

MEM
1/15/07
5:15p

2006-07 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

FEBRUARY 15, 2007

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 3

The third meeting of the Faculty Senate for 2006-07 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, February 15, 2007, at 2:36 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 117 faculty/academic professional members. Vice Chair Mary Jo Kane presided.

1. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Carol Chomsky, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), thanked senators for attending today's extra meeting. It was scheduled since there will not be time to discuss the Tenure Code on March 1, since the President will give his State of the University Address during that meeting. The goal is to bring the changes to the April Faculty Senate meeting for approval.

FCC has received reports on issues related to athletics and academics and has continued conversations with faculty members from across the University, especially those from the merged colleges. The issues collected from these meetings have been and will continue to be brought to the administration. The issues included centralized versus decentralized activities, resources for and pressures on departments, faculty workload, budget model, disciplinary and interdisciplinary resources and opportunities, and internal communications.

In addition to these issues, there are many other topics being discussed by the other Senate committees. She urged senators to read through the minutes that are sent. In a recent meeting with committee chairs, a discussion was held on ways to improve communication from various levels of faculty governance.

2. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE

Professor Martin Sampson, Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that he is the only person serving in this role this year, and therefore asked that anyone interested in serving talk to him.

Last week he sent a statement to all faculty comparing the University's and Governor's recommendations. While the Governor and the University agree on creating Minnesota's future, there is disparity for core operating costs. This is a serious issue as it pertains to the long-run viability of the University.

One issue is merit pay, which is not understood by the legislature. When additional salary funding is not received, it means that the faculty most unfairly treated are the faculty who had the most remarkable prior year but can only be recognized by an across-the-board increase. He suggested that all legislators be contacted on this issue, even if they support the University.

Lastly, of the University's \$182.3 million request, the Governor proposed funding \$90.4 million plus an additional \$63 million. This extra funding is for the Mayo/University partnership and no one is objecting to this funding, except that it is not supposed to be in the higher education budget.

3. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Student Learning Outcomes
Discussion by the Twin Cities Delegation of the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

This item is for discussion at this meeting and will be an action item at the April 5 meeting.

MOTION FOR DISCUSSION:

That the Twin Cities Delegation of the Faculty Senate:

-- adopts as University policy the following Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes for the Twin Cities campus, and

--endorses these learning outcomes as the guiding principles for teaching and learning at all levels of curricular decision-making on the Twin Cities campus.

Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes

At the time of receiving a bachelor's degree, a student:

--Can identify, define, and solve problems

--Can locate and critically evaluate information

--Has mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry

--Understands diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies

--Can communicate effectively

--Understands the role of creativity, innovation, discovery, and expression across disciplines

--Has acquired skills for effective citizenship and life-long learning.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) has discussed these outcomes at several meetings over the last year and recommends to the Faculty Senate that it adopt them as policy for the Twin Cities campus.

The Faculty Consultative Committee reviewed the outcomes as well and concurs in the recommendation from SCEP.

RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard McCormick, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), provided background on these learning outcomes. He stated that they originated with the Provost's Council for the Enhancement of Student Learning (CESL). The emphasis that was placed on developing these outcomes as goals for undergraduate education had a positive impact on the University's accreditation last year.

He said that these outcomes have been developed after consultation with faculty and staff from across the University during the past few years. The rationale for this language is a shift from inputs to outcomes and the University giving thought to what they want undergraduate students to learn while they are here. By focusing on outcomes, the University stops requiring just seat-time in courses. CESL's work is in harmony with efforts over the last 15-20 years to improve teaching, to reward excellence, and to enhance the undergraduate experience.

There is a perception that strategic positioning is in conflict with a concern for undergraduate education, but strategic positioning has as its goal excellence in all three missions of the University, and research and teaching especially overlap in the work of the faculty.

In closing he noted that SCEP has voted to endorse these outcomes.

Q: Why do these outcomes only apply to the Twin Cities?

