

**2011-12 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**MARCH 1, 2012**

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 3**  
**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 3**  
**STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 3**

The third meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2011-12 was convened in Coffman Theatre on Thursday, March 1, 2012, at 2:30 p.m., as a joint meeting of the two bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 25 academic professional members, 16 civil service members, 130 faculty/academic professional members, and 24 student members. Vice Chair Carol Chomsky presided.

**1. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**  
**FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**Statement of Appreciation for Senior Vice President and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan**  
**Information for the Faculty Senate**

Statement of Appreciation for Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee expresses its deep appreciation to Tom Sullivan for his seven years of leadership as Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost at the University of Minnesota. We commend his consistent efforts to strengthen academic freedom at the University, his tireless support of faculty governance, and his constant efforts to strengthen the academic base that sustains the tenure policy as a cornerstone of the University. We welcome him back to the faculty as a colleague and thank him for his abiding dedication to the University.

Adopted unanimously December 16, 2011

Endorsed unanimously by the Faculty Consultative Committee December 20, 2011

**BARBARA ELLIOTT, CO-CHAIR**  
**ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

**CHRISTINE MARRAN, CO-CHAIR**  
**ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR**  
**FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**2. RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**Statement on the Value and Measurement of Scholarship at the University of Minnesota**  
**Whether or Not Externally Funded**  
**Information for the Faculty Senate**

**The Value and Measurement of Scholarship at the University of Minnesota**  
**Whether or Not Externally Funded**

**Faculty productivity at the University.** The academic productivity of the University's faculty contributes substantially to the community, the state, the nation, and the world. The University's

tri-fold mission—research, teaching, and service—guides faculty work. All of us are expected to generate and advance new ideas and creative work that can lead to new therapies, innovations in economic and business sectors, better understandings of human behavior, improvements in methods of interaction with our environment and the global world, and other societal advances. Teaching and research are in synergy at the University; achievement in one promotes achievement in the other. Together they constitute proven means of yielding graduates with the knowledge and tools for innovation in the work place, professionals who can effectively respond to human needs, and scholars who quicken the pace of discovery. Why are we able to deliver on our mission? Our faculties are researchers, working artists, authors, and leaders who are actively engaged in expanding the boundaries of their respective fields. The goals of education are not merely the acquisition of knowledge but also the learned ability to discover and create new knowledge. In other words, experienced researchers and students they educate drive discovery. Our goal is to convert students from consumers of knowledge to generators of knowledge.

The productivity of all faculty members at the University has value, whether externally funded or not. The U.S. research enterprise has grown rapidly since World War II to become the most creative and productive research enterprise in the history of humankind. This enterprise, facilitated in part by sponsored research that supports the creativity of individual investigators, has helped develop medical and scientific innovations that save lives and provide employment. But equating innovations with sponsored funding is misguided; it is not money alone but ideas that expand the boundaries of both the arts and sciences. This rapid advancement of the enterprise has also been driven by scholars with little more than access to a good library and pen and pencil. Those in the humanities and arts operate with little financial support yet their scholarly work—symphonies, books, performances, and exhibits, to name a few—has a dramatic impact on our students, our communities, and culture as a whole.

**Productivity is rigorously evaluated.** University faculties have a tradition of and continuously benefit from highly critical local, national, and international review. University policy requires that colleges annually review all faculty, tenured or not. Evaluations focus on scholarly productivity, quality of teaching, and breadth and reach of service. Scholarly outputs, such as articles, books, presentations, patents, and various art forms, are forms of faculty productivity, externally funded or not. To gain tenure, scholars must submit their work for review by experts from other universities who must judge the national and international impact of the scholarship and magnitude of contribution to the arts and sciences. After tenure, professors continue to have annual evaluations of the quality of their work.

Productivity at this University has never been greater in both quantity and quality. The bar is higher to reach tenure than in the 1980s and 90s, and an effective process for post-tenure review is in place at the University of Minnesota to ensure continuing faculty productivity. In addition, the rigor in measuring educational success has also dramatically increased and improved. The intensity and quality of faculty evaluations by their students and peers have become mandatory and more effective. Students have more contact with professors; new and more effective teaching methods are practiced, and internet-based classroom management systems have created more transparency and given more control to students.

At a time in the U.S. when all enterprises must assure the impact and quality of investment, externally funded or not, the University of Minnesota has in place a diverse array of methods for ongoing measurement of our capacity and our progress in assuring value and fulfilling the University's mission.

#### **COMMENT:**

The Faculty Consultative Committee requested the Senate Research Committee to prepare a statement on the value of scholarship irrespective of whether it receives external support.

Adopted unanimously January 25, 2012.

**LINDA BEARINGER, CHAIR  
RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**3. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
Amendments to the Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Emeriti, Administrative Policy on  
The Title of Emeritus/Emerita for Retired Faculty, and the Administrative Procedure on  
Conferring the Title of Faculty Emeriti/Emeritae  
Information for the Faculty Senate**

**BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY  
FACULTY EMERITI**

...

**SECTION III. FACULTY EMERITUS TITLE.**

**Subd. 1. Title.** In recognition of years of valued service and contribution to the institution, the University awards the title *emeritus* to a faculty member who meets the standards of a faculty emeritus as defined in this policy. The emeritus title will be of the rank held by the faculty member at the time of retirement. Granting the title does not provide employment status or employee rights.

**Subd. 2. Special Circumstances.** Under special circumstances, the following may apply:

(a) On the recommendation of the president, the Board of Regents may award the title of *emeritus* to a faculty member not meeting the definition, or make a promotion in the emeritus rank.

(b) The president, following notice to the faculty member and an opportunity to be heard on the issue, may withhold or withdraw the emeritus title in circumstances: (1) where a faculty member has retired during suspension or termination proceedings initiated under Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; or (2) where evidence presented to the president demonstrates that the faculty member has engaged in conduct that violates the standards of Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*.

...

**ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY: The Title of Emeritus/Emerita for Retired Faculty**

...

**CONTINUED RELATIONSHIP WITH THE UNIVERSITY**

An academic department, service, or other administrative unit may enter into a volunteer or contractual agreement with a faculty member emeritus/emera to provide services subject to terms of the contract and applicable laws and rules as referenced in Section VI of Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Emeriti*.

## **WITHHOLDING OR WITHDRAWING THE EMERITUS/EMERITA TITLE**

The president, following notice to the faculty member and an opportunity to be heard on the issue, may withhold or withdraw the emeritus/emerita title in circumstances: (1) where a faculty member has retired during suspension or termination proceedings initiated under Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure or (2) where evidence presented to the president demonstrates that the faculty member has engaged in conduct that violates the standards of Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure.

## **INFORMAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

If a faculty member emeritus/emerita has a complaint arising under Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Emeriti and this administrative policy and procedures, it will be resolved by an informal process. The faculty member emeritus/emerita can request review by the administrative level above that of the administrator that caused the complaint (e.g., at the college/campus level when the dispute concerns a decision by a department chair/head). Requests for reviews are to be made in a timely manner. Decisions made to withhold or withdraw emeritus/emerita status made to the faculty member, following notice and an opportunity to be heard, are not subject to further review.

...

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE: Conferring the Title of Faculty Emeriti/Emeritae**

...

## **WITHHOLDING OR WITHDRAWING EMERITUS/EMERITA TITLE**

- The president receives a recommendation with evidence to either withhold or withdraw the emeritus/emerita title based on the particular circumstances.
- If the president, upon review of the recommendation, is considering withholding or withdrawing the title, the president provides to the faculty or retired member notice and an opportunity to be heard in accordance with Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Emeriti, Section III, Subd. 2(b).
- Following the faculty member's or retired faculty member's opportunity to be heard, the president makes a decision with regard to withholding or withdrawing the emeritus/emerita title.
- The president provides a written report to the faculty member explaining the decision.
- Should the emeritus/emerita title be withheld or withdrawn, the services and privileges accorded that title, beyond retired status, should not be provided.

## **COMMENT:**

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs reviewed and endorsed these changes to the policy and procedures.

**GEORGE SHEETS, CHAIR  
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

## **4. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that since the Faculty Senate last convened, FCC has met eight times and addresses a number of issues.

FCC had the opportunity to meet with Vice President Kathy Brown and hear about that office's strategic planning exercise. Topics of particular interest include diversity, equity, and work on the job family classification study, a topic of particular interest to staff.

They also spoke with then-Provost Sullivan about current practices for decanal reviews. The context of that discussion was shared with the new Provost, Karen Hanson. FCC is hoping to encourage widespread collegiate or organizational participation in reviews while acknowledging the need to balance frank feedback with the privacy required in the personnel process.

FCC has also struggled with the question of the University's budget model and collegiate curricular decisions. Focus has been placed on how the model for distributing tuition dollars has led to distortions in curricular development. They endorsed the formation of a faculty committee to advise the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education on these matters. FCC is also discussing issues associated with the liberal-education requirements.

In the last two months the committee has met with a number of department chairs. Themes from these meetings were then shared with the President and Provost, and will be shared with the Council of Deans. The one topic discussed the most was the process by which graduate programs received portions of their funding. He reported that recent consultation suggests that progress is being made towards a process that will be more consistent with shared goals across the broadest scope of graduate programs.

## **5. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS UPDATE**

Professor Elizabeth Boyle, one of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons along with Professor Caroline Hayes, stated that they have been working to establish relations with legislators and supporting the University's bonding bill request. They have been at four hearings for the University at which stories from both graduate students and alumni have been shared regarding the need for building renovations. President Kaler has also been at two hearings to share his vision for the University and the commitment to students. They are planning meet-and-greet sessions for faculty and legislators and campus building tours to build excitement for the University's request.

## **6. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT Adding Rochester as a Voting Unit Action by the Faculty Senate**

### **MOTION:**

To amend Article III, Section 1(a) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (79) 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 III. FACULTY SENATE MEMBERSHIP, ELECTIONS, AND OFFICERS (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Faculty Senate)**

#### **1. Membership and Voting Units**

a. For the purpose of electing representatives and alternate representatives, if any, to the Faculty Senate, qualified faculty members and qualified academic staff shall vote within each of the following units of the University, except as noted in section II(1)(b), below:

TWIN CITIES: Biological Sciences; Continuing Education; Dentistry; Design; Education and Human Development; Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences; Law; Liberal Arts; Libraries; Management; Medical School; University of Minnesota Extension Service; Nursing; Pharmacy; Public Affairs; Public Health; Technology; Veterinary Medicine

CROOKSTON

DULUTH: Other [includes non-collective bargaining faculty/academic staff from UMD].

MORRIS

ROCHESTER

**COMMENT:**

The number of faculty and faculty-like P&A staff has reached the number stipulated in the constitution for membership in the Senate (10), so the Faculty Consultative Committee recommends adding Rochester to the list of units entitled to Senate membership. This does not change the total number of faculty senators (155).

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR  
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**DISCUSSION:**

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 93 votes in favor and none opposed.

**APPROVED**

**7. NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE TWIN CITIES MEMBERS OF THE  
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**Slate of Candidates**

**Action by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation and UMD Faculty Senators**

**MOTION:**

To approve the following six people to stand for election to the Faculty Consultative Committee, from which one of each pair are to be elected by the Twin Cities and non-represented UMD faculty for a term of 2012-15. First pair: Professors James Cloyd and Paul Olin; Second Pair: Professors Scott McConnell and Rebecca Ropers-Huilman; Third Pair: Professors Brian Buhr and Sally Gregory Kohlstedt. A simple majority is required for approval.

