a proposed slate to be considered for election to the Committee on Committees, composed of as many tenured and tenure-track faculty members, confirmed as willing to serve, as there are positions to be filled. This slate has been approved by the Faculty Consultative Committee.

Additional nominations of individuals confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities faculty, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting; or (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. To ensure appropriately balanced representation on the Committee on Committees, any additional nomination shall specify against which candidate the nominee will run. In the event there are additional nominations, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall vote by secret

ballot on any contested position(s) and the individuals who receive the most votes will be elected to the positions. For any uncontested positions, the election may be conducted by a voice vote. In case of a tie in any Senate vote in the election process, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate(s) by lot.

The elected Twin Cities faculty members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2009-10 are:

Jay Coggins, College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences
Jeanne Higbee, College of Education and Human Development
Roberta Humphreys, Institute of Technology
Joanna O'Connell, College of Liberal Arts
Stephen Weeks, College of Design

**CATHY FRENCH, CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**18. FACULTY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT
Ex Officio Membership
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 1 of the Faculty Senate Rules as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~). A simple majority is required for approval.

ARTICLE 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

...

- ~~Research~~--Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (two representatives, including the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station); Office of the Vice President for Budget and Finance; Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences; Vice President for Research (two representatives, ~~including the Associate Vice President for Regulatory Affairs~~); University Librarian; Director of Institutional Compliance

...

COMMENT:

The Research Committee has been informed that there is no longer a position entitled 'Associate Vice President for Regulatory Affairs.' Therefore the Research Committee is asking that the rules be amended to remove this entitled position, but yet retain two ex officio positions on the committee to represent the Vice President for Research.

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**19. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Eligibility for Faculty Senate Committee Service
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 2 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (new language 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)

...

2. Eligibility for Membership

...

e. With the exception of the Faculty Committee on Committees, only individuals tenured or tenure-track faculty eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate may serve as the chair of a committee of the Faculty Senate. The chair of the Committee on Finance and Planning, which reports to both the Faculty Senate and the University Senate, must also be chaired by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member.

...

COMMENT:

The Committees of the Faculty Senate are: Academic Freedom and Tenure, Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative, Council on Liberal Education, Educational Policy, Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Faculty Affairs, Faculty Committee on Committees, Faculty Consultative, Finance and Planning, Judicial, Nominating, and Research. These committees deal with academic and faculty welfare issues that are primarily the responsibility of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. In addition, the Chairs of these committees are often in the position of commenting to central administration on sensitive or controversial matters. Because of these responsibilities and pressures, the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) recommends that the Chairs of the Faculty Senate committees be tenured or tenure-track faculty.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A senator spoke against the motion since the University Senate itself was changed a few years ago to include academic professionals and civil service staff. There are also contract faculty at the University who are not holding tenured or tenure-track positions. The current language is fine, in that any member of the committee may serve as chair, when in practice it is typically a tenured or tenure-track faculty member. If the chair is meant to deal with controversial matters, then why would faculty without tenure be eligible to serve when academic professionals are not?

Another senator noted that academic professionals are active in the governance system and can handle leadership of Senate committees. Therefore, she is opposed to this amendment.

A senator then stated that leadership and brilliancy on a committee is not related to someone's tenure status.

Another senator said that the language should be the most inclusive, so this amendment should not be approved.

A senator stated that academic professionals are great contributors on committees, but chairs of four Senate committees serve as ex officio members of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Therefore these committees need faculty chairs.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was not approved with only 27 in favor, 58 opposed, and one abstention.

NOT APPROVED

**20. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Amendments to the Faculty Compensation Policy
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate adopt the following revised Faculty Compensation Policy (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

FACULTY COMPENSATION POLICY

BACKGROUND ON COMPENSATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Faculty are compensated for their contributions to teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service to the institution and the state/region/nation/other nations, as well as their professions. Total compensation includes annual base salary plus fringe benefits, including retirement, health and dental coverage, and life and disability insurance. In some instances, annual base salary is augmented through internal sources, such as overload teaching, or from external sources in the case of approved external consulting.