A: Each campus is in charge of developing its own degree requirements and curriculum. Morris is aware of these outcomes and can choose to adopt them for their campus as well.

Q: How do these outcomes relate to campuses that are unionized?

A: It involves terms and conditions of employment so it would need to be negotiated by the unions.

A senator said that these outcomes are meant to be an umbrella and therefore have been left intentionally vague. The next piece is evaluative criteria to measure these outcomes. There is also a question about the outcome for understanding diverse philosophies and cultures. This is like the current liberal education statement, and neither address power and privilege. This statement is a political stance by not including references to power and privilege in this outcome.

Another senator stated that these outcomes reflect what higher education already does. If this list is meant to suggest a change in what is done, he would disagree. He did not realize that so many classes only require seat time. This document would be a disservice if it were presented to the public as a change in what the University does.

Professor McCormick said that these outcomes are a description of what already happens, but that the emphasis on outcomes has not been articulated in this way previously. There is a difference between seat-time and grades versus demonstrable learning outcomes upon graduation.

A senator then said that if these outcomes lead to philosophical changes, then they are meaningful. However, without accompanying policies, these outcomes are almost an empty statement. He noted that half of these statements could already be attributed to most students before they arrive, while others would be easy to achieve in one class session.

Professor McCormick said that approval of these outcomes is a first step in a much longer process of discussion and modifications.

Vice Provost Arlene Carney, a member of CESL, said that the motion in April will be to endorse these outcomes as concepts. Currently, most of the focus is on graduation and retention rates. These outcomes are meant to be a shift from these measures. These outcomes evolved by asking faculty what they thought students should know to receive a bachelor's degree, so they should reflect what is already being done. The other goal is to make these outcomes clear to the students.

She noted that these outcomes are just a first step, followed by policy or curriculum changes. There is also room for more articulation of the outcomes within each discipline. There will be a long-term set of processes involving partnerships with faculty to achieve these goals.

Q: Is the statement 'mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry' intended to mean that students will only master one body of knowledge and everything else is superficial?

A: The outcome is meant to emphasize that students are meant to master the subject matter in their major.

A senator said that these outcomes are disturbing from a historical point of view since many of these criteria have been met without being discussed. Other students might graduate with only meeting a few of these outcomes, but excelling in those areas. Up until the last few years, the people who taught did just that and did not stand around discussing the philosophy of what they were doing and the details of what the students needed to achieve. He cannot see anything to object to in these statements, but it is bewildering that anyone should need to specifically say them.

A senator then asked that care be taken in how these outcomes are presented to the public as not to degrade what was been done.

Another senator said that by talking to students, most have a 'check-box' mentality, which means that they are only interested in meeting requirements and not reflecting on what they have learned.

A senator then said an implicit factor in these outcomes is evaluation and competencies. It suggest that a student could meet all the competencies and then ask to graduate in a much shorter timeframe.

Another senator noted that this is an ambitious list and questioned how realistically they can be fulfilled.

A senator then felt that some outcomes are missing from the list, such as leadership and passion, as well as core competencies in written, verbal, and interpersonal skills.

4. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE
Amendments to Faculty Tenure - Section 5.5, 7.11, 7.12
and new Section 9.2
Discussion by the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

A line-numbered PDF version of the current and proposed language is available on the web at:
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/070215tenurelinenumber.pdf>

A paper copy line-numbered version will also be available at the meeting.

ITEM 1 FOR DISCUSSION:

SECTION 7.11 APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE 12/8/06 FOR INCLUSION AS PART OF THE PACKAGE OF TENURE CODE CHANGES TO BE BROUGHT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

7.11 General Criteria. What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each candidate has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both.(fn X) This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service.(fn 5) The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision.(fn Y) Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, and technology transfer will be taken into consideration in evaluating the candidate's satisfaction of criteria. Such contributions can involve scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service based on one's academic expertise. But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.

(fn X) "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus.

