

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 22, 2012
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Chris Cramer (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Caroline Hayes, Walt Jacobs, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Jan McCulloch, James Pacala
- Absent: Elizabeth Boyle, George Sheets, Richard Ziegler
- Guests: Professor Michael Hancher (incoming Committee member); Provost Karen Hanson; Professor Timothy Johnson (chair, Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics); Vice Provost Robert McMaster, Assistant Vice Provost Suzanne Bardouche (Office of Undergraduate Education)
- Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents); Tina Falkner (Academic Support Resources)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Provost Hanson; (2) docket approval; (3) policy changes from the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics; (4) change in application of high school preparation requirements]

1. Discussion with Provost Hanson

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Provost Hanson.

Provost Hanson began by commenting on several matters.

-- She is going through the compact process with the colleges; given that a \$21-million investment pool was announced mid-way through the compacts, some units have sent addenda to their original documents.

-- She met with the Women's Faculty Cabinet about the gender-equity study; now there is need to construct a process to implement the recommendations.

-- She favors faculty-like P&A eligibility for the teaching awards; the question not yet settled is about changing the award from a permanent salary augmentation to a one-time award. Professor Cramer reported that the proposal he and Professor Jacobs had been informed of late last semester is to accept faculty-like P&A eligibility but to change from a \$3000-per-year augmentation to a \$10,000 lump-sum award. That would still leave Minnesota near the top of the CIC in terms of the size of the award, but the change would eventually save considerable money. Provost Hanson said the change would allow for more awards and also allow an increase in the amount given to the advising award winners.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Professor Bearinger noted that in the Academic Health Center faculty members who win a similar award are given a five-year salary augmentation. That could be an option here. Provost Hanson agreed.

Professor McCulloch asked if Provost Hanson envisioned a separate award for faculty-like P&A staff. Provost Hanson said that because of the criteria for the awards, it may be that P&A staff would be at a disadvantage in competition for them, so she thought there would be a separate award. Professor Brothen reported that the two faculty-like P&A staff on the Senate Committee on Educational Policy felt strongly that if they are doing the same work as the faculty, they should be eligible for the same award, and they were absolutely adamant that they did not want a separate award, which would be seen as second-class.

Professor Cramer noted that in evaluating candidates, the nominating committee is to evaluate them in a number of areas, and while candidates need not have an outstanding record in every area, they do need to be outstanding in more than just one (i.e., teaching alone is insufficient). One of his departmental colleagues was a P&A staff member who was converted to a contract faculty appointment and she was a finalist for the undergraduate teaching award this year. He said he believes that faculty-like P&A staff can compete successfully for the award.

Professor Ben-Ner commented that it would be strange to reward the contributor, not the contribution.

Provost Hanson said that she had understood that it would be easier for tenured and tenure-track faculty members to meet the criteria for the award because some employees do not do work in all areas identified by the award criteria. Professor Chomsky clarified that there is no formal "faculty-like" appointment category at the University; that is a category developed for the purposes of the Senate and the decision about who is "faculty-like" is decided at the unit level, given the description established by the Senate. Care must be taken about the categories and attention paid to the consistency of the definition across the campus for purposes of the award. Professor Pacala said it is also important to recognize that faculty-like P&As are not all equal across the University and it should not be considered a given that regular faculty have an advantage in competing for the award; in the Medical School, the faculty-like P&A staff could have the advantage.

Professor May said that in the liberal arts nationally (although not at Minnesota), some departments are hiring more part-time, adjunct, and contract faculty members, more and more of them with Ph.D.s, so there need to be clear criteria and anyone teaching (who is not a student) should be eligible for the award. In terms of fairness and the potential change in the financial support that comes with the award, older faculty members who receive the augmentation do not receive the same benefit as a younger faculty member who wins, so the change in the nature of the award affects different people differently. Perhaps the amount could be spread over several years, if there are tax consequences, or perhaps some could be provided for research and travel, and would then not be taxable. The recipient should have as much flexibility as possible in deciding how to receive the award funds.

Professor Cramer said that one option for the funds would be to use a portion to pay salary. Part of the desire to get rid of the centrally administered augmentation, he said, as it is a challenge for Human Resources, which has to track it as a separate appointment initiated by departmental accounting staff. The idea of the lump-sum award is to provide an account from which an individual can withdraw funds for

any use that conforms to University rules. With respect to the idea of a separate award and potential unequal representation in winning, he recalled that the P&A members of the Faculty Senate had applauded him on the floor of the Senate meeting when he advocated one award for both faculty and P&A staff. Provost Hanson observed that at her previous institution there was a separate award that was not seen as second class and that had slightly different criteria for winning. She said she will be speaking with the P&A Senate and will learn their views.