Initial annual base salary is negotiated at the time of hire, with floors established for the instructor and assistant professor ranks only. Increases to annual base salary for faculty occur in the following ways: through annually determined merit increases; through acceptance of a

retention offer that includes an increase; in conjunction with a promotion in rank and/or the awarding of indefinite tenure; through an augmentation attached to an administrative title or a set of administrative duties; or in conjunction with an honorary or endowed title. For many faculty, annual base salary is supplemented with summer school or other internal summer employment, such as grant research. Annual base salary may also be supplemented internally during one's contract period through means such as extension teaching. Normally, new salaries go into effect for A base faculty on July 1 and for B base faculty on September 16 of each year.

The salary determination process must provide an objective unbiased evaluation of each faculty member following a thorough review of his/her work. The process must encourage continued good or improved performance, which in turn, should be rewarded by the compensation system.

CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL SALARY INCREASES AND PROMOTION

Any salary determination process at the University of Minnesota must be nondiscriminatory. Initial salary offers, periodic increases, and retention offers may not be based on considerations related to the race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, sexual preference, marital status, public assistance status, veteran status, or age of the person being considered.

The criteria for determining salary increases must be similar to those used for promotion and tenure. The tenure and promotion regulations of the University, ~~adopted in 1985,~~ provide the following instructions which form the framework within which salary decisions must be made: (See Board of Regents policy: Faculty Tenure, sections 7.11, 7.12, 9.2, and 5.5, and administrative Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty)

~~7.11 GENERAL CRITERIA~~

~~The basis for awarding indefinite tenure is the determination that the achievements of an individual have demonstrated the individual's potential to continue to contribute significantly to the mission of the University and to its programs of teaching, research, and service over the course of the faculty member's academic career. The primary criteria for demonstrating this potential are effectiveness in teaching and professional distinction in research; outstanding discipline-related service contributions will also be taken into account where they are an integral part of the mission of the academic unit. The relative importance of the criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision.~~

~~7.12 DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT~~

~~Each academic unit must have a document that articulates with reasonable specificity the indices and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates meet the criteria of Section 7.11.~~

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

Faculty ~~input~~ participation into the discussions surrounding criteria and procedures for salary increase determination is essential to maintaining an equitable and collegial environment. (For the purposes of salary discussion and determination, the relevant academic unit is the departmental or budgetary unit, whichever is smaller.) With the administrator of each unit, the faculty must have the opportunity to develop the criteria for, and the format of, the process through which annual salary increases are determined, including for those faculty who hold endowed chairs. The process determined through consultation may include faculty participation in the judgments regarding compensation changes as a committee of the whole or through a salary committee consisting in whole or in part of elected members. The documents that describe these criteria, formats, and processes shall be shared with the college dean, the ~~appropriate vice~~

~~president~~ Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, as appropriate, and ~~finally~~ the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. This process must include the provision that the ~~department chair (unit head leader)~~ meet with each faculty member individually, at least once per year, to review his or her performance. The sessions shall review the past year's performance and offer suggestions for enhancing productivity, where appropriate. Units may choose to conduct more in depth evaluations on a periodic basis (e.g. 4 or 5 years) that would include outside evaluations.

ALLOCATION FORMAT

Each year the annual salary increase pool for meritorious performance received by the unit will be distributed based on the criteria specified in the University's Regulations Concerning Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure and appropriate departmental faculty evaluation documents.

Unsatisfactory performance, which shall be documented and communicated to the individual involved, shall serve as justification for withholding an individual's increase.

This policy does not apply to any across-the-board component of salary increases.