**FIRST PAIR**

**JAMES CLOYD:** 1976\*, Professor of Experimental and Clinical Pharmacology, College of Pharmacy. University Senate member: 2010-13. Senate Committee participation (past and present): None.

**PAUL OLIN:** 1984\*, Associate Professor of Restorative Sciences, School of Dentistry. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation (past and present): AHC Faculty Consultative, 2006-12 (Vice Chair, 2010-12); AHC Finance and Planning, 2006-11 (Chair: 2007-11); Finance and Planning, Ex Officio, 2007-11.

SECOND PAIR

**SCOTT MCCONNELL:** 1986\*, Professor of Educational Psychology, College Education and Human Development. University Senate member: 1996-98, 2002-05. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Faculty Consultative, Ex Officio: 2001-02; Research, 1997-2003 (Chair: 2001-02); Support Services, 1992-94.

**REBECCA ROPERS-HUILMAN:** 2007\*, Professor of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development, College of Education and Human Development. University Senate member: None. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Faculty Affairs, 2009-10.

THIRD PAIR

**BRIAN BUHR:** 1992\*, Professor of Applied Economics, College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences. University Senate member: 2003-06. Senate Committee participation (past and present): None.

**SALLY GREGORY KOHLSTEDT:** 1989\*, Professor of History of Science and Technology, College of Science and Engineering. University Senate member: 1995-1999, 2003-06, 2010-13. Senate Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 1997-2000; Faculty Consultative, Spring 2012; Council on Liberal Education, 2008-10.

-----  
\*Date of initial appointment at the University.

**FOR INFORMATION:**

The Faculty Consultative Committee serves as the executive committee of the Faculty Senate and forms the faculty membership of the Senate Consultative Committee. Senate legislation has merged the Twin Cities faculty and non-represented UMD faculty for purposes of Faculty Consultative Committee elections. Should a non-represented UMD faculty member be elected, that individual will be a member of the Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees.

Additional nominations of eligible faculty, 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; (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. If the nominees are paired, any additional nomination shall specify against which pair the nominee will run. The clerk of the Senate shall present the slate to the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation for its approval. In the event there are additional nominations, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation will reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected by voting by secret ballot. The slate as approved shall be presented to the faculty for an election

Currently serving with terms continuing at least through next year are:

- Avner Ben-Ner, Carlson School of Management
- Peter Bitterman, Medical School
- Nancy Ehlke, College of Agricultural, Food, and Natural Resource Sciences
- Walt Jacobs, College of Liberal Arts
- Elaine Tyler May, College of Liberal Arts
- James Pacala, Medical School

The terms of Christopher Cramer (College of Science and Engineering), Jan McCulloch (College of Education and Human Development), and Kathryn VandenBosch (College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences) expire at the end of the academic year.

**CAROL CHOMSKY, CHAIR  
NOMINATING SUBCOMMITTEE**

**DISCUSSION:**

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

**APPROVED**

**8. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
Administrative Policy on Readmission and Changes to Master’s  
or Doctoral Degree Objectives  
Action by the Faculty Senate**

**ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY  
Readmission and Changes to Master’s or Doctoral Degree Objectives**

<b>Policy Contents</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Policy Statement</b></li><li>• <b>Reason for Policy</b></li><li>• <b>Procedures</b></li><li>• <b>Forms/Instructions</b></li><li>• <b>Additional Contacts</b></li><li>• <b>Definitions</b></li><li>• <b>Responsibilities</b></li><li>• <b>Appendices</b></li><li>• <b>FAQ</b></li><li>• <b>Related Information</b></li><li>• <b>History</b></li></ul>	<b>Effective Date:</b> Month, YYYY <b>Last Updated:</b> Month, YYYY  <b>Responsible University Officer:</b> Sr. VP for Academic Affairs and Provost  <b>Policy Owner:</b> Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education  <b>Policy Contact:</b> Dean Tsantir
--	--

---

**POLICY STATEMENT**

Graduate programs make all decisions about readmission, change of degree objective, or addition of degree objective. Programs have the discretion to require a full admissions application from a student requesting a new or additional degree objective.

**I. Readmission**

Students whose active student status has lapsed and who wish to resume graduate work must seek readmission to their graduate program. Readmission is not guaranteed, and colleges and programs may add conditions to the readmission (e.g., course grades older than a specified number of years may not be included in the degree plan).

**II. Change or Addition of Degree Objective within the Same Program**



Currently enrolled graduate students who wish to change or add a degree objective (e.g., add the doctoral degree in the same program in which they are completing a master's degree) must request the change or addition of degree objective. The student's graduate program must either approve or deny the request.

- If the change is to a lesser degree (e.g., to a master's degree from a doctoral degree) in the same program to which the student was admitted, the student must still request a change of degree objective (see Procedures for Readmission/Change or Addition of Degree Objective and Associated Requirements).

### **III. Change or Addition of Degree Objective within the Same College**

Currently enrolled graduate students who wish to change to a different program, or add another degree objective in a different program, in the same college in which they are already enrolled must request a change of degree objective. The graduate program offering the new degree must either approve or deny the request. (see Procedures for Readmission/Change or Addition of Degree Objective and Associated Requirements).

### **IV. Change or Addition of Degree Objective in a Different College or Campus**

Currently enrolled graduate students who wish to change to a different program in a different college, add a degree objective in a different college, or change their campus of enrollment must complete and submit an application for admission. The graduate program offering the new degree must either approve or deny the application.

### **V. Exceptions**

This policy does not apply to first professional degrees. (The first professional degrees are the J.D., M.D., Pharm.D., D.V.M., D.D.S, and L.L.M. degrees.)

---

### **REASON FOR POLICY**

Decisions on readmission, and the addition or change of a degree objective, should ensure that students admitted to a program have appropriate preparation for graduate work in a particular discipline and at the intended degree level.

---

### **PROCEDURES**

- Use of the Central Application System for Admission, Readmission, and Changes to Master's or Doctoral Degree Objectives

---

### **FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS**

Request for Exception: Use of the University's Central Graduate Admission Application System

University of Minnesota Central Graduate Admission Application System

---

### **ADDITIONAL CONTACTS**

	Contact	Phone	Fax/Email
--	---------	-------	-----------

<b>Subject</b>			
<b>Primary Contact(s)</b>	<b>Dean Tsantir</b>	612-625-1303	<a href="mailto:tsan0006@umn.edu">tsan0006@umn.edu</a>

---

## DEFINITIONS

There are no definitions associated with this policy.

---

## RESPONSIBILITIES

### Colleges and Programs

Publish the requirements for readmission, and to add or change a degree objective.

---

## APPENDICES

Procedures for Readmission/Change or Addition of Degree Objective and Associated Requirements

---

## FAQ

### 1. Is it possible to continue to a doctoral degree from a master's degree?

Yes, if you have been accepted into the doctoral degree program. If you are a currently enrolled graduate student who wishes to add a degree objective, you must request the addition of the degree objective. It is up to your graduate program to approve or deny the request.

### 2. I've decided it is impossible for me to complete my doctoral degree and want to exit with a master's degree. Can I do this?

Yes, if you are a currently enrolled graduate student who wishes to change to a lesser degree (e.g., MA from PhD) in the same program to which you were admitted you must request a change of degree objective. It is up to your graduate program to approve or deny the request.

### 3. I need to leave my program unexpectedly. Will I have to apply for readmission when I return?

You may be eligible for a Leave of Absence. Students who suspend their studies using an approved Leave of Absence do NOT need to apply for readmission. Refer to the administrative policy *Leave of Absence and Reinstatement from a Leave: Graduate Students* to determine if your circumstances make you eligible for an approved leave. If you do not maintain active status and do not have an officially approved Leave of Absence, you will need to apply for readmission.

### 4. I was admitted for the doctoral degree in my program and want to earn a master's degree in my current program before I complete the doctoral degree. How do I do this?

Currently enrolled graduate students who want to complete the master's degree in the same program in which they are pursuing the doctoral degree must request the addition of a degree objective.

**5. I would like to add an additional degree in another college. How do I do this?**

Currently enrolled graduate students who wish to add another degree outside the program to which they were originally admitted, must submit a new application for admission for the new program. The new program must approve or deny the application.

**6. I am planning to add a second degree objective. Who should I notify?**

Students who are adding a second degree objective are encouraged to notify their advisor and the Director of Graduate Studies of their current program of their plans.

**7. I am currently enrolled in a program that offers multiple tracks. My academic interests within my program have shifted and I'd like to switch tracks to better align with my scholarly interests. How do I change to a different track in my program?**

To change or add a formal track (or subplan), you need to request the change from your program (see Procedures for Readmission/Change or Addition of Degree Objective and Associated Requirements). Your program must either approve or deny the request.

**8. I did not enroll last semester and now I have to apply for readmission. Can I appeal the decision if my program does not readmit me?**

Admission and readmission decisions by the graduate program are final. Students who believe that they became inactive (unenrolled) through error or misconduct on the part of the program may file a student academic complaint regarding the lapse in active status.

---

**RELATED INFORMATION**

Administrative Policy: *Leave of Absence and Reinstatement from a Leave: Graduate Students*

Administrative Policy: *Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees*

**COMMENT:**

This policy has been reviewed and endorsed by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and by the Faculty Consultative Committee. They recommend the Faculty Senate approve it.

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR  
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**DISCUSSION:**

Professor Nita Krevans, Chair of the Graduate Education Policy Committee, stated that this policy is meant to provide a speedier and flexible central system response for students who are inactive and reapply or students who change or add new degree objectives.

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

**APPROVED**

**9. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**Administrative Policy on Post-baccalaureate**  
**Certificate Plans Approved by the Board of Regents**  
**Action by the Faculty Senate**

**ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY**

**Post-baccalaureate Certificate Plans Approved by the Board of Regents**

<p><b>Policy Contents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Policy Statement</b></li><li>• <b>Reason for Policy</b></li><li>• <b>Procedures</b></li><li>• <b>Forms/Instructions</b></li><li>• <b>Additional Contacts</b></li><li>• <b>Definitions</b></li> <li>• <b>Responsibilities</b></li><li>• <b>Appendices</b></li><li>• <b>FAQ</b></li><li>• <b>Related Information</b></li></ul>	<p><b>Effective Date:</b> Month, YYYY <b>Last Updated:</b> Month, YYYY</p> <p><b>Responsible University Officer:</b> Sr. VP for Academic Affairs and Provost</p> <p><b>Policy Owner:</b> Sr. VP for Academic Affairs and Provost</p> <p><b>Policy Contact:</b> Joseph Shultz</p>
---	--

---

**POLICY STATEMENT**

This policy governs post-baccalaureate certificates approved by the Board of Regents. Such certificates may be offered by collegiate units to individuals who wish to enhance their knowledge, skills, and professional training.

**I. Admission**

Minimum admission requirements for post-baccalaureate certificates are the same as for master's and doctoral degrees. Admission is governed by the Administrative policy: *Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees*.