(fn 5) The persons responsible and the process for making this determination are described in subsections 7.3 through 7.6.

"Scholarly research" must include significant publications and, as appropriate, the development and dissemination by other means of new technology or scientific procedures resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society.

"Teaching" is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes extension and outreach education, and other forms of communicating knowledge to both registered University students and persons in the extended community, as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.

"Service" may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one's academic expertise, is that provided to the profession or to the local, state, national, or international community. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, and related contributions to one's department or college, or the University. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.

(fn Y) Indefinite tenure may be granted at any time the candidate has satisfied the requirements. A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria in the last year of probationary service and may be terminated earlier if the appointee is not making satisfactory progress within that period toward meeting the criteria.

ITEM 2 FOR DISCUSSION:

SECTION 7.12 APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE 12/8/06 FOR INCLUSION AS PART OF THE PACKAGE OF TENURE CODE CHANGES TO BE BROUGHT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

7.12 Departmental Statement (fn 1). Each department or equivalent academic unit must have a document that specifies the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether

candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 7.11 ("General Criteria" for the awarding of indefinite tenure). The document must contain as an appendix the text and footnotes of subsections 7.11 and 9.2 ("Criteria for Promotion to Professor") and must be consistent with the criteria given there but may exceed them. Each departmental statement must be approved by a faculty vote (including both tenured and probationary members), the dean, and other appropriate academic administrators, including the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. The chair or head of each academic unit must provide each of its probationary faculty members with a copy of the Departmental Statement at the beginning of the probationary service.
(fn 1) "Departmental" refers to an academic department or its equivalent, such as division, institute, or unit.

ITEM 3 FOR DISCUSSION:

SECTION 9.2 APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE 12/8/06 FOR INCLUSION AS PART OF THE PACKAGE OF TENURE CODE CHANGES TO BE BROUGHT TO THE FACULTY SENATE (The Committee recognizes that further changes may be made as a result of discussions at the Faculty Senate or Faculty Consultative Committee or as a result of other suggestions, but for now this Committee is setting it aside as at least temporarily finished.)

9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor. The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement.(fn X) This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service.(fn 5) The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, and technology transfer will be taken into consideration in evaluating the candidate's satisfaction of criteria; such contributions can involve scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and discipline-related service.(fn Y) But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.

(fn X) "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus.

(fn 5) The persons responsible and the process for making this determination are described in subsections [to be supplied as equivalent to 7.3 through 7.6 for 7.11].

See the definitions of "scholarly research," "teaching," and "service" in footnote _ , subsection 7.11. A greater contribution in the area of institutional service is expected of candidates for the rank of professor than was expected for the award of tenure.

(fn Y) Not being promoted to the rank of professor will not in itself result in special-post-tenure review of a tenured associate professor.

ITEM 4 FOR DISCUSSION:

SECTION 5.5 APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE 12/8/06 FOR INCLUSION AS PART OF THE PACKAGE OF TENURE CODE CHANGES TO BE BROUGHT TO THE FACULTY SENATE (The Committee recognizes that further changes may be made as a result of discussions at the Faculty Senate or Faculty Consultative Committee or as a result of other suggestions, but for now this Committee is setting it aside as at least temporarily finished.)

5.5 Exception for New Parent or Caregiver, or for Personal Medical Reasons. The maximum period of probationary service will be extended by one year at a time at the request of a probationary faculty member:

1. on the occasion of the birth of that faculty member's child or adoptive/foster placement of a child with that faculty member; or
2. when the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member[2] who has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition. A faculty member may use this provision no more than two times; or
3. when the faculty member has an extended serious illness, injury, or debilitating condition.

The request for extension must be made in writing within one year of the events giving rise to the claim and no later than June 30 preceding the year a final decision would otherwise be made on an appointment with indefinite tenure for that faculty member.

[2] The term "family member" is meant to include a relative, a marital partner, a domestic partner, or an adoptive/foster child.