PROMOTION INCREASES

Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and from associate professor to professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring \$2250 increase in base salary ~~and promotion from associate professor to professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring \$3000 increase in base salary.~~ These amounts ~~figures should be interpreted as minima~~ and are in addition to the annual increase given for meritorious performance. The ~~minima~~ amounts will be adjusted annually to reflect inflation using the Higher Education Price Index. It will be the responsibility of the Provost to identify the amounts each year and to communicate those amounts to the deans (or equivalent unit heads). The Provost's office will, after calculating the increases, round the results to the nearest \$50 or \$100, and no particular ratio between the two promotion increments need be maintained. The deans will set aside funding for promotional increases separate from funding normally set aside for merit and retention purposes. Deans may institute higher minima but are required to use consistent and equitable procedures when granting these increases.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS PROVISIONS

1. A standing administrative and faculty compensation committee (including representatives of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee) will examine and make recommendations on policies such as salary levels in the University as a whole, salary disparity among units, minimum salary levels for associate and full professors, and salary compression.
2. Goals and expectations for endowed chairs and professorships must be established in each unit, in consultation with the dean, and must be used as the basis for review of the performance of individuals who hold endowed chairs and professorships.
3. The Provost will receive an annual report from each college on reviews of endowed chairs and will provide a summary report to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

NOTES

~~*For the purposes of salary discussion and determination, the relevant academic unit is the departmental or budgetary unit, whichever is smaller.~~

~~**The process determined through consultation may include faculty participation in the judgements regarding compensation changes as a committee of the whole or through a salary committee consisting in whole or in part of elected members.~~

~~***No mention is made of a possible across the board component of compensation increase because it is assumed that no faculty input is required at the unit level for such increases.~~

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

DRAFT

APPENDIX

POLICY FOR STATEMENT ON EVALUATING LECTURESHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS, PROFESSORSHIPS, AND CHAIRS

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs **(Adapted from an ad hoc subcommittee report, September, 2006)**

There are more than 700 Endowed Chairs at the University of Minnesota. The expenditure of dollars to those holding endowed chairs and professorships exceeded \$30 million in fiscal year 2003. The number and dollar expenditures are expected to grow due to shrinkage of historical means/levels of support coupled with expansion of charitable campaigns.

Currently, there is no policy that requires faculty oversight or involvement in the development or implementation of review processes for faculty holding these positions. In fact, there is no requirement of a review. The faculty compensation policy does not recognize the existence of this form of compensation and the tenure code makes no mention of these factors. Therefore, it behooves the Faculty Senate to provide clarification to the tenure code and post-tenure review process as well as to develop a policy to require review of those faculty that receive awards, honors, and recognition and the inclusion of faculty from the appropriate academic unit in the review process.

Section 7a.1 of the ~~TENURE CODE~~ Board of Regents policy: Faculty Tenure requires that

faculty of each academic unit must establish goals and expectations for all faculty members, including goals and expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity, and contributions to the service and outreach functions of the unit. The factors to be considered will parallel those used by the unit in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty.

According to the ~~RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW Approved by the Tenure Subcommittee January 5, 1998 Revised by the Tenure Subcommittee March 5, 1998~~, the implementation of Section 7a of the tenure code requires the following:

The faculty of each academic unit should adopt two policy statements. One is a statement of goals and expectations for all faculty members in that unit (Section 7a.1). The other is a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews (Sections 7a.2, 7a.3). Many Academic Units already have these (or similar) policies in place for compensation review purposes. If so, the faculty need only make any modifications it feels necessary and identify them as the policies applicable to post-tenure review pursuant to Section 7a.

The two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. If existing policies are being designated for this purpose, there should be a vote of the faculty designating them as such. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every Academic Unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean may approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

The Subcommittee of SCFA asserts these policies must be applied to those that receive special awards, honors and recognition. This would include lectureships, fellowships, professorships, or chairs (referred to more generally as endowed chairs to distinguish the appointment from administrators) as defined in the Board of Regents policy: Awards, Honors, and Recognition. The special recognition, honor or compensation bestowed upon the faculty must be considered in establishing the goals and expectations for that faculty in a manner analogous to taking into account the different stages of professional development of faculty.