**II. Program Requirements**

Programs offering post-baccalaureate certificate plans must assure students receive graduate-level training. The minimal criteria are:

- a) Plans must consist of at least 12 semester course credits.
- b) All courses must be at the 4000 level or above. At least 50% of the certificate course credits must be at the 5000 level or above.
- c) Students must maintain at least a 2.800 GPA (on a 4.000 scale) for satisfactory progress.

Colleges and programs may specify additional or more stringent requirements. Colleges and graduate programs must publish these requirements and provide them to students upon matriculation.

**III. Transfer of Credits**

a) Graduate course credits earned at other institutions may be transferred to University post-baccalaureate certificate plans subject to approval by the University graduate program. Such credits must have been earned at an accredited institution in the United States or at a non-U.S. institution judged by the graduate program to be comparable to a regionally accredited graduate program in the United States.

b) At least 60% of the graduate course credits required for the certificate must be taken at the University.

#### **IV. Credits in Common**

A maximum of three graduate course credits may be counted in common between two University post-baccalaureate certificate plans.

#### **V. Certificate Completion Timeline**

All requirements for the certificate must be completed and the certificate awarded within five calendar years after initial enrollment. Colleges and programs may set more stringent time requirements and may allow students to petition for exceptions to the time limit.

---

#### **REASON FOR POLICY**

This policy provides a framework for offering post-baccalaureate education that is oriented primarily toward professional and skills development and that culminates in the award of a certificate.

---

#### **PROCEDURES**

There are no procedures related to this policy.

---

#### **FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS**

There are no forms associated with this policy.

---

#### **ADDITIONAL CONTACTS**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Fax/Email</b>
<b>Primary Contact(s)</b>	Joseph Shultz	612-626-6544	<a href="mailto:shul0048@umn.edu">shul0048@umn.edu</a>

---

#### **DEFINITIONS**

**Post-baccalaureate:** Following the completion of undergraduate studies and the award of the undergraduate degree.

---

#### **RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **Colleges and Programs**

Publish the requirements for post-baccalaureate certificate plans and provide them to students upon matriculation.

---

## APPENDICES

There are no appendices related to this policy.

---

## FAQ

**1. How do I know if my post-baccalaureate certificate is governed by this policy?**

Students should contact their post-baccalaureate certificate program in order to confirm whether their certificate is governed by this policy.

**2. Will my post-baccalaureate certificate be recorded on my transcript?**

Individual courses that you complete as part of your post-baccalaureate certificate will be recorded on your transcript. If your post-baccalaureate certificate has been officially approved by the Board of Regents, it will also be recorded on your transcript.

**3. Can I include credits from my completed University post-baccalaureate certificate toward a subsequent University master's or doctoral degree?**

Yes, credits from a completed post-baccalaureate certificate program may be counted toward a subsequent master's or doctoral degree. The number of credits that may be counted is at the discretion of the degree-granting program.

**4. Can I include credits from my undergraduate degree toward a post-baccalaureate certificate?**

In general, no. Credits taken prior to the award of a baccalaureate degree may not be counted toward a subsequent post-baccalaureate certificate, except under special circumstances. (See questions 5, 6 and 7).

**5. I want to apply and begin a post-baccalaureate certificate program before I complete my undergraduate degree. Can I do this?**

Yes, students from any University undergraduate program may apply to a graduate program when they have more than seven credits or two courses to complete for their baccalaureate degree (including grades of Incomplete); however, when they first enroll as a graduate student, they may have no more than seven credits or two courses to complete for their undergraduate degree.

This also applies to current University students in officially approved integrated bachelor's/post-baccalaureate certificate programs (programs that allow concurrent study toward a bachelor's degree and a post-baccalaureate certificate).

**6. Can I be admitted to a post-baccalaureate certificate program that is linked to my undergraduate program while I still have more than one semester of undergraduate coursework remaining?**

Yes, current University students in officially approved integrated bachelor's/post-baccalaureate certificate programs may be admitted to the post-baccalaureate certificate program prior to the award of the bachelor's degree if allowed under the admission requirements of the integrated program.

**7. I want to pursue a post-baccalaureate certificate that is not an officially approved joint bachelor's/certificate program, and I want to take some of the graduate-level courses required for the post-baccalaureate certificate prior to the last term of my senior year. Can I use these credits toward my certificate?**

Yes, you may count these graduate credits toward your certificate if your college seeks an exception to the requirement that a U.S. bachelor's degree or its foreign equivalent is required for admission.

---

## **RELATED INFORMATION**

### **Adding, Changing, or Discontinuing Academic Plans**

#### **COMMENT:**

This policy has been reviewed and endorsed by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and by the Faculty Consultative Committee. They recommend the Faculty Senate approve it.

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR  
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

#### **DISCUSSION:**

Professor Nita Krevans, Chair of the Graduate Education Policy Committee, stated that the committee was asked to write a basic policy governing post-baccalaureate plans, their admission, and their minimum structural requirements. This policy governs plans approved by the Board of Regents, as there are certificate programs that have not been approved by the Regents. The difference is that approved plans appear on a student's transcript and are governed by Faculty Senate policy. All Regents-approved plans are already in conformity with this policy.

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

**APPROVED**

## **10. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Administrative Policy on Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees Action by the Faculty Senate**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees**

#### **Policy Contents**

- **Policy Statement**
- **Reason for Policy**
- **Procedures**
- **Forms/Instructions**
- **Additional Contacts**
- **Definitions**
- **Responsibilities**
- **Appendices**
- **FAQ**
- **Related Information**
- **History**

**Effective Date:** Month, YYYY

**Last Updated:** Month, YYYY

**Responsible University Officer:**

Sr. VP for Academic Affairs and Provost

**Policy Owner:** Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education

**Policy Contact:** Dean Tsantir

---

## **POLICY STATEMENT**

The University establishes minimum admission requirements for master's and doctoral degrees. Colleges and graduate programs may set additional or more stringent requirements (e.g., an undergraduate GPA standard). Colleges and graduate programs must publish and maintain their admission requirements.

Graduate programs make all admission decisions. Colleges issue the official confirmation of admission decisions to applicants.

### **I. General Admission Requirements for Degree Seeking Students**

a) Applicants must hold a bachelor's degree from an accredited U.S. college or university or a comparable degree from a recognized college or university in another country.

i) Students from any University undergraduate program may be admitted and may matriculate in a graduate program while simultaneously completing their baccalaureate work, with the program's permission, if they have no more than seven semester credits or two courses remaining to complete their bachelor's degree (including liberal education and distribution requirements).

If the student does not complete the work for the baccalaureate degree by the end of the second term of enrollment in the graduate program, a hold is placed on the student's graduate registration until the graduate program determines that the student has completed the baccalaureate degree.

ii) Current University students in officially approved integrated bachelor's/master's degree programs may be admitted to the master's program prior to the award of the bachelor's degree if allowed under the admission requirements of the integrated program.

b) International applicants must meet English language proficiency requirements specified by each program and college. Colleges and programs must publish and maintain their requirements.

International applicants who have completed 24 quarter credits/16 semester credits within the past 24 months in residence as a full-time student at an accredited U.S. college or university or University-approved foreign country or institution are exempt from demonstrating language proficiency or meeting proficiency standards.

c) Applicants must provide unofficial transcripts from all post-secondary institutions attended. If they are admitted, applicants must provide official transcripts, as specified by the program, before they register and enroll at the University.

### **II. Conditional Admission**

Applicants may be admitted contingent upon satisfying specific requirements (conditional admission). Graduate programs that choose to admit applicants conditionally must ensure that these requirements are communicated in the notification of admission. A timeframe for satisfying the requirements must be specified. If the specified requirements are not satisfied before the expiration of the timeframe, admission is revoked.



### **III. Admission for Graduate Professional Development**

Colleges and graduate programs may offer admission for graduate professional development to applicants who wish to enroll in a graduate program but who may not wish to complete a graduate degree. Applicants for graduate professional development must apply and be admitted to the college and program in which they plan to pursue coursework. Applicants for graduate professional development must meet the admission requirements specified in I.a., b. and c.

### **IV. Concurrent or Sequential Graduate Degrees**

Applicants who wish to pursue degrees concurrently in different graduate programs and/or different colleges must apply and be admitted to each college and program in which they plan to pursue a degree.

Applicants who have already been awarded a University graduate degree or a post-baccalaureate certificate and are seeking to obtain an additional degree must apply and meet the admissions criteria for their new graduate program and/or degree objective.

### **V. Deferred Admission**

Admitted applicants may request, from the graduate program, a deferral of their admission to graduate study for up to one full academic year without re-applying. If the deferral is approved and matriculation does not occur within the one-year period, the applicant must re-apply.

### **VI. Acceptance of Financial Support**

In the event that a college or graduate program offers an applicant financial support, the student may not be compelled by the college or graduate program to accept the financial support offer prior to April 15 of the year of admission. [Council of Graduate Schools' Resolution Regarding Graduate Scholars, Fellows, Trainees, and Assistants]

### **VII. University Employees**

In order to protect against potential conflict of interest, University employees holding academic appointments above the rank of instructor or research fellow must obtain permission from their college and supervisor or department chair to accept an offer of admission to pursue a University master's or doctoral degree in the same field, or a closely related field, in which they are also employed.

### **VIII. Exceptions**

- a) Graduate programs may request exceptions to I.a. from their collegiate dean, or the unit's chief academic officer (or designee).
- b) This policy does not apply to first professional degrees. (The first professional degrees are the J.D., M.D., Pharm.D., D.V.M., D.D.S, and L.L.M. degrees.)

---

### **REASON FOR POLICY**

The University's admission standards are highly selective and competitive, and reflect the institution's identity as a leading public and land grant research university. Decisions on admission should ensure that students admitted to a program have appropriate preparation for graduate work in a particular discipline and at the intended degree level.

---

## PROCEDURES

- Use of the Central Application System for Admission, Readmission, and Changes to Master's or Doctoral Degree Objectives

---

## FORMS/INSTRUCTIONS

Request for Exception: Use of the University's Central Graduate Admission Application System for Admission and Readmission and Changes to Master's or Doctoral Degree Objectives

University of Minnesota Central Graduate Admission Application System

---

## ADDITIONAL CONTACTS

Subject	Contact	Phone	Fax/Email
Primary Contact(s)	Dean Tsantir	612-625-1303	<a href="mailto:tsan0006@umn.edu">tsan0006@umn.edu</a>

---

## DEFINITIONS

**Recognized college or university:** A college or university in another country that is comparable to a regionally accredited U.S. college or university. This information is published and updated by organizations such as NAFSA (National Association for Foreign Student Affairs) and AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) and is available through the University's graduate admissions office.

---

## RESPONSIBILITIES

### Colleges

- Publish and maintain admission requirements.
- Issue the official confirmation of admission.
- Ensure that all information relevant to enrollment (e.g., legal, terms of financial support, if awarded) is communicated to the student in the collegiate confirmation of admission.
- Review letters generated by the University's central graduate admission application system and letters sent by graduate programs to ensure conformity with collegiate policy and University policy governing financial support.
- Request exceptions from the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (or designee) to the requirement to use the University's central graduate admission application system for reasons such as accreditation requirements or national admissions practices.