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

DISCUSSION:

Professor Tom Clayton, Chair of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AF&T), said that his committee felt that the comments from November were helpful and he welcomes further suggestions and specific language changes.

SECTION 7.11

A senator thanked Professor Clayton and his committee for their work on this process. She then commented about service in this section and how it is thought of more generally at the University. This revision makes a distinction between professional and institutional service, which then implies that these two areas will not intersect. This assumption is a problem since it reflects a way of thinking about the community as starting where the campus ends. Faculty need to think of the University as a community and about involving people with expertise in University decisions.

Another senator then said that he still has concerns about the sentence that starts on line 4 and refers to the basis for awarding tenure in 'a national or international reputation.' While this goal might work for the Twin Cities, it will be a problem for some of the coordinate campuses whose focus is on teaching, since it is hard to get national, let alone, international recognition for teaching. He asked that the committee consider alternate language for these cases.

Professor Terry Simon, a AF&T member, said that there is a Morris representative on the committee and she has agreement from faculty at her campus that this language would fit their situation.

Q: All departments have been asked to upgrade their 7.12 statements, but this upgrade is contingent on language in Section 7.11. How can these statements be finished before the final wording in this section is approved?

A: Although units have been asked to produce draft 7.12 statements at this time, before these statements are in final format, wording will have been approved to Section 7.11. This Section is almost complete, with just minor changes made between meetings.

A senator commended the changes that have been made to the service section as it provides more possibilities for those faculty who participate in nontraditional service.

Q: Where does this section address extraordinary professional service?

A: It can depend on the nature of the activity, but fits most likely under professional service. It could also be thought of as teaching or research. The best place to evaluate this type of service is in the department's 7.12 statement, although lines 14-15 also address this question.

A senator questioned the term 'extraordinary ability' and how it fits with the rest of the criteria.

Professor Simon said that there was no language previously to address someone who brings great credit to the University. This language is for special cases when credit is needed.

Q: If someone is an excellent teacher but has a limited record of research, would they be tenured? If the answer is no, then this leads to a reputation of not valuing teaching.

A: No.

A senator said that professional activities alone, even if this service is great, should not be grounds for tenure. He then encouraged more emphasis and stronger language for interdisciplinary activities versus individual efforts.

Another senator said that the term 'extraordinary ability' is vague and what faculty want the most is clarity in the criteria. It seems to create a loophole to still award tenure. Lastly, he could not consider a candidate that would need this phrase to receive tenure. In this case, the language is a solution for a problem that does not exist.

A senator then stated that lines 27-29 appears to make important the development of new technology and not new knowledge. This section also implies that a new technology must have proven value and not just anticipated value.

SECTION 7.12

Q: If there is a disagreement between the 7.12 statement approved by the department and an academic administrators, what is the process for resolution? Does this process recognize the primacy of the faculty in shaping this document?

A: The faculty work these issues out with their department chair/head and the dean before it is sent to the Provost's Office. If there is inconsistency or ambiguity between the 7.12 statement and Section 7.11, then the Provost will negotiate a resolution. The final decision does rest with the Provost.

A senator said that some of the comments made when discussing Section 7.11 could be resolved by creating a strong 7.12 statement.

Q: What is the mechanism that defines future evolution of these documents and where will this be noted?

A: The intention is to have these 7.12 statements reviewed every 10 years. It appears that a footnote that was in a previous version was not included.

SECTION 9.2

Q: In the previous version, language in lines 77-78 was identical to language in 7.11. In this version, language in 7.11 was changed, but not in this Section. Is this correct?

A: This is just a mistake and will be fixed.

A senator commented that it appears that the language is present in Section 9.2, but just appears later in the paragraph.

Q: Will there be language added that calls for a timely review of an associate professor?

A: There is a separate procedures document that will address this issue, as well as unit-specific documents.

A senator noted that timely review should be included in the Code instead of a procedures document.

Q: Where is post-tenure addressed in the Code?