Pursuant to the Tenure code (Section 7a.1), each unit must have a statement addressing the goals and expectations for all faculty including those that receive special recognition, honor, or compensation. Each unit must also have a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews of all faculty, including those specially recognized faculty. In keeping with the RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW ~~Approved by the Tenure Subcommittee~~, the two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every academic unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean may approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

For the recognition, honor, or compensation that is awarded by an entity other than the academic unit (for example, the college, university, or outside entity), rules and procedures for timely review must be developed by the awarding entity. These procedures must have a component involving the review conducted by the academic unit of the faculty.

**KATHRYN HANNA, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Kathryn Hanna, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committees (SCFA), stated that a few years ago the faculty had a discussion about faculty compensation and the fact that the current policy was silent for faculty who hold endowed chairs and other similar positions. SCFA felt that this should be addressed in the policy. A subcommittee was formed to revise the policy. The primary change was to add language that included endowed and honorary faculty titles and annual reviews of these positions. Language was also added that units should have goals and expectations of endowed chairs and professorships. The last changes were removing obsolete references and promotion dollars increases.

She then noted that there was one clerical chance that was not included. The dates provided at the end of the second paragraph need to be revised since these dates refer to the previous quarter system.

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

APPROVED

21. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

22. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

23. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2008-09 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APRIL 30, 2009

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 5

The fifth meeting of the Student Senate for 2008-09 was convened in Studio C, Rarig Center, on Thursday, April 30, 2009, at 11:33 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 33 student members. Chair Ryan Kennedy presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS
Information

Resolution on a Tuition Cap

Approved by the: Student Senate December 4, 2008

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

*The University remains fully committed to identifying strategies that provide adequate tuition revenue for the University without unduly burdening Minnesota students and their families. The University has done this by providing free tuition to all low-income Minnesota students, generating \$260 in the past five years to support new scholarships, and creating incentives to encourage timely degree completion, thereby reducing total tuition costs for students. Low-income families no longer face the highest hurdles in terms of affordability. The University is also committed to improving financial support for middle-income Minnesota students, one of the biggest priorities moving forward.

Statement on Student Access to Student Release Question Data

Approved by the: Student Senate December 4, 2008

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

*The Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs are working together to explore the concept of the University publicizing a list of the top third excellent teachers based on student ratings, similar to a system used by the University of Illinois. Such a system would give students positive information about teachers in a way that will assist them in choosing their courses.

Resolution on a Twin Cities Campus Smoking Ban

Approved by the: Student Senate February 4, 2009

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

*A small working group has been exploring the feasibility of an outdoor smoking ban for the Twin Cities campus. The working group has been consulting with faculty, staff, students, and others during the academic year and has heard a wide range of differing opinions about a potential smoking ban as well as other related smoking policy issues. No decisions related to a campus-wide smoking ban have been made.

Resolution on Transparency for the University of Minnesota Leadership

Approved by the: Student Senate March 5, 2009

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required
* With respect to the Graduate School efforts, the provost has charged a team of faculty, staff, and students to formulate recommendations for restructuring graduate education to enhance student services and support, preserve or further promote academic excellence, and conserve fiscal resources. The team has held open meetings to consult with the University community and their recommendations will be posted for a public comment period shortly. It is important to stress that no final decisions have been made. While the President understands that there has been much debate about the way in which this effort was rolled out, the University is committed to consulting openly with faculty, staff, and students on this and other key decisions to address budget challenges and academic improvements moving forward.

Resolution on Opportunity Minnesota

Approved by the: Student Senate March 5, 2009

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

* Passage of this legislation was unsuccessful at the legislature. The University's commitment to student scholarships remains a significant priority and we will continue our current efforts, and find additional ways, to make college more affordable and reduce the amount of debt students have upon graduation.