### Programs

- Publish and maintain admission requirements.
- Provide timely communication with applicants throughout the admissions process.
- Request exceptions from their collegiate dean, or the unit's chief academic officer (or designee) to the requirement that applicants hold a bachelor's degree from an accredited U.S. college or university or an equivalent degree from a recognized college or university in another country.

---

## APPENDICES

Template Form: Request for Exception: U.S. Bachelor's or Equivalent Degree Admission Requirement

Template Form: Request to Allow Academic Appointees above the Rank of Instructor or Research Fellow to Pursue a University Master's or Doctoral Degree

---

## FAQ

### Students

**1. I would like to apply to a graduate program, but I currently have more than seven credits to complete for my bachelor's degree. If I wait to apply, I will miss the application deadline for my preferred first term of enrollment as a graduate student. Can I apply anyway?**

Yes. You may apply to a graduate program when you have more than seven credits or two courses to complete for your baccalaureate degree (including grades of Incomplete); however, when you first enroll as a graduate student, you may have no more than seven credits or two courses to complete for your undergraduate degree.

**2. I applied to begin my graduate program in the fall and now I need to defer my admission for one year. Is my original application still valid for the following fall?**

Yes. You must request the deferral from the graduate program. If the program approves your request, you may defer your admission for up to one full academic year—from entry in fall of one year to entry in fall of the following year (e.g., from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013). If you do not matriculate within the one-year period, you must re-apply and pay a new application fee. Please note that you may NOT defer for more than one academic year (e.g. from Fall 2012 to Spring 2014) and that any financial offer you receive with your initial admission offer may not carry over to the new entry date.

**3. I have been admitted to pursue two degrees simultaneously in different colleges. Do I need to defer my admission in one?**

Yes. Students can only be registered in one college at a time. Prior to registering for the first time, you will need to notify both programs/colleges of your plans to enroll initially in one college and to request from the other program and college a change of status to pursue concurrent degrees. Your decision may have implications for fellowships and other forms of graduate student support. Students are thus encouraged to notify programs/colleges early of their plans. For some officially approved joint or dual degree programs, initial registration in one college is required, and the student does not have the option to choose. If you are admitted to pursue two degrees simultaneously in the same college, you should also notify both programs of the program in which you plan to register initially.

**4. I have been admitted to take graduate courses as a Graduate Professional Development (GPD) student. Do I have to register every term?**

Yes, students admitted for Graduate Professional Development status must adhere to the same registration requirements as other admitted students and must register in the fall and spring semesters. Registration during the summer is not required.

## Faculty/Staff

**1. How can my program know if a degree granted by a foreign institution is considered comparable to a bachelor's degree from an accredited U.S. college or university?**

Foreign degree and institution information is available through the University's graduate admissions office and is published and updated by organizations such as NAFSA (National Association of International Educators) and AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers).

**2. How can my program know what are reasonable standards for English language proficiency?**

The graduate admissions office maintains a web site that lists operational standards for the most common English language tests.

**3. How can a program determine whether or not credits earned by an international applicant from a foreign institution fulfill the requirement for exemption from the English language proficiency requirement?**

Programs should refer to the approved list of English-speaking countries and universities to determine whether such credits fulfill the requirement.

**4. Are there additional English language proficiency requirements for international students whose native language is not English and who will serve as teaching assistants (TAs) for University of Minnesota courses?**

Yes. TAs who are not native English speakers may need to meet additional English language proficiency requirements as specified in the Administrative Policy: [Language Proficiency Requirements for Teaching Assistants](#).

**5. My graduate program has admitted a student for Graduate Professional Development. How long may the GPD student remain in the program?**

If the student is a domestic student, the graduate program determines how long the student may continue to take courses as a GPD student. Ideally, the period for which the student may remain a GPD student should be clearly stated in the letter of admission.

If the student is an international student, the period for which the student may remain a GPD student is in part determined by federal visa regulations and SEVIS requirements. International students admitted to GPD are given an I-20 for one year and must be admitted to a degree program if they wish to continue their advanced education at the University after the one-year period.

**6. May a graduate program extend the hold placed on a graduate student's registration if the student is a University undergraduate student, was admitted without the bachelor's degree, and does not complete it by the end of the second term of registration as a graduate student?**

Yes, Graduate programs have the discretion to extend the hold based on the student's circumstances, or to terminate the student from the program based on the student's non-completion of the baccalaureate degree within the stipulated period.

**7. Why do academic employees with appointments above the rank of instructor or research fellow require permission to enroll in a University master's or doctoral program?**

Academic employees above the rank of instructor or research fellow who have responsibility for teaching, advising or supervising graduate students by virtue of their employment can be placed in a conflict of interest situation if they pursue a master's or doctoral degree in the same field, or a closely related field, in which they are also employed. In this circumstance, employee involvement in the student-related activities of the graduate program in which they are also a student should be limited to matters of general administrative and educational policy and should not extend to consideration of applications, petitions, or evaluations that relate to the employment status or academic work of individual students, or to the setting of student examinations, for example.

Additional information on University standards for code of conduct can be found in Regent's Policy: Code of Conduct. Section III, Subd. 8 below refers specifically to the expectation to avoid conflicts of interest and commitment.

**"Avoid Conflicts of Interest and Commitment.** Community members have an obligation to be objective and impartial in making decisions on behalf of the University. To ensure this objectivity, community members are expected to:

- avoid actual individual or institutional conflicts of interest;
- disclose potential conflicts of interest and adhere to any management plans created to eliminate any conflicts of interest; and
- ensure personal relationships do not interfere with objective judgment in decisions affecting University employment or the academic progress of a community member."

Individuals may also consult with the Student Conflict Resolution Center for advice on how to prevent and avoid situations that may result in a conflict of interest resulting from employee involvement in the student-related activities of the graduate program in which they are also a student.

---

**RELATED INFORMATION**

AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers)

Council of Graduate Schools' Resolution Regarding Graduate Scholars, Fellows, Trainees, and Assistants

List of English-speaking countries and universities exempted from English proficiency testing.

NAFSA (National Association of International Educators)

Office of Human Resources Academic Job Codes and Titles

**COMMENT:**

This policy has been reviewed and endorsed by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and by the Faculty Consultative Committee. They recommend the Faculty Senate approve it.

**THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR  
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

## **DISCUSSION:**

Professor Nita Krevans, Chair of the Graduate Education Policy Committee, stated that this policy does include a few changes from current practices. First is that this policy governs all graduate programs at the University except for first professional degrees. Former Graduate School admissions policies only governed admission to programs under the Graduate School. Some programs will now be required to use the central University admission system or request an exemption. Some programs use their own application software, usually when there is a national admissions application, and they should not have an issue when requesting an exemption. Programs will have one full admission cycle to switch or request an exemption.

A second change is that the Graduate School, for programs under its egis, had a minimum English language requirement that was on a page maintained by the Graduate School. This allowed for all English language tests to be monitored and for minimum standards for admissions to programs under the Graduate School to be posted.

The committee was asked to make the policy more flexible, so it now reads that units and programs may set individual English standards. Units and programs are directed to the web page that will continue to be maintained by the Graduate School as a guideline. There was concern that a University-wide standard might be needed, but the President's Policy Committee is recommending the current wording and will see what comments are received during the 30-day comment period.

Q: How was it determined which first professional programs to exclude?

A: There is a nationally-recognized category of these programs as developed by the registrars of all major institutions. They usually have national accreditation standards and admissions systems. The committee does not control this list.

Q: Regarding the minimum requirement standard, there is currently a process for deans to grant exemptions in exceptional cases. Is this still part of the policy?

A: Yes. Exemptions from a BA or BS degree requirement can still be granted.

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

**APPROVED**

### **11. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

### **12. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS**

**NONE**

### **13. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

## **14. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information**

### **UNIVERSITY SENATE**

Resolution on the Personal Floating Holiday

Approved by the: University Senate March 3, 2011

Approved by the: Administration February 16, 2012\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\* After careful consideration of the senate resolution, I am pleased to approve this request and have asked Vice President for Human Resources Kathryn Brown to move forward on policy amendments for implementation effective July 1, 2012.

Supporting the Efforts of the Work Group Promoting Academic Civility in Graduate and Professional Education

Approved by the: University Senate May 5, 2011

Approved by the: Administration – no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

\* In agreement with the resolution.

Administrative Policy on Outside Consulting and Other Professional Commitments

Approved by the: University Senate December 1, 2011

Approved by the: Administration February 16, 2012

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

### **FACULTY SENATE**

Amendment to the Regents Policy: Code of Conduct

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 2, 2010

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

Amendments to the Policy on Teaching Awards

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 5, 2011

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Reduction in Liberal Education Theme Requirement

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 1, 2011

Approved by the: Administration December 2, 2011

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

## **15. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Statement on Salary Instructions Information for the University Senate**

### **Statement on Salary Instructions**

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) commends the thoughtful discussions in the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) pertaining to salary instructions to units for the next fiscal year. Cogent arguments were

made with respect to the importance of a salary increase system that is based on merit, but also advancing the notion that merit can encompass everyday contributions, sustained loyally in the face of diminishing resources, increased workloads, and salary freezes.

Considering the various options discussed by the committees, SCC recommends to the administration that a tangible proportion of recurring funds for salary increases be distributed in a progressive fashion (e.g., as a constant dollar amount for low-income employees that decreases ultimately to zero with increasing salary), with the remainder being dedicated to pay increases based solely on merit criteria. Such an approach addresses the disproportionate impact that recent increases in employee-paid health insurance costs had on the lowest paid members of the University workforce, while preserving an emphasis on merit-based compensation for those at the other end of the earnings spectrum.

Additionally, unit heads evaluating merit should ensure that the time window for their evaluations includes not only the most recent year, but also any relevant preceding periods during which funds for merit-based salary increases were not available.

Adopted without dissent January 23, 2012.

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR  
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**16. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
Statement on Salary Increases for 2012-13  
Information for the University Senate**

**Statement on Salary Increases for 2012-13**

The Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs recommends to the President of the University of Minnesota that any salary increase that is earmarked for faculty and P&A employees to take effect in FY2013 be divided into two components as follows: 50% in an across-the-board allotment of equal percentage to all, and 50% to be distributed on the basis of normal merit reviews. This recommendation is intended to apply only to the coming cycle of salary increases, not to any increases thereafter.

**COMMENT**

Historically, salary increases for faculty and P&A employees at non-bargaining unit campuses of the University of Minnesota have been awarded entirely on the basis of annual merit reviews. In view of the perennial challenge of competing to attract and retain productive faculty, the policy of tying salary increases to competitive merit evaluations is generally sensible. The past three years, however, have been unusual. Apart from promotion and retention cases, no raises at all were given in the first and third of those years and an across-the-board temporary pay cut of 1.15% was imposed in the second. Additionally, as of January 1 of this year, approximately \$12 million in the annual cost of health insurance has been shifted to employees in the form of higher premiums, higher co-pays, and reduced coverage.

After due deliberation, the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has concluded that this is a time when a partial across-the-board increase in salary for faculty and P&A employees is warranted. This is an occasion when recognizing and rewarding the shared sacrifice and collective merit of an entire workforce, in preference to ignoring those contributions by considering them in themselves unworthy of even minimal monetary recognition, can be



expected to promote collegiality and institutional engagement. After a period of substantial austerity, a partial across-the-board allotment will send a unifying message of appreciation to the entire workforce and take a small step towards making employees whole after their shared sacrifices.