A: It is in Section 7A, which is not for revision at this time. Lines 95-96 were added after receiving comments at the November meeting.

Q: What happens to an associate professor who will never meet the criteria for promotion?

A: The 7.12 statement needs to recognize the work of an associate professor and enable these individuals to be promoted.

SECTION 5.5

A senator questioned the definition of 'relative' and why is it not included in the policy.

Q: Is there a maximum time limit to remain as an assistant professor, with all the possible stoppages of the clock?

A: No.

Professor Carol Chomsky, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that AF&T will consider today's comments and any others that they receive. These sections will be on the April agenda for approval. She urged senators to send language changes in advance of the meeting.

5. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

6. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

FOR INFORMATION:

An item of new business needs to receive a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting to be considered and voted on at the meeting at which it was introduced. If two-thirds majority vote is not reached, the item will be referred to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

MOTION:

To approve the following statement on Faculty Salaries from the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA).

Statement on Faculty Salaries

This disparity in our salaries, compared to peer institutions, has been noted before in Senate statements, as has the University's status as a prime intellectual, scientific, economic, and civic engine of the state, and the devastating effects this disparity causes in matters of recruitment, retention, and general morale for faculty and staff.

Now, however, the University has launched an ambitious goal to take its place among the top three public research institutions in the world. Studies of the correlation between faculty salaries and institutional rankings suggest that this goal will not be met if faculty salaries stay low. Nor can the University achieve its goals, and continue to provide benefits to the state if its staff salaries are not competitive.

While we appreciate the money the Governor has recommended for "Competitive Compensation," we are unable to sit silently and watch as the University's request for general salary funds is struck from its budget request. We call upon the Governor to reconsider his penny-wise logic and give the University the full support needed in helping us achieve great things for the citizens of Minnesota.

Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee February 15, 2007
Endorsed by the Faculty Consultative Committee, February 15, 2007.

**GEOFFREY SIRC, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the rules to consider an item of new business which deals with a resolution by the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA). A vote was taken and the motion was approved to allow the business to be considered.

Professor Carol Chomsky, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), presented a few wording changes to the third paragraph.

Senior Vice President and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan said that the administration and faculty have been at the legislature throughout the last two weeks to make this case in the broader University budget. It appears that legislators are sympathetic to the University's budget and this motion would be well-received by both bodies.

A senator said that the third paragraph is a mistake since it suggests that the justification for a decent raise is that the University will become a top-three research institution. It then devalues what the University does if it is not a top-three research institution.

Another senator stated that this statement was intended as a letter to the Governor and he is uncomfortable suggesting that a salary raise will buy the University a top-three ranking. An academic analysis of what a University does was also not included.

A senator then spoke in favor of the statement, but questioned whether either committee thought about a statement to the Governor on his not funding enhancements to undergraduate and graduate teaching or the libraries. If these other issues were included, it would focus less on faculty wanting increased faculty salaries.

Professor Chomsky said it was not discussed by SCFA and FCC had a brief discussion. She said that today's comments could enhance a letter to the Governor in addition to this resolution.

Professor Martin Sampson, Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that there is a context that this statement does not address. It has to do with the long-run viability of the University's salary structure since most of the top 15 institutions are private. The University competes with these institutions for the same individuals and the state needs to find a way to stop this downward pattern.

A senator stated that the University needs to continue to reinforce that how the University spends its money is in its own hands and not the Governor's. The pattern for departments is that any extra money is used to create a faculty line and not instead to pay current faculty better. The message to send is that the University is disappointed in the way that the Governor appears unwilling to invest in the quality of education.

Another senator suggested that a similar letter be sent to the Regents for them to also lobby for the University.

A senator said it appears that this resolution is more a matter of committee timing than a desire to only advocate for other needs. She proposed a friendly amendment that FCC create a strong statement and send it with this one addressing enhancements to undergraduate and graduate education and library support.

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

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

APPROVED

7. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