Resolution on All-Campus Vote for Student Fee Increases

Approved by the: Student Senate April 2, 2009

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

* Passage of this legislation was unsuccessful at the legislature.

2. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS UPDATE

Pamela Stenhjem, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that the committee is in the middle of succession planning for next year's officers. Most of the executive committee will be continuing, but there will be a new chair, Sarah Waldemar.

CAPA is sending a letter to the administration regarding the Regents Scholarship program. This scholarship currently allows employees to take courses for free and receive a degree. Because of budget constraints, employees will be assessed 25 percent of the cost. CAPA is divided on the issue. Staff who use the benefit are opposed since many say that they will no longer be able to afford to take classes. Staff who do not use the benefit feel that it is acceptable change instead of cutting 44 jobs to save the \$2 million through this reduction. The letter asks that the issue be revisited when the economy improves.

The Outstanding Unit award will be decided today. Media publicity is being sought to bring attention to the unit and the award.

In closing, she said that she appreciates the active work of the Student Senate. If CAPA can be of assistance, please let them know.

3. CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE UPDATE

There was no report.

4. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Ryan Kennedy, Chair of the Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), said that this is his last meeting as chair. He thanked everyone for their great participation and attendance this year. The Student Senate made great strides in its efforts and he looks forward to this being continued by next year's senators.

5. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – Marshall Johnson said that elections are complete with a record turnout with one-third of the eligible students voting. Faculty and staff awards were also presented last week. At the last forum a Maroon, Green, and Gold recycling initiative was approved. This addresses two concerns. First, club allotments will be tied to maintenance of a recycling station on campus, which will also bring recycling to more areas of campus. Second, this program will help with funding issues, without raising student fees, as the number of clubs increase. Crookston will also be competing the North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture (NACTA) annual competition. CSA has revamped its student organization handbook. CSA appreciates the work of the Student Senate and the dialogue between the campuses.

Duluth – Jonathan Lundberg said that elections have been completed for next year. Yesterday the smoking survey results have been recognized as valid by the Chancellor, so now work is starting on a policy revision. Lastly, SLC has been reabsorbed into UMDSA.

Morris – Kathy Julik-Heine stated that elections took place last week. A working group composed of members of MCSA and the Academic Support Services Committee is looking at the technology fee allocation process. Currently the process is completely student-run, but the working group considered more faculty advising in this process. A new process and committee composition has been proposed. Research is being done on a smoking ban by collecting data from other colleges with a ban. A survey is being conducted on student habits.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly – Jeffery Anderson reported that board elections have been completed, an annual conference was last weekend, a Twins game outing was last night, and a Washington DC lobbying trip has been completed.

Minnesota Student Association - Mark Lewandowski noted that MSA's free tax preparation program has ended. The Lend a Hand, Hear the Band concert was a few weeks ago. General elections are complete and board elections will be next week. MSA also helped with the Tony Diggs Student Group Excellence Awards.

6. REPORT FROM TWO STUDENT MEMBERS OF THE FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE Discussion

The two of us serve both on the Student Senate and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP). Over this year, we had several brainstorming sessions and met with a few administrators. We'd like to bring some topics to your attention. (We emphasize we are not reporting on behalf of SCFP nor other committee members.)

Meetings. We met with Richard Pfutzenreuter (vice-president and CFO) on December 17, to talk about the prospects for tuition increases (as a follow-up on the Student Senate resolution on a tuition cap, December 4), student participation in setting priorities early on in the budget process, and fee consolidation. Upon his suggestion, we also met with Kathryn Brown (vice-president and chief of staff) and Lynn Holleran (her assistant) on April 2. We discussed the same topics and ways to help students have a better understanding of how decisions are made. We talked briefly about the Graduate School debacle. Both meetings were very constructive (more on that later).