Adopted unanimously January 4, 2012.

**GEORGE SHEETS, CHAIR  
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**17. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Statement on 2012 Salary Increases  
Information for the University Senate**

Statement on 2012-13 Salary Increases

1. Salary increases should be based on merit;
2. Merit should be understood to include general support of the unit as well as outstanding performance; and
3. The period for calculating merit should be four years, back to the time of the last significant salary increase.

Adopted without dissent, with one abstention, January 17, 2012.

**RUSSELL LUEPKER, CHAIR  
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**18. LIBRARY COMMITTEE  
Letter to Members of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee  
expressing opposition to HR 3699, the Research Works Act  
Information for the University Senate**

February X, 2012

Dear Members of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee:

The undersigned organizations and institutions write to express our strong concerns with H.R. 3699, the Research Works Act, which has been referred to your Committee. This bill would impede public access to valuable research results from work funded by federal agencies.

Most immediately, H.R. 3699 would repeal the successful National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy, which currently ensures that the public receives timely, free access to articles reporting on the results of our nation's \$29 billion annual investment in medical research. Besides cutting off access to this crucial information, the proposed bill would prohibit all other federal science agencies from enacting similar policies, unfairly restricting the public's ability to access the results of our collective investment in scientific research.

The current NIH policy, with its 12-month delay in public access, has a proven track record of delivering positive benefits to U.S. taxpayers, while holding the government accountable for public investment in scientific research. It provides access to more than a half million individual

users each day, including health care professionals, patients, caregivers and their families. People rely on the accessibility of this information to improve their understanding of the medical conditions they are facing as well as their quality of care.

As of today, the PubMed Central database contains more than 115,000 articles on hypertension research, 150,000 on diabetes research, and more than 110,000 on heart disease research. U.S. citizens whose tax dollars underwrite this research, believe that crucial details of the most recent medical advancements in these areas should be available to them, and to the doctors and caregivers whose responsibilities are the health and long life of all Americans. Access to up-to-date, health-related information plays a crucial role in ensuring that patients are as educated as possible about their individual situations, including the latest therapies. PubMed Central ensures that access, after a 12-month delay, for patients, as well as students, physicians, and others who do not have ready access to the exclusive publications.

H.R. 3699 will affect access to not only these vital biomedical research results stemming from NIH funding, but also scientific research underwritten by **all** other federal agencies. Access to critical information on energy, economics, computational science, engineering and hundreds of other areas that directly impact the lives and well being of the public would be unduly limited by this proposed legislation.

Taxpayers fund research with the expectation that the resulting ideas and discoveries will propel science, stimulate the economy and improve the lives of all Americans. Public support for science is enhanced when the public can directly see the benefits from our investment in scientific research. Scientific progress depends on the broadest possible dissemination of knowledge, and the ability to build upon the work of others.

The NIH Public Access Policy is supported by the patient advocacy, higher education, library, and research communities – including dozens of Noble Prize winners – as a means to address the costly barriers that have impeded so many from accessing vital information, and as an opportunity for all communities to benefit from access to publicly funded information in an equitable, timely and affordable manner.

Given the success of the NIH policy and the potential for other similar programs, we urge your opposition to H.R. 3699, the Research Works Act. We look forward to working with you to ensure that the NIH Public Policy continues to serve science, the research community, and the public, and that similar policies can be enacted across other federal science agencies.

Sincerely,

**COMMENT:**

The Senate Library Committee signed the attached letter to Members of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee expressing opposition to HR 3699, the Research Works Act. It joined the University of Minnesota, other universities, patient advocacy groups, library organizations, and others concerned about the bill.

**NEIL OLSZEWSKI, CHAIR  
LIBRARY COMMITTEE**

**19. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY**

**FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF**

Vernon Opheim  
Professor  
Music – University of Minnesota Duluth  
1931 – 2011

David A. Storvick  
Professor  
Mathematics  
1929 – 2011

### **STUDENTS**

David W. Bull  
College of Liberal Arts

Daniel F. Fogg  
College of Liberal Arts

William Harper  
University of Minnesota – Duluth

Jeffrey A. Howell  
College of Veterinary Medicine

David H. Karwoski  
College of Education and Human Development

Andrew W. Knippel  
Carlson School of Management

Jacob Nelson  
School of Business and Economics – University of Minnesota Duluth

Rachel Sandell  
College of Liberal Arts

Benjamin T. Schuster  
College of Liberal Arts

### **20. INTRODUCTION**

#### **Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean of the Medical School Aaron Friedman**

Vice President and Dean Aaron Friedman was introduced to the Senate.

### **21. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that the committee has only met once this semester. The primary activity was to transmit to the President consensus advice on this year's salary instructions based on recommendations from the Faculty Affairs and Finance and Planning Committees.

**22. MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 1, 2011  
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.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usenate/111201.pdf>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK  
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

**DISCUSSION:**

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

**APPROVED**

**23. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

**24. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS**

**NONE**

**25. STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY ADDRESS**

I want to talk with you today about balances.

Not only the balances on the books, or in our labs, but also about the balances we strike for this University as we move forward in a challenging time.

About public support balancing the tuition support provided by students and families. About training for a job balancing being educated for a life of learning. About balancing our research mission and our educational goals. About balancing our rich heritage and tradition with a need to respond in new ways to global challenges. About balancing the future we desire with the needs of paying for it now. About balancing our commitment to Minnesota with our responsibility to the world.

And perhaps most importantly, about the balance of risk and reward.

I chose this theme after eight months of crossing this state and our campuses, and after meeting and listening to hundreds, if not thousands, of people. Of course, chief among those stakeholders I've met, listened to, and learned from the most are you: our exceptional faculty, our tireless staff, and our inspiring students of this great University.

One of my favorite regular outings each week is to visit a department on our Twin Cities campus and to see all the great work being done from the labs of the Academic Health Center to the design studios in St. Paul. Each one of those visits informs me about the enormous impact we

have on students, and on the public.

Another of my favorite events is a lunch I have nearly every week with a different group of faculty. The depth and breadth of what you do is astonishing, and I am proud to be your colleague.

Since last July, some of my most exhilarating days have been on visits to our statewide campuses, coming to understand the special and distinct work conducted there.

I've seen and heard of the life-changing research you do, the energizing teaching you offer, and I've come to know the spectacular promise of our students. They are why we are here.

Wherever I go, I tell stories about our dance and physics students, our Ag and Ph.D. students, stories that confirm how great an institution of higher education we are all together.

Now, of course, the pushes and pulls on our great institution are many. But I have found that most Minnesotans love their university and *they* want it to do well.

Still, our role as a public, land-grant research university is not clear to many. Many do support our drive to excellence, but not if it means that their student can't get into the U. Many value what we provide to our rural towns and agricultural economy in greater Minnesota, but feel we should do more. Many understand that higher education is the broadest and best-paved road we have to a prosperous life, but, frankly, aren't sure we are a good value.

Those and other balances reflect where we are today. They are the consequences of past decisions. But to me, they represent also the initial conditions on which we will build our future.

What we do from now on is, mostly, up to *us*.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Board of Regents Chair Cohen, Regents Beeson, Brod, Hung, McMillan, Ramirez, and Simmons: Thank you all for honoring me with your presence. Senator Wiger, Director Pogemiller, Mayor Coleman—my mayor, Mayor Brede: Thank you for being here and for your commitment to higher education and this University. To those of you listening and watching in Crookston, Duluth, Morris, Rochester, and online: Thank you all for joining me today .

I want to first acknowledge and officially welcome new members of my team. We recruited Provost Karen Hanson from another Big Ten institution. She is a philosopher who balances the natural leanings of a chemical engineer. We have a new chief information officer, Scott Studham; a new government relations leader, Jason Rohloff; and a new chief communications officer, Diana Harvey.

By my first anniversary, I expect we also will have new leadership for our Crookston campus, for our Office of Equity and Diversity, for University Services, for the Carlson School and the School of Dentistry, and for intercollegiate athletics on the Twin Cities campus.

As an aside, as you know, Gopher athletics is certainly in the news. And let me just say: I am committed to its competitive success and sure of its value to the state. That success, as in all we do, must be balanced with integrity.

All of this new blood means the balance of having to say good-bye to friends, coworkers and leaders. Please join me in thanking Chancellor Chuck Casey, Joel Maturi, Kathleen O'Brien, Donna Peterson, and Tom Sullivan for their combined 97 years of service.

## STATEWIDE CAMPUSES

I frequently say that my goal for our University is for us to be in the conversation about the great American public universities—such as Berkeley and Michigan, Virginia and UCLA. We are fortunate that in many areas our achievements far exceed our reputation—perhaps a reflection of Minnesotans' reluctance to brag.

I like to tell people that if Texans lived here, this would be known as the land of 30,000 lakes! We're the only state in the nation that rounds down!

But, thankfully, we are Minnesota, where our statewide campuses offer tremendous opportunities for liberal education, sustainability studies, new ways of learning in the health sciences, and innovations in e- and distance learning. This is where our campuses address critical issues facing the state, such as the future of our mining industry and the health of our great lakes.

But advancing what we do on all of our campuses, and changing how we are known, require us to focus our resources and develop new ways of teaching and learning, new avenues of research, and new kinds of public engagement.

And I do want to emphasize: *new* ways!

## BUDGET DECISIONS

Let me describe some of these new directions by reminding you of one of the first things I did as president. Last summer, following the government shutdown and special session, the University received an additional \$25 million, and I had to decide how to allocate it. That money went largely into four areas.

First, we allocated \$4.1 million for undergraduate aid to reduce tuition for in-state students this semester, and we reduced the planned tuition increase for fall 2012 from 5 percent to 3.5 percent for Minnesota resident undergraduates. That rate of increase is the lowest increase this century and the second lowest dollar amount.

Second, we allocated funds to critical needs in the current year, primarily to offset large cuts to medical education funding, and to hire additional faculty.

Third, we reserved some funds in case our economic situation worsened in fiscal year 2013.

And fourth, we allocated funds to support 150 doctoral dissertation fellowships per year for three years, a 40 percent increase over previous years. These fellowships are competitively awarded to allow our best students to finish their graduate work in a timely way.

What does such a fellowship do? Let me give you just one example. A fellowship allowed Candance Doerr-Stevens, a Ph.D. student in our College of Education and Human Development, to devote herself full-time to an innovative project analyzing how high school students use digital media to learn. If not for her \$22,500 fellowship—and the tuition and health care benefits we provide our graduate students—Candance, a mother of two, would have needed another year to complete her dissertation.

She says the fellowship allowed her to be "in the trenches" with teachers and students. It allowed her, she said, "to walk through an intellectual garden," unencumbered with other responsibilities.

Fellowships are a critical and effective way we invest in the next generation of scholars,

teachers, and citizens who will mold the future. Candance, as a representative of the value of doctoral research at the University of Minnesota, please rise so we can acknowledge your important work.

And her children are three- and six-year-olds, which is an additional degree of difficulty!

## THE BUDGET AHEAD

Now, many people think the best way to understand where an institution is headed is to look at the strategic plan. I say: Look at the budget.

If you look at those budget decisions from last summer, you will see my goals for the institution clearly reflected: holding the line on tuition increases to keep the University affordable, rebuilding our excellent faculty, investing in bold scholarship, and maintaining a prudent budget structure.