Professor Cramer suggested that Provost Hanson bring any final proposal to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.

Professor May offered another observation. Many have noticed, with respect to awards in general (the teaching awards are a prime example), that the amount of time, energy, and paper required to make a nomination is daunting. She has had colleagues refuse to be nominated for the teaching awards because they did not want someone else to have to do all that work—and they did not want to have to do all the work that would be required of them as well. Some departments have a committee that nominates people for many awards—and those people win awards. Other departments are idiosyncratic in their approach; they have world-class teachers but no one nominates them for an award. Or it may be that someone generates his or her own nomination, gathers the letters needed, and so on. She said she did not know how to address the problem but said it is an issue. Provost Hanson concurred.

Professor Cramer recalled that he chaired such a committee in his department. They asked someone last year to be nominated; he declined because of the work involved. He agreed to be nominated this year because the committee told him to view it from the perspective of being good for the department's reputation. He won one of the teaching awards.

In some cases the approach can change with the chair, Professor May observed, so there is no consistency. There are distinguished departments that have never won awards because it is not part of their culture to nominate. In others it is part of the culture and they also have in place a process to submit nominations.

Professor Ericksen wondered if the change in the form of compensation for the award might affect participation in the Academy of Distinguished Teachers. With annual compensation, people might feel more compelled to participate than if they receive one amount or a three-year award.

-- Professor Cramer inquired if Provost Hanson had any update on the gender-equity recommendations. She does not, Dr. Hanson said. She and President Kaler met with the Women's Faculty Cabinet to discuss their recommendations, and the original report, but the detail about implementation are still to be worked out.

Professor Hayes reported that she had met with Provost Hanson on March 6, after a discussion by the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC). Based on the view of various faculty groups, the WFC recommended that the Academic Health Center be included and that under-represented groups in addition to women should be included in the initial salary adjustment reviews. President Kaler responded by asking how many individual reviews would be needed if more than women were included, and whether there was evidence of a need given that the WFC and Clayton studies only looked at men and women.

Provost Hanson said that a thoughtful process is needed to look at inequities for other categories; her view is that if an effective process is set up in response to the recommendations about gender equity, that process will allow others to raise concerns. And there should be a standing salary-equity review mechanism. She said she did not mean to say that other categories should not be looked at.

One idea that has been expressed at meetings of this Committee, Professor Bearinger said, is about how to bring an inequity to light. It should not be left only to the individual to do so; there needs to be a mechanism to review salaries. She said she is concerned that the University not delegate authority and responsibility to the unit—because doing so assumes the unit was not the cause of the inequity in the first place. But there is the question of judging faculty performance by others who are not in that disciplinary area, Provost Hanson pointed out. Professor Bearinger said that faculty members from other units can be identified. First the inequity must be identified, Dr. Hanson said, and that must occur outside the normal salary-setting mechanism, although it must still be informed by the standards of the discipline. Professor Bearinger said that comparisons must be in rank.

Once it has been decided there is an inequity within a unit, is it the unit's responsibility to resolve it, Professor Bearinger asked? If the individual must come forward, that replicates the problem. Dr. Hanson said she assumed there would be mechanisms employed (that could include consideration of other inequities as well) that would be different from the normal salary process and that used disciplinary standards. The question is how University-level analysis would empower individuals, Professor Bearinger said.

Professor Hayes said that in consideration of the concern that Dr. Bearinger raised, while recognizing, as Provost Hanson pointed out, that the unit has the specific disciplinary knowledge needed for an assessment, the WFC recommendations suggest that for departmental reviews, one committee member should come from outside the unit. Dr. Hanson agreed that might be one solution; her concern, she said, is the amount of faculty work that could go into these reviews.

Professor Cramer suggested that, apropos of the comments of Professor Bearinger, there should be a trigger. The use of regression analysis allows one to predict the salary for everyone; if someone is more than X standard deviations from the mean, that could automatically trigger a review obviating any need for a direct request from the individual.

Professor Bitterman said the analysis should not be done only at the level of the individual. It can also be done by unit and groups of units so that it is possible to see systemic problems. One could use such analysis to look at systemic bias. Professor Bearinger noted that her home appointment is in a college that is composed of faculty members, the vast majority of whom are women, so comparisons cannot be within the school in that case. They have postdocs from another college who are making more than some of the faculty in her college.

Professor Bearinger also noted that the job-classification studies are underway and some of the categories have been completed. There has been a lot of consideration about how to set salaries within a classification; one question is whether they looked across job classes. There lies another gender-equity issue, she surmised, if comparisons across classes are not made. Those comparisons should be made before the new classifications are rolled out.