Tuition increases. In both meetings we were reassured the administration will do its best to keep tuition increases as low as possible. However, only after the state budget is settled will it be possible to know the exact value. A factor to be taken into account is that the stimulus funds are one-time money, meaning that in 2012 the budget levels will drop further down. So, on all budget decisions (including tuition levels), the administration will have to balance pain now against pain in the future. **Recommendation.** We strongly encourage the Student Senate to keep in close contact with students serving in SCFP over the next several years.

Fees. As you know, the Board of Regents has asked the administration to review the current situation and study consolidation options. Some of the current fees were created, in part, to allocate specific amounts to specific uses and to communicate what those uses were. Over time, some fees have slowly drifted from their original use and additional fees were created. There's a delicate balance between rolling all fees together (to better represent the total cost of education), not appearing to increase tuition by a third (even when the total cost is unchanged), and ensuring specific amounts are indeed allocated to particular uses. **Recommendation.** We did not have time to follow up on this matter recently and encourage the Student Senate to stay in touch with Vice-President Pfutzenreuter as the matter evolves.

Student involvement in budget decisions. Students are already involved in the budget process: we have several representatives to the Board of Regents, as well as in several Senate committees and other key positions. Some years ago, in response to requests by students, administrators started meeting with student leaders early in the academic year (before the budget process starts) and during the year (for example, several administrators have met with the Student Senate). **Recommendation.** We think the next step is to initiate regular discussions with administrators at the college and campus level. Our impression is that the central administration would welcome such discussions, but can't realistically force them to take place. **Rationale.** The two of us believe further student involvement would help demystify the (extremely complex) budget process and make everyone aware of the competing priorities of different stakeholders. The more they are part of the process, the more students can take ownership of the outcomes—enabling them to be stronger advocates for the U.

One-on-one meetings. We found our meetings with administrators to be an effective means to communicate specific concerns and gather specific information. **Recommendation.** Have specific students be contact persons with specific administrators and aim to build such relationships with as many administrators as possible.

Policy meetings with administrators. Helpful as they may be, one-on-one meetings only go so far. For larger policy changes, once all information has been gathered (e.g., from several one-on-one meetings), we need to have everyone sit around the same table and discuss the big picture. **Recommendation.** Establish regular meetings of student leadership and administrators (maybe also University Senate leaders), for broader policy discussion. Though superficially similar to the existing concern forums and town-hall meetings, the meetings we propose would be work meetings, specifically aiming at establishing a roadmap for policy change, and complementing the student leadership retreats discussed at the last Student Senate meeting. We think such

retreats can be important to identify common goals, maintain cohesiveness, and help everyone stay aware of everyone else's efforts.

Student leader networking. The two of us happen to serve in the Student Senate, as well as SCFP and either MSA or COGS/GAPSA. This made it easier for us to connect (some of) the dots. As we all discussed at the last Student Senate meeting, personally knowing other student leaders can make the difference. The chances are high that other students serving in Senate committees will occasionally come across important information they wish to communicate to someone, but do not know whom to communicate it to. **Recommendation.** Create a mailing list (similar to the ones already in existence) including all student senators and student members of Senate committees (who could opt out if they so wished). Other interested students could opt in. This list would be used solely for short reports (e.g., on topics discussed in a small meeting) or queries (e.g., looking for other students with expertise in a specific topic).

Submitted April 15, 2009

**JOÃO PEDRO BOAVIDA, SENATOR AND MEMBER OF SCFP
MIKAEL MOSELEY, SENATOR AND MEMBER OF SCFP**

DISCUSSION:

A senator said that information dissemination to the greater student body is needed.

Mikael Moseley, a student member of the Finance and Planning Committee, said that transparency is a key to coordinating the efforts of students. Work needs to be done on better distributing information.

A senator said that at a previous institution, the student government had a retreat twice a year to share information and it worked well.

Another senator said that an email list would be a great way to share information with students who choose to opt-in.