I think that's a pretty robust framework. Our budget for fiscal year 2013 is still taking shape, but there are some noteworthy features that are a window to my priorities. This is an outline of what I will recommend to the Board of Regents in May.

First, the increase in the cost pools is zero percent. Zero. Our budget is built using the idea of cost pools, which pay for services and administration. And, except for salary raises and student aid, in my budget the increase in the cost pools for fiscal year 2013 is zero. I pledged to hold the line on administrative costs, and this budget does that.

Second, we have budgeted a 2.5 percent compensation increase for all employees. This follows three years of salary freezes or modest increase and furloughs, and an increased burden of health care costs. This rewards all of you who have carried us through some very difficult budgets.

To our staff and faculty: Thank you very much for your hard work and your sacrifices. Thank you for understanding the effects state cutbacks have had on our operations. Thank you.

And third, in our 2013 budget plan, there is a pool of about \$21 million for academic investments. This substantial pool of money will be awarded competitively through the annual compact budget process. I encourage your best ideas—and those of your deans and chancellors—to compete for those dollars.

I believe this budget positions us well to move forward in exciting and productive ways, and reflects a prudent balance. To be clear: The state budget continues to be strained and this may affect our support in the future. But we cannot afford to put our aspirations on hold indefinitely. We will move forward, making responsible hires and rewarding our people now.

## TUITION AND DEBT

I'd like to turn now to tuition and student and family debt—critical issues that are directly tied to state support. Simply put, as the State of Minnesota's investment in the University has declined, our need for tuition dollars to replace part of that state support has increased.

We are working every day to tell our story. I have testified six times at the Capitol in the past month. I have met face-to-face with nearly 100 of our 201 state legislators. We are activating our 21,000-person-strong grassroots network.

But the fantasy that the University could somehow advance its mission and hold the line on tuition as state support dwindles is just that: a fantasy.

For students and families of limited means, tuition increases can drive a painful increase in student debt. About a third of our undergraduate students graduate debt-free. But the average debt of the other two-thirds of our undergraduates system-wide exceeds \$27,000.

If you graduate and quickly get a job earning, say, \$50,000, that debt level of \$300 a month may be manageable. But it can be a real challenge under many other circumstances. For instance, if your debt causes you to drop out, or extends your time to graduate, or if you simply can't find a job after graduation, those are serious challenges.

With his State of the Union address, President Obama started a national conversation. It is very important to remember all of what he said and I quote: "We can't just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we'll run out of money. States also need to do their part, by making higher education a higher priority in their budgets. And colleges and universities have to do their part by working to keep costs down."

We will do our part—but remember those words: "States also need to do their part." My hope is that the State of Minnesota will engage us in the important work we do at a level that minimizes or eliminates tuition increases. But it is not enough to work for—or simply hope—that the state will invest in its future with us. We must chart our own future. We must reduce costs, eliminate course and program duplication, improve learning outcomes, and be efficient and effective in all that we do.

We must achieve excellence in our operations.

## OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE

Operational Excellence isn't a buzzword, or a project, or an initiative. Think of it as a long-term commitment to work smarter, reduce costs, enhance services, and generate new sources of revenue. It, too, is about balancing competing interests and goals. It is about innovation and operating differently, not simply about cutting costs. It is about fundamentally changing the culture of this University, and how we manage change.

Culture change is not easy, and it is not fast. But we absolutely have to move to a more nimble and responsive way of doing our administrative work, and we have to do it at a lower cost. It is about increasing our effectiveness even as we become more efficient.

When I started—Oh, those long eight months ago!—I committed myself to reimagining how we operate and function. A group of senior leaders has been meeting since September. We've added a staff work group to help drive innovation and change. In December, a first round of listening sessions was held with diverse faculty and staff from across the institution.

Four main themes emerged. First, we are too risk averse and too regulatory, more mired in saying "no" than in finding ways to say "yes." Second, we can do more to unleash entrepreneurialism and innovation. Third, we can improve our change management and problem-solving skills. And lastly, consultation is important, but we can overdo it.

I've charged each senior leader to implement a risk recalibration initiative in their respective area. This work is aimed squarely at addressing the University's risk-averse culture by eliminating unnecessary or redundant policies and procedures.

In the Office of the Vice President for Research, this work has already streamlined procedures in areas ranging from technology transfer to grant administration to compliance. One example: our first-in-the-nation Minnesota Innovation Partnerships, or MN-IP. It will more swiftly and



thoughtfully move our University discoveries and intellectual property from our laboratories to the marketplace by cutting out unnecessary negotiations.

There are a myriad of other changes that we will introduce as quickly as possible with the goal of reducing workloads and getting bureaucracy out of the way. We have to do this because we need to eliminate ESP in our organization. ESP stands for "Extremely Stupid Procedures." We have them. We need to eliminate them. We need to work harder. We need to work smarter.

Here is one example of a change that makes sense. When we purchase equipment, our policy has been to capitalize anything valued at \$2,500 or more. When you capitalize equipment you do get the financial value of depreciation, but it also means you have to track and inventory that piece of equipment.

Right now, we track 69,000 items per year.

So, with the leadership of our operational excellence team, we have decided to increase the equipment capitalization threshold from \$2,500 to \$5,000, consistent with peer institutions. This will reduce the number of items we "count" by 31 percent. That means more than 20,000 things will no longer have to be inventoried and tracked. Hundreds and hundreds of people hours can be reallocated to higher and better uses. That's one good example, and a good balance of risk and reward.

We've begun another important activity that may affect many of you. It concerns academic centers and institutes. I was surprised to find out—and you may be surprised, too—that we have 265 academic centers and institutes, and they have budgets totaling more than \$200 million annually.

I have directed all of our deans to look at and examine the mission centrality, value, and scope of each of these centers and institutes. Administrative centers will also be examined. We may find that some, and maybe even most, remain valuable and relevant, but I'm willing to bet others are not.

Excellence also means aligning our strategies with economic realities. That is another component of balancing change. For example, given the uncertain economic environment for residential development, the UMore Park LLC board decided that we are going to focus in the near term on economic development activities that will add value to the property. While we remain committed to the long-term goals, we will use this time to further develop a plan to mitigate the impacts of gravel mining and other development activities on faculty who use UMore space for their research.

It is important to note that everyone has a role in identifying and implementing new ways to work smarter, reduce costs, enhance services, and generate revenues. Local solutions are as important as system-wide initiatives, and we must get better at scaling those that work.

I want to re-envision the fundamental role of administration from one of enforcer to one of partner and facilitator, so that we can help units across the institution rethink how they work, what they do, and how we solve shared problems. Together.

## INITIATIVES: TEACHING AND LEARNING

Let me now turn to new initiatives. I'll start with our educational mission. I am asking today for faculty, staff, and governance to engage with me in two ways. First, I want all of our campuses to be leaders, in the state and nationally, in using technology to improve teaching and learning.

Our colleagues in Rochester and Crookston may have a head start, but I am establishing a process to request proposals from faculty on all of our campuses for innovative educational initiatives that will advance teaching and learning. I want our best thoughts about how to use modern tools to enable student success, and I want to pilot those ideas, adopt what works and spread it across our campuses. I would like to see a special focus on electronic textbooks as a way to reduce costs to students. I have asked senior vice presidents Karen Hanson and Robert Jones to lead this effort.

Second, I will engage with you to define and bring to life a remarkably revised academic calendar. Specifically, building on the report from the 2011 Summer Semester Committee, I'd like to take a serious and rigorous look at moving to a year-round academic calendar. This would include three 14- or 15-week periods that—with sincere apologies to our English faculty—I am going to call semesters, even though there are three.

Now, I have learned that in Minnesota there are two immovable calendar events—the religious holidays in December and the secular 10-day celebration that is the Minnesota State Fair. Working around them, I do believe a full, three-semester calendar could be crafted, and it offers great opportunities for both students and faculty. My vision for a year-round calendar would also incorporate an extended winter session in January.

There are significant advantages to doing our best to make this work. First, it would give more students a real chance at graduating in less than four years. On such a calendar, a full-time, year-round student could earn 120 credits in less than three years.

Second, a longer winter session would give students more opportunity to study abroad, have meaningful internship or service and learning opportunities, or complete honors or other significant senior projects.

Third, and very importantly, a year-round schedule increases use of our laboratory and classroom space. Using our facilities year round reduces bottlenecks and can reduce our long-term need, and cost, for new facilities. Finally, three full semesters would increase tuition revenues annually, allowing us to hire more faculty.

Faculty would still teach two semesters a year, but could have flexibility to arrange them so that two consecutive semesters could be devoted to research. Alternatively, "B," or nine-month faculty, might choose to teach three semesters from time to time for additional compensation.

Of course, there are big challenges, chief among them here—managing financial aid for students. There are also valuable programs on our campuses in the summer that would have to be accommodated. And, we'd need a transition time to move to the new model.

But all in all, in the balance, I think the benefits could outweigh the challenges, and this is an idea well worth driving forward. We'll start this conversation on the Twin Cities campus, with other campuses having the option to join as they wish.

## INITIATIVES: RESEARCH AND OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT

Let's turn now to our research mission. Remember, we are the state's only public research university. I have three initiatives to move forward.

The first is consistent with my hope that this institution and its faculty will become more entrepreneurial in every sense of the word. To enable faculty to develop and learn outside the academy, we are advancing through governance a process for tenured and tenure-track faculty to take what we're calling an "entrepreneurial leave." The leave, at zero percent salary but with full

benefits, will allow faculty to work full-time with industry, start-ups, or NGOs to develop ideas or products in the marketplace.

Basically, if you have a commercial, artistic, or creative idea you'd like to explore, we will hold your place here. On its surface this looks like an opportunity mainly for those in medicine, science, or engineering. But, in fact, it offers an opportunity for every faculty member who wants to engage the commercial or non-profit sectors.

Second, to support and enable our researchers to succeed in a highly competitive environment, we need to develop and maintain a leading-edge research infrastructure, including our libraries. To accomplish this I am establishing a formal, recurring, research infrastructure funding pool. While our planning for capital building projects is robust—we engage stakeholders system-wide to develop our six-year capital improvement plan—we do not have a similar structure for our research infrastructure. We need it. I am asking the vice president for research to develop a collaborative process for regularly assessing and identifying high-priority research investment needs, and I am asking the chief financial officer to establish a reliable budget line in the University's annual budget. We must budget at a level that ensures appropriate investment supporting research across all disciplines at the University.

Finally, let me address our Academic Health Center (AHC). We are confident that our partnership with Fairview will deepen and that we, together, will bring additional revenues to the AHC. The external review I announced in January is being staffed and will take place as soon as possible within the constraints of the reviewers' schedules. A great Academic Health Center is central to the strength and global reputation of our University.

The third part of our mission is outreach and engagement. By this time you have probably heard my commitment to partner with key stakeholders to reduce the achievement gap in Minnesota—that is, those gaps in school performance between students of color and white students, and between low-income students and their middle- and upper-income classmates. To remain competitive economically and socially, Minnesota must find ways to improve the academic and life-course accomplishments of all of our citizens.