What is also relevant is who should pay for the initial adjustment if there has been a determination that inequity exists, Professor Hayes said. The department should pay for some of it, but not all, because that might lead to an incentive to never find anything wrong. So perhaps a central pool of funds could be set up for the initial round of adjustments. Or there could be more oversight, Provost Hanson said; it runs against the grain to reward discrimination with central funds.

Provost Hanson had to leave, but as she did so she asked Committee members to think about the implications of moving to three semesters. Professor Cramer thanked her for joining the meeting.

2. Docket Approval

The Committee approved the April 5 Faculty Senate docket unanimously.

3. Policy Changes from the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA)

Professor Cramer welcomed Professor Johnson to the meeting to review proposed changes to 11 policies or procedures governing intercollegiate, to gain approval for eliminating 3 policies, and to provide information about the hearing process for student-athletes in certain circumstances.

Professor Johnson began with the Policy on Scheduling and explained that the only change is in the guidelines and timelines for submitting competition and travel schedules to FAOCIA and how academic plans will be submitted in the case that teams are away for more than two class days in a week.

Professor May said that she objected to the entire set of policies around student-athletes. She is in non-compliance because she refuses to report on the performance of student-athletes in her classes, because she does not believe in having second-class students who are subject to different policies than other students. All students in her classes are treated the same. If they miss class they must make up the work or they will be penalized, whether they are athletes or not. Professor Johnson said he could not change Professor May's mind but said he did not see student-athletes as second-class students just because a report about their academic performance is requested. Professor May responded that she was not suggesting that the so-called "student-athletes" are second class students, but that the rest of the students are second class because they do not get the same attention as the athletes. Her position is that all students should be treated the same and she does not support policies that apply to some group of students but not to all students. She simply offers all her students the same opportunities as the athletes. That's only fair, she said. Professor Johnson said that athletics is part of the University and she is in violation of University policy, which he said is a shame. If someone is a member of the debate team and the team makes it to the national championships, that would be a University-sponsored event and faculty are required to make allowance for the participants. It is the students who are punished for Professor May's stance.

But these are athletes, not poets or musicians or debaters, who are tutored and watched over, Professor May responded. All students should have the same access to the support available to athletes. Athletics is part of the University, Professor Johnson reiterated, and he noted that he came from a family that valued both athletics and music. He took the position of chair of FAOCIA because he believes both athletics and academics are important. He agreed that the University should have student-thespians, but it doesn't. Most of the student-athletes have good grades, he said, and he added that he had the same view

that Professor May has when he came to the University but has since changed his mind because this is one University and it needs to help these young men and women get through..

Professor May said she believes student-athletes are exploited because they are frequently removed from classes for athletic events and they are required to spend so much time in athletic training that they are not able to take full advantage of the educational opportunities the University offers. Professor Johnson said that claim is factually inaccurate.

Professor Chomsky returned the discussion to the Policy on Scheduling, raised a question about wording, and agreed to work with Professor Johnson to clarify the intent. In response to a question about the relationship between the University and NCAA rules, Professor Johnson said that a number of the policies are focused on the University or FAOCIA (such as the requirement that a team must appeal to FAOCIA if it will miss more than 9 class days during a semester). In general, he said, where there are both University and Big Ten and/or NCAA rules, the University's rules are more stringent.

Professor Pacala asked what process ensures the accountability of the FAOCIA chair in approving academic plans for student-athletes who will be away from campus more than two days in a week. There isn't any formal review, but accountability is assured because it is not a secret process where the chair of FAOCIA has total control and invisibility, Professor Johnson said: Ms. Holleran, who runs the advising center for student-athletes, provides copies of the plans to the Director of Compliance, Mr. Bruett, and to the staff member who works with FAOCIA, Ms. Courtney. He reads the plans, and if something looks odd, he will tell Ms. Holleran that it is necessary for FAOCIA to review it. He tells the coaches that he likes athletics but that he feels very strongly about academics and that the University cannot allow a gap between them.

The full committee also receives a report on class days missed, Professor Cramer noted from the policy. Professor Johnson said that in addition, Associate Athletic Director Sullivan provides a report on the exact number of days missed by each student-athlete. FAOCIA also ensures that the teams are not scheduling competition when they should not be—and in one case required a team to cancel participation in an event.

Professor Johnson told the Committee that two of the four policies that are being eliminated, Big Ten and NCAA rules now supersede them and render them nugatory. One of the others is eliminated because it refers to a University program that no longer exists; the other, concerning an award to be given each year, was also obsolete.