7. COORDINATION OF STUDENT GOVERNANCE Discussion

Ryan Kennedy, Chair of the Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), said that time was spent on this topic at the April 2 meeting. Most of the discussion focused on communication between student governance groups. This discussion could be continued, or today's focus could be how to make student governance stronger with the administration, communities, and state legislature.

Q: Can a written response be received for each Student Senate action taken?

A: The administration does respond to each item approved by the Student Senate. Resolutions do not require approval, but comments on the resolutions are almost always received.

Q: Are Student Senate actions sent to the Student Representatives to the Regents?

A: This is not done, but can be.

A senator suggested that coordination with the Student Representatives to the Regents be done through the Student Senate. Student Representatives to the Regents usually only see the end of

the decisions, while work is being done through the campus assemblies and Student Senate. Sharing of ideas and concerns should take place by all organizations.

A senator proposed that a website for student senators be created that would allow for on-line chats, open to only senators, and then a public concern area. Dedicated maintenance would be an issue for the site.

Q: Are written reports from student senators communicated to other student associations?

A: There is not a formal process for written reports for student senators or between the student governance organizations. Student Representatives to the Regents submit a written report twice per year to the Regents. The CSA President sends a weekly email to all students, but nothing written is done at the other campuses. Some colleges may send emails to their students, but likely do not include any information on student governance. Written communication from the GAPSA executives are tied to their stipend. An email with short links are sent, with the full text on the website.

A senators said that some colleges have oral reports from their senators to provide accountability to their constituency.

Q: Are coordinate campus student association minutes on each campuses website?

A: Yes.

8. APPOINTMENT OF 2009-10 STUDENT SENATE MENTORS

FOR INFORMATION:

Whereas, many issues in Student Government take more than one year to fully complete; and

Whereas, each year many new Student Senators spend a great deal of time learning the University's intricate governance system; therefore be it

Resolved, the Student Senate Chair appoints at least three Student Senators by May 15 each year to serve as mentors to new Student Senators; be it further

Resolved, the appointed Student Senate Mentors can be either a returning Senator or an exiting Senator that will be a student through the following fall semester.

Approved by the Student Senate Consultative Committee on April 17, 2003

DISCUSSION:

Ryan Kennedy, Chair of the Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), asked for a minimum of three volunteers to serve as mentors for next year.

Q: When would volunteers be needed?

A: They are mostly needed for next fall when the Student Senate process starts and senators have questions.

Jeffrey Anderson, Kathryn Barron, Missy Gettel, Mark Lewandowski, and Alexander Schostag agreed to serve as 2009-10 Student Senate Mentors.

**9. ELECTION OF 2009-10 STUDENT SENATE/
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR
Election by 2009-10 Senators Only**

Kathy Julik-Heine, a student senator from the University of Minnesota-Morris, was elected Student Senate Chair.

**10. ELECTION OF 2009-10 TWIN CITIES UNDERGRADUATE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBER
Election by 2009-10 Twin Cities Undergraduate Senators Only**

Kia Adams, Xander Castro, and John Worden were elected 2009-10 Twin Cities undergraduate Committee on Committees members.

**11. ELECTION OF 2009-10 TWIN CITIES MEMBERS OF THE
STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Election by 2009-10 Twin Cities Senators Only
One Twin Cities undergraduate senator and one Twin Cities graduate/professional senator**

Jeffery Anderson and Mark Lewandowski were elected 2009-10 Twin Cities members of the Student Senate Nominating Committee.

12. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

13. NEW BUSINESS

A senator said that the Juneteenth organization will hold their celebration on June 14 at Boom Island Park. This organization is in dire need of volunteers to help set-up and clean-up. A flyer for the event was distributed.

Another senator said that the Graduate School report will be discussed at today's University Senate meeting. If a Graduate School senator cannot attend this meeting, please let him know as there are alternates available for this meeting.

14. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:16 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**