This is not a simple task, and not a task that any single social institution—families, schools, our business community, non-profits, or government—can do alone. But, driven by our three-part mission of teaching, research, and community engagement, bringing research and expertise to bear on significantly reducing the achievement gap is an important responsibility for this University. After all, we are the state's most powerful engine of discovery and innovation, and the best choice as the state's chief convener on such pressing issues.

I plan to devote my time to help lead this effort, and this spring I will host a "mini summit" to bring together our faculty experts to ensure that their efforts across all of our communities and campuses are coordinated. We at the U must continue to strengthen the diverse human capital across our state.

## LIBERAL ARTS

Before closing, let me discuss with you a pressing issue that must concern us all. That is the need to balance training for a job with being educated for life. The strength of American higher education—which is still the envy of the world—is its core of the liberal arts.

When I go to the Legislature or an Ag leaders' breakfast or a Rotary club luncheon, I always talk about our role as the state's only public research university. I talk about our deep and wide economic impact. But employers continually and loudly tell me that many of those jobs demand the skills of the liberal arts and humanities: writing, communicating, critical thinking and

analysis, working in teams, wrestling with and solving problems.

This University is about much more than training a workforce for today—although we do a very good job at that. It is about creating the ideas and innovations, the thinkers and leaders, and the economy and culture that will ensure our success for tomorrow—and for the day after, and the day after that.

## LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Let me close by taking you back 150 years, back to 1862. We were in the midst of the Civil War. It was also the year that 38 Indian men were wrongly hanged in Minnesota—a stain on our state's history.

Amid those dark times, President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act. Senator Justin Morrill of Vermont authored the act promoting agricultural research, the mechanical arts, and access to higher education for all. We will be celebrating the sesquicentennial of the Act all year through our Land Grant 150 series of programs. I would encourage you to take part in these events.

We have here today someone who can really and truly relate to the Morrill Act. He is a graduate of UMD and is now a master's student in our College of Design on the Twin Cities campus. His name is Prescott Morrill and—believe it or not—he is the great grandnephew of Senator Morrill. Prescott, please rise so we can applaud you and your forward-looking uncle.

So, with this special and direct connection, we move forward toward the next 150 years of our land-grant mission, balancing the prosperity of this state with the economy of the flat and hyper-connected world in which we live. We move forward in a world where human suffering and hunger are far too common, where the rule of law is lacking, and where intolerance and prejudice still thrive. We move forward as one of the few institutions in the world with the scope, span of skills, and talent needed to tackle those daunting problems.

From public health to agriculture, from engineering to law, from philosophy to medicine, our great University has the ability to attack and solve the challenges facing Minnesota, the nation, and the world. That should be our calling for the future.

In that future I see no other side to consider. In that case, there is no counterbalance to our calling. As an efficient, effective, and engaged institution, this University will continue to change the world.

## 26. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

**Q:** How is your \$150,000 salary increase consistent with your goal of holding the line on administrative costs? Will tuition increases be stopped without considering whether state funding is increasing or decreasing?

**A:** His salary is set by the Board of Regents and his total compensation is only slightly greater than that of former President Bruininks. It is also similar to presidents at other comparable institutions. The issue of tuition is a serious question and one constantly being worked on by the University. In his eight months, he has proposed the smallest increase in 13 years, which is moving in the correct direction. To bring tuition under control, three things must be done: the balance with the state must be addressed, efficiency and effectiveness must increase, and philanthropy must be a focus. He believes that the University is headed in the right direction. His goal is to have tuition increases as small as possible and even zero.

Q: As a faculty member, she is happy to hear about the balance between training for a job and a liberal education, but she is less thrilled about a year-round calendar of three semesters as the main rationale is to speed-up production of degrees. This addresses one of her core concerns, which is the intense focus on metrics such as graduation rates and time to degree. If the metrics are the goal, then everyone works to hit these numerical targets regardless of the substance. This system also does not tolerate failure, error, or experimentation. One must err in order to learn and therefore fail in order to succeed. True education has to accommodate these options as acceptable but the present structure of accountability accommodates only success narrowly defined in terms of grades, scores, credits, and credentials. How will the administration make more room in the present system for true education instead of mere credentialing?

A: Faculty own the curriculum, so what happens in the 120 credits required to graduate is up to them. He believes that there are areas in which tremendous amounts of education take place and true intellectual progress is made, but in other areas there is not. He applauded engagement with faculty colleagues to think about what goes into an undergraduate degree. In this world, unfortunately, the University needs to define metrics and measure outputs or someone else will.

Q: Many ways that things done administratively appear to be against the goals you recently defined in a previous question. One major impediment is the budget model which creates competition between colleges for tuition revenue. Is there any hope that the current budget model will be replaced?

A: The University is a profoundly decentralized organization which creates barriers to making changes. He is not prepared to announce that the budget model is being decommissioned today but he is in conversations with deans and financial people to identify the barriers and find ways to make the system work. While he has laid out his vision for the future, it will take hard work and a little time to arrive at these outcomes.

Q: The faculty might own the curriculum but it would be far better if the faculty controlled the University instead of the administration. There was a story this week in the *Star Tribune* about executives leaving the University and the golden parachute packages that they were provided. Today's *Star Tribune* has a letter from someone in Disability Services pointing out the perversity of throwing away money in the way that it was done and the quote from President Bruininks that he 'rounded up' when setting a severance package for one administrator. Will the University move away from this model to treat students and staff as well as administrators?

A: The packages described in the article were offered by former-President Bruininks and that was within his authority. He is a new president and people should wait to see what he does. He expects to adhere more closely to the policy on this issue.

Q: The past administration spent \$2.8 million on buy-out packages for a handful of administrators. This amount would cover a 2.8 percent raise for 1500 clerical workers, the front-line staff for the University. What is the vision of recognizing the work and contributions of all staff? What is the commitment of the current administration for increasing the funding for the Regents Scholarship, which was cut by the previous administration and limits staffs' ability to complete a degree from where they work?

A: He is recommending a salary increase this year for all employees. The University Senate has advised that some portion of these funds should be across-the-board. His final decision will go the Regents, but he is likely to recommend a portion as across-the-board. He is receiving a briefing from Vice President Brown on the Regents Scholarship costs and he will take changes under advisement. He is open to a conversation on what changes can be made.

Q: While many balances have been addressed, the one between breadth and depth was not mentioned. This University does a lot of things in many places. What are your thoughts on the tradeoffs between doing the same as now with less support from the state versus making investments in some areas?

A: This process will start when decisions are made regarding how to allocate \$21 million in recurring funds from the state for academic investments. Some of these funds will be used to fill gaps for the general health of the institution, but most will be used to begin to build spires of greatness. At the graduate level, all programs will be assessed to determine what the University does well. If something is not done well, then the question needs to be answered as to why it is still being done.

Q: In your address today, you mentioned that discrimination is a large problem. At today's Student Senate meeting, the body overwhelmingly approved a resolution opposing the proposed constitutional marriage amendment. Will the administration stand behind the commitment to fight discrimination and oppose its institutionalization within the state constitution?

A: The University clearly supports diversity but the politics of University endorsement is more complex. He would require more conversations with governance and the Regents before he would insert the University into a political battle. As an institution, it is open, supportive, and would not close doors to talented individuals.

Q: Some discomfort with metrics is that quality and integrity are hard to measure, yet these are concepts central to the University's mission and that drive the state. In these difficult times, what can the University do to protect quality and integrity?

A: The University needs to have discussions at each level and each time that a decision is made. Maintaining this focus in difficult times is what separates institutions. He will never oppose a decision that is made that is based on quality. However, most people want a quality education, yet do not want to pay for it. He will not work to have the University be cheap and mediocre.

Q: At the national level, the University tends to undersell itself. What do you propose to change this attitude?

A: The University can do a better job in terms of its university relations. However the rest is a culture change. If something is true, then highlighting it is not bragging. Faculty need to tell their story individually. For many this means being more comfortable talking about their work and being aggressive when there is an opportunity.

Q: When you first came to the University, you stated that the University needed to emphasize STEM disciplines. He noted that these disciplines are also available within the College of Liberal Arts and that other areas of study will also be making key scientific and intellectual discoveries of the future, sometimes in combination with a STEM discipline. Will the University continue to emphasize other disciplines in addition to the STEM fields?

A: His comments were not meant to emphasize one area over another but to have excellence in what the University does. In the traditional NSF STEM disciplines, the University has students who want to study and employers who want to hire quality graduates so he is proposing increased enrollment in these areas. As the University moves into its discussion of new academic investments, he strongly encourages repetition of these comments. The interdisciplinary nature of the future demands that current silos be broken down. He and the Provost need to encourage the removal of barriers to working together.

## **27. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert  
Abstractor**

## 2011-12 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MARCH 1, 2012

### STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 3

The third meeting of the Student Senate for 2011-12 was convened in Coffman Theatre on Thursday, March 1, 2012, at 11:34 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 30 student members. Vice Chair Joshua Preston presided.

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

Resolution on Bicycles and Pedestrian Concerns

Approved by the: Student Senate December 1, 2011

Approved by the: Administration - no action required\*

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

\* The safety of the University Community is of utmost importance. The University administration recognizes that during this year, safety has been challenged by the construction throughout campus and the need for pedestrians, bicyclists, cars, trucks, and buses to adjust to new routes. The Twin Cities Campus Master Plan prioritizes transportation modes in the following manner: pedestrians, bicycles, buses, and finally automobile traffic. It is with this priority order in mind that the University made several changes to enhance safety in preparation for the 2011-2012 academic year: 1) striped new bike lanes on Pleasant Street, Harvard Street, and the approaches to the east side of the Washington Avenue Bridge; 2) created bike boxes at intersections on Pleasant Street; 3) marked the southernmost sidewalk across Northrop Mall for bike traffic; 4) developed the Oak Street Bike Center; 5) worked with the City of Minneapolis on bike and traffic safety enhancements near campus; 6) initiated the *Safety is Easy - The Pavement is Hard* public awareness and education campaign; 7) created new bike route maps for on-line and published in the Minnesota Daily; and 8) stepped up enforcement of pedestrian, bike, and automobile traffic violations.

The University administration recognizes that we have the opportunity over the winter to fine tune and improve our efforts at enhancing pedestrian and bicycle safety. Staff have identified areas where we will enhance bicycle route signage and striping – both permanent and construction route detours – in order to ensure bicycle routes are clearly identified. Signs also will be placed in the larger bike parking areas alerting cyclists that all campus sidewalks are dismount zones unless otherwise marked. University of Minnesota Police will continue enforcement efforts (not only bicycle enforcement, but also jaywalking, and vehicular safety), but also will task their bike monitors with distributing rewards to cyclists who practice safe biking habits. In order to be successful, the University needs the help and assistance of its student leaders. To change the culture, student leaders must play a key role in setting the example for the community and encouraging their friends and classmates engage in safe behaviors. We look forward to working with the Student Senate on this extremely important issue and welcome other specific suggestions for how we can continue to enhance



safety on campus.

## **2. P&A SENATE UPDATE**

### **For Information:**

The P&A Senate represents the academic professional and administrators (P&A) class of 5400 non-unionized employees at the University. This class was started in 1980 and the governance body was formed as an advisory committee to the President. P&A have skills between civil service employees and faculty in jobs such as teachers, researchers, advisors, counselors, and extension service workers. Most people stay in this classification or move to a faculty position. P&A employee have some of the same benefits as faculty, but work on annually renewable contracts.

The P&A Senate meets from 9:30-11:30 am the first Friday of most months and meetings are open to the public. The P&A Senate consists of 40 representatives from campus units and colleges and has four subcommittees: Benefits and Compensation, Communications, Outreach, and Professional Development and Recognition.

### **Discussion:**

Ann Hagen, Vice Chair of the P&A Senate, said that Vice President Kathy Brown, from Human Resources was at the February P&A Senate meeting to discuss changes in that unit. The new wellness programs were also explained at that meeting.

Tomorrow's agenda includes a review of the PULSE survey and a discussion with P&A serving on a few Senate committees. P&A employees have also been informed that the President approved the change in the usage of the personal floating holiday.

## **3. CIVIL SERVICE SENATE UPDATE**

### **For Information:**

The Civil Service Senate represents the approximately 4300 employees in the civil service category which includes accountants, scientists, executive assistants, and administrators. The classification was started in 1945 with the passage of the civil service rules by the Regents. In 1984 PELRA was passed which allowed for the creation of a bargaining unit separate from civil service employees.

The Civil Service Senate is composed of 50 elected members. The body elects a vice chair each year, with the vice chair becoming next year's chair. The Civil Service Senate meets twice per year.

### **Discussion:**

There was no report.

## **4. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR REPORT**

Joshua Preston, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Vice Chair, reported that Adam Matula resigned from the Chair position due to a study abroad opportunity. The Minnesota Student Legislative Coalition (MSLC) is planning Support the U Day for March 30. This is a chance for students to lobby on behalf of the University and raise awareness of the funding needed for the bonding bill. He is looking for more involvement from Twin Cities students.

He has been working on the marriage resolution, which is later on today's agenda. This is the most significant resolution in recent memory and allows the students to fully utilize their power. This action has also drawn the attention of the administration, Faculty Consultative Committee, and non-profits outside the University.

## **5. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES**

**Crookston** – no report.

**Duluth** – Harrison Defries stated that UMDSA is restructuring the student association hierarchy to provide greater clarification.

**Morris** – Andy Showalter reported that MCSA is holding its technology fee hearings and has approved a green reinvestment fund.

**Rochester** – Courtnee Heyduk noted that RSA is working on its advertising policy, improving commons spaces on campus and elections.

**Graduate and Professional Student Assembly** – Emily Combs reported that GAPSA is restructuring in response to several resignations and is surveying all graduate and professional students on how the organization can be better. The Council of Graduate Students is working with Institutional Reporting on a survey of graduate students next fall and is conducting focus groups this spring regarding experiences with Boynton.

**Minnesota Student Association** - Sophie Wallerstedt said that MSA is working on the Improve U project, which is a campus re-design process to implement a change proposed by a student. The project provides for up to \$10,000 to fund the change. Elections will be held in April.

## **6. MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 1, 2011 Action**

### **MOTION:**

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL:

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssenate/111201stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK  
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

### **DISCUSSION:**

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

**APPROVED**

**7. RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED  
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT THAT DEFINES MARRIAGE  
AS BETWEEN ONE MAN AND ONE WOMAN**

**Action**

**RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL  
AMENDMENT THAT DEFINES MARRIAGE AS BETWEEN ONE MAN AND ONE  
WOMAN**

On November 6, 2012, the people of Minnesota will be voting on whether or not to amend the state constitution to “provide that only a union of one man and one woman shall be valid or recognized as a marriage in Minnesota.”<sup>1</sup> Because the approval of such a provision would directly discriminate against (and thus perpetuate the stigmatization of) those who identify with the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender (GLBT) community by depriving them of the same rights and recognition under state law as heterosexual couples, the Student Senate of the University of Minnesota believes it must take a stance on the proposed amendment. In making its decision, the body has considered three points:

- (1) The mission statement of the University of Minnesota, which states that in the exchange of ideas it is imperative to “provide an atmosphere of mutual respect, free from racism, sexism, and other forms of prejudice and intolerance”<sup>2</sup>; and,
- (2) The responsibility of the Student Senate is to deal “with any issue that affects the academic mission of the University or general welfare of ... students” while still working “for the betterment of the University as a whole”<sup>3</sup>; and, lastly,
- (3) GLBT students who are denied the full rights and recognition by state law that heterosexual couples enjoy are more likely to leave the state upon completion of their degree. As each student’s education through the University represents a significant investment in Minnesota’s future by the state itself, we believe the state has a vested interest in retaining those it has helped educate.

For these reasons, the Student Senate of the University of Minnesota believes the amendment is neither in the best interest of the University of Minnesota nor its students, and the Student Senate therefore rejects it. In addition, this body urges citizens – students and non – to stand with the GLBT community and vote against the proposed constitutional amendment.

**JOSHUA PRESTON, VICE CHAIR  
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**DISCUSSION:**

Joshua Preston, Vice Chair of the Student Senate, said that this resolution is likely the most significant action that the Student Senate will take for several years. When asked if this is an appropriate topic for the Student Senate, he believes that the discussion will show that these concerns are unfounded. He looks forward to the debate that will take place around this issue and how it will show the responsibility that this body has to the students and the citizens of this

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/mngov/constitutionalamendments.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/history-mission/index.html>

<sup>3</sup> *University of Minnesota Student Senate Constitution.*

state. The proposed amendment is meant to curtail the rights of a minority, which is not a stance that should be allowed by students.

Q: Is there any data to support the third clause of the resolution?

A: He is not sure if there is data to support this claim but this clause was included to speak to the larger economic argument for this topic.

A student commented that he stands in solidarity with his GLBT friends on this important issue.

Another student stated that Morris supports this resolution. Everyone should be able to marry in this state and she finds it ridiculous that the fight is now for the possibility to have this option someday. She feels it important that the institution stand up for her rights and those of every other student on this campus. It also makes wider statement to the state for all friends and family since everyone knows someone who cannot marry the person that they love.

A senator said that Rochester has a student group devoted to freedom of sexuality and this is a large group of students on a small campus.

A senator agreed that students need to raise their voices and he commends the speakers today. This issue will not be a debate among students on this campus. The Student Senate represents a respectful student body who respects minorities and their rights to love, be loved, and celebrate this love. He feels proud to be a leader and to stand up for the people of this state.

A senator thanked the Morris students who attended today's meeting. She is supportive of this resolution and her friends. Many times issues before this body represent nameless, faceless people but this is an topic in which the faces and names are known, and students can see the effects.

Another senator noted that most students agree that this resolution should be passed but this is a chance to set a precedent for the older generations. However he feels that this resolution includes a wrong reason by mentioning the effect on the state's economy.

Q: If this resolution is approved, what are the next steps to have an impact?

A: There are many passionate students on this issue who want to take further action. However, to avoid it being a feel-good resolution, senators must commit to continue the fight as many outside groups are watching what happens today.

A senator said that he could not be prouder to be here today as an ally of the GLBT community. This is a human rights issue that affects everyone and should not be made into a partisan issue. He does not care about the economics but instead the human implications. This amendment would codify hate into the state constitution and would limit the future rights of citizens. He asked that this resolution also be taken back to each student association for further action so that all groups can stand in solidarity.

A student commented on the third clause noting that while students might see this as an issue of equality, the resolution needs to appeal to the people who are uncomfortable with this topic and might only be concerned with the economics of a wasted investment in students.

A senator said that ideally the economic implications would not have to be included. However, this is the beginning of the wave to educate the state and some people will only be interested in this topic when it is tied to their wallets.

Another student said that there are many outside groups watching this issue including Outfront Minnesota, Minnesotans United for all Families, and MPIRG.

A senator stated that he would support the removal of the third clause.

Another senator spoke in favor of keeping the third clause. On the main arguments for repealing the 'Don't ask, Don't tell' policy was the investment that the military has already made in GLBT soldiers. She did suggest that the words 'we believe' be added before GLBT students in the third clause.

This amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment.

A student recounted a story of a friend from another institution who was called names three years after voting against a cut to GLBT funds when it was brought to the Senate. She cannot imagine this attitude being tolerated at this institution as students protect their own. It is easy to think of this amendment as something beyond the University which will not affect students and the community, however it will. Bigotry, fear, and hatred, all things encouraged by this amendment, have a way of trickling down to drive out GLBT communities. Then the University's mission statement would only be a series of words. This amendment threatens all that the University stands for and needs to be defeated.

Another student said that many students feel that coming out in high school is incredibly difficult. If the University adopts this amendment, it might change attitudes in small towns across the state and students might not feel as threatened. Adoption will also energize other student organizations that are working to defeat this amendment.

A student hoped that approval today would also spread this movement to other institutions in the state.

A senator noted that the opposition has not rallied much support. This amendment represents an archaic and barbaric belief that is not shared by this generation.

With no further discussion, a roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved with 23 votes in favor, one opposed, and four abstentions.

**APPROVED**

**8. ELECTION OF 2011-12 STUDENT SENATE/  
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR  
Action**

Joshua Preston, a student from the University of Minnesota Morris, was elected Student Senate Chair.

**9. OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

**10. NEW BUSINESS**

Joshua Preston reminded senators that the University Senate meeting starts at 3:00 pm today.

A senator then noted that the Student Senate asked the University to endorse the designated suppliers program (DSP) which would regulate apparel procurement. He would encourage President Kaler to sign onto the DSP.

Another senator then asked students to make sure that faculty are encouraged to release the Student Release Questions (SRQs) as part of the class evaluation process.

**11. RESOLUTION CALLING FOR INCREASED TRANSPARENCY  
IN COLLEGIATE FEES PROCESSES  
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Student Assembly**

**RESOLUTION CALLING FOR INCREASED TRANSPARENCY  
IN COLLEGIATE FEES PROCESSES**

WHEREAS, all students must pay mandatory collegiate fees that are to pay for ‘...“goods and services that directly benefit students but that are not part of actual classroom instruction”. Allowable goods and services include advising, career services, computer labs, special equipment, orientation activities and other goods or activities intended to enhance the student experience outside of actual classroom instruction.’ ; and

WHEREAS, collegiate fees continue to increase each year, with an average increase of 38.8% in Fiscal Year 12, with limited explanation as to the reasons for the dramatic increase.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, The Twin Cities Campus Student Assembly, joins with the Council of Graduate Students and the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, to respectfully request that the collegiate units explain the striking increase in fees charged by some colleges. And

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that one graduate and/or professional student representative and one undergraduate student representative be present at future meetings of each respective college to discuss alteration to the fee assessment process, and how the fees collected are spent by each college. And

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that should future increases in collegiate fees occur, colleges notify students as soon as the final decision has been made.

**ADAM MATULA, CHAIR  
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**DISCUSSION:**

Emily Combs said that since this resolution was drafted, progress has been made on receiving information from the collegiate compact reports on student fee increases being proposed. Student can also request information on the proposed increases before they are finalized so that the student voice can be heard.

Q: Are expenses itemized on the reports?

A: Large purchases are itemized on the reports, but not all expenses can be done this way due to the University’s budget model but the University is looking into making changes.

A senator said that this resolution is a good idea but students should also be involved on the committee's initially making these decisions.

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

**APPROVED**

## **12. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:38 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert  
Abstractor**