Professor Johnson reported that he also receives all grade changes for all student-athletes. The list is sent to about five people for review. (Actually, he said, he receives all grade changes for all students on the campus and has to look down the correct column of the spreadsheet to find the student-athletes.) In only one case while he has been on FAOCIA has the committee called a faculty member to a meeting when it found that all the student-athletes in the course received certain grades in a distance-education course. As it turned out, the grades made sense, but the University does want a chair who will be attentive to these kinds of issues.

Professor Chomsky commented that in the Law School, no grade changes are allowed unless there has been an arithmetical error in computation. Are grade changes common? Most of them are changes of an Incomplete to a grade, Professor Johnson said. There has been a culture change in this

area; before Ms. Holleran became director of academic advising for athletics, if a student-athlete was failing a course, he or she could be signed up for an IDL course and would then have 9 months to complete it. Now IDL courses are only used as supplements.

Professor Johnson next explained the complexities of GPA eligibility standards, how the University's standard is higher than that of the Big Ten and the NCAA, and how the two are calculated differently (e.g., the Big Ten counts an "I" as an "F"). In some cases a student-athlete may be eligible under Big Ten and NCAA rules but not under University rules; if the coach and the athletic director wish, they may ask FAOCIA for a waiver from the University standard. They do not rubber-stamp such requests and insist on a contract with the student; they have been overwhelmingly successful with students completing the contracts. The changes being recommended to this policy are intended to ensure that the University's standards remain in place.

Professor Johnson explained briefly changes to policies on awards, on reporting rules violations, on computers in locker rooms; he also touched on review of conduct guidelines, the process for search and advisory committee membership, and on the selection and responsibilities of the Faculty Athletics Representatives (to the Big Ten and NCAA).

Professor Cramer asked that the policies be distributed again to Committee members before a final vote is taken to approve them (or not). He thanked Professor Johnson for joining the meeting.

4. Change in Application of High School Preparation Requirements

Professor Cramer now welcomed Vice Provost McMaster and Assistant Vice Provost Bardouche to the meeting to discuss a proposed change in the way the University deals with high school preparation requirements. The proposal was approved by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. Committee members were provided a summary document (between the * * *)

* * *

High School Preparation Requirements Viewed as a "Graduation Requirement"

Current policies and practice on the Twin Cities campus:

If undergraduate students (both new freshmen and new transfer students) are admitted without having completed the stated high school preparation requirements for the campus, they are required to make up the missing requirements during their undergraduate career prior to being cleared for graduation.

The policy on *High School Preparation Requirements for Undergraduates*, <http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/HIGHSCHOOLPREP.html>, states the current HS requirements for students seeking admission to the Twin Cities campus. The FAQs following the policy note the current practices regarding if students may be admitted with a missing requirement and how missing requirements are tracked and made up.

The policy on *Admissions for Undergraduates*, <http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/ADMISSIONS.html>, mentions conditional admission and uses missing high school preparation requirements as a possible example of "conditional admission to graduate." This policy notes in #2 that "Each college will set the criteria and standards that

are to be used by the Admissions Office in admitting both New High School and New Advanced Standing students to the college.” These standards are in addition to the HS preps (e.g., CSE requires specific levels of calculus, physics, and chemistry).

Proposed change to policy language and practice:

If a student has been admitted with a missing HS prep, do not require the student to satisfy it as a requirement for graduation. HS preps will continue to be tracked and noted on a student’s record by Admissions. The “missing HS preps” service indicators will still be visible to advisers, to help inform the advising considerations for each student.

In *High School Preparation Requirements for Undergraduates*, make two changes: First, delete the FAQ regarding making up the missing HS requirements. Second, in the Responsibilities section, for the Academic Adviser, remove the requirement of checking on the HS requirements as part of graduation clearance. Academic Adviser responsibilities would read “Advise students on the coursework needed to satisfy their campus, college, and degree requirements, taking into account the student’s prior coursework and background, including high school and any courses at the college level.”

In *Admissions for Undergraduates*, delete the sentence referring to missing high school preparation requirements as an example of conditional admission to graduate: (e.g., that any deficiencies in satisfying high school preparation requirements are made up).

Background and Reasons for Change:

Fundamentally, we admit students because we believe they can be successful, based on a holistic review of their application materials, and using the standards developed by the University and the colleges. The high school prep requirements were developed for each campus to assure a minimum level of preparedness and a breadth of knowledge, and most NHS students admitted will have met all of them. However, we regularly admit some students who do not meet all of the high school preparation expectations, often because their high school did not offer courses that met all of the exact requirements, or due to other special circumstances.

For fall semester 2011 and spring semester 2012, 93.1% of the new freshmen students and 85.4% of the new transfer students had met all of the HS preps. Only 371 of 5,375 new freshmen and 418 of 2,862 new transfer students had not; the vast majority of the missing requirements were either the visual/performing arts or the two years of a single second language.

The University of Minnesota Liberal Education and Writing Intensive requirements ensure that students have been exposed to and developed skills and knowledge in a breadth of areas by the time they graduate, along with demonstrating through major coursework and grades that they have mastered the body of knowledge related to their major(s).

In the case of transfer students, their holistic review also includes their college coursework at other institutions. A logistical problem is created for advisers and students because the high school transcripts for transfer students are often transmitted to the Office of Admissions well after the admissions decision is made and even after orientation and registration have occurred; this delay means that our transfer students may not be aware that they could face additional requirements based on missing HS preps.

* * *

Vice Provost McMaster explained that if students arrive at the University without having completed every one of the high school requirements (about 5% of students admitted), current practice is that they must complete them before they graduate from the University of Minnesota. This requirement becomes an impediment to timely graduation for a number of students. Undergraduate advisers, the associate deans for undergraduate education, and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy have all endorsed the proposed change in this practice.

Ms. Bardouche reiterated the point that the vast majority of incoming students have met the preparation standards, more so than a number of years ago (in part because admission to the University is now so much more competitive). Moreover, the University admits a large number of transfer students who have been doing well in college, but advisers are nonetheless supposed to go back and identify which of the high school requirements have not been completed. Students who are home-schooled, or who have moved around a lot (e.g., the children of parents in the military), or who come from under-funded districts that were not able to provide for the classes needed (or did provide them but at conflicting times) are all examples of students who might not have met every one of the high school preps.

In terms of uncoupling admissions and graduation standards, which is what this proposal seeks to accomplish, colleges and majors set admissions standards beyond the University's baseline; they also set graduation requirements beyond the liberal-education requirements and other campus-wide requirements. If a college or major believes that a student must have two years of a language, it can require it as a collegiate requirement or as a requirement for the major. This proposal only provides that there will not be University-wide enforcement of high school preparation requirements as a graduation requirement.

Ms. Bardouche reported that this fall, in four of the undergraduate-admitting colleges, a total of 18 students had not completed the high school preparation requirement for two consecutive years of instruction in the same language—and 8 of those students were admitted to CLA, so they will have to make it up in any case in order to graduate with a B.A.

Professor May said the proposal makes perfectly good sense to her, but she urged that students be strongly encouraged to take courses in the visual and performing arts. She noted the example of a student of hers who had not met the requirement and was forced to do so; the student intensely disliked having to take the extra course (which she took in playwriting)—and the course changed her life to the extent that she became a playwright. The requirement "is a good thing." Dr. McMaster said there will be a little bit of slippage, but only in the case of a few students out of the roughly 7000 who graduate each year. And they will continue to track missing high school requirements, Ms. Bardouche explained, so the information will be on the record and available to advisers.

Professor Pacala said he was uncomfortable with the word "requirements"; a requirement is a requirement, but this sounds like it isn't. If there are problems with the visual arts or language requirement, they should be dropped. But isn't the diploma supposed to mean something? Dr. McMaster said that the University's degree signifies what the student took at the University; the proposed change provides that the University will have more flexibility in dealing with high school preparation requirements. The University does allow substitutes (such as with a liberal-education course). But this change would not undercut educational quality, he said.

At present the admissions staff decide who to admit, Professor Cramer said, and they allow some variation. Once the student is at the University, it is a tabula rasa. How is it decided to admit a student who has not met every one of the high school prep requirements, Professor Chomsky inquired? By individual decisions? Dr. McMaster said that is correct; the admissions staff may conclude that someone is a terrific student and should be admitted even without having completed all the requirements. So they come in with a debt and some are occasionally given a waiver, Professor Hancher concluded. That is not correct; the students are required to take the missing course in most cases, Dr. McMaster said. Is this for everyone or made only on petition, Professor Hancher asked? For everyone, Ms. Bardouche said. So there could be an option to require a petition and waiver, Professor Hancher pointed out.

Professor Luepker inquired about the number of students who would not have to fulfill the requirements. It would be small because admission is so competitive, Ms. Bardouche said. And he did not expect to see any change in behavior at the high school level simply because the University slightly loosens the way it treats the preparation requirements, Dr. McMaster added. But programs in the arts are being cut, Professor May observed.

The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the proposal, with one abstention.

Professor Cramer thanked Vice Provost McMaster and Ms. Bardouche and adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota