

**2013-14 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
DECEMBER 5, 2013**

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

The second meeting of the Faculty Senate for 2013-14 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, December 5, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 117 faculty/academic professional members. President Kaler presided.

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

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**

Recommended Guidelines for Evaluating Competitive Faculty Applications for University Funded Sabbatical Supplements
Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 3, 2013
Approved by the: Administration **PENDING**
Approved by the: Board of Regents - no response required

**2. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Amendments to three Graduate Education Policies:
Master's Degree: Performance Standards and Progress
Doctoral Degree: Performance Standards and Progress
Post-Baccalaureate Certificate Plans Approved by the Board of Regents
Information for the Faculty Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

The Faculty Consultative Committee acted on behalf of the Faculty Senate to unanimously approve these three policies because they are primarily technical changes to restore to current policy elements of earlier policies that were inadvertently omitted when the policies were reorganized and moved to the University's policy library. The one small change of substance, substituting "should" for "must" in the Ph.D. policy, was suggested by the Graduate School so that departments/programs were not forced to terminate a student's graduate work because of an inflexible GPA rule, even though the department might have good reasons for not doing so. It was also brought to our attention that the policies allow departments and graduate programs to establish higher minima than the ones established by these policies.

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy also approved these policies unanimously.

POLICY 1

MASTER'S DEGREE: PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROGRESS – 10.31.2013

POLICY STATEMENT

Students are responsible for knowing all program requirements of their master's program when they matriculate. If program requirements change, students may elect to continue under the requirements in effect when they matriculated, provided they have remained in good standing.

The advisor and the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) for the program are jointly responsible for helping each student plan and appropriately complete the requirements in a timely fashion. The DGS is also responsible for ensuring that each student receives training appropriate to the discipline in the responsible conduct of research and ethical teaching and scholarship.

Programs and collegiate units may have additional and/or more stringent requirements.

I. Pre-Matriculation Requirements for Programs

Programs must, before students begin their first term of study:

- Provide each student a current graduate program handbook, specifying the program's requirements and policies governing successful degree completion
- Assign each student a temporary advisor

II. Progress Review

- a. **Annual Review** Programs must review the progress of each master's student annually. Students deemed not to be in good standing must be informed of the results of the review in writing, with a copy to the student's advisor.
- b. **Degree Plan** Master's degree students must have an approved degree plan on file in the collegiate unit in order to defend and/or apply for degree clearance. It is recommended that the degree plan be filed at least one term (fall or spring semester) before the intended term of the defense and/or application for degree clearance. The degree plan must be archived in the system of record. For students intending to pursue a minor:
 - i. In master's programs that include a final examination/defense, students must declare the minor prior to the examination/defense.
 - ii. In master's programs that do not include a final examination/defense, students must declare the minor prior to filing for degree conferral.

III. Performance Standards

- a. **Continuous Enrollment** Students are required to enroll every semester (fall and spring) from the time of matriculation until degree conferral.
- b. **Time Limit for Earning the Master's Degree** All requirements for the master's degree must be completed and the degree awarded within the shorter of five calendar years after initial enrollment in the graduate program or the more restrictive time frame specified by the program.

Students who are unable to complete the degree within the time limits described above due to extraordinary circumstances may petition the program and collegiate unit for an extension of up to 12 months. Students must obtain the approval of their advisor/s and program DGS and submit the petition by the deadline.

- If a petition is approved, the student is notified in writing of the expectations for progress and for the month/year of degree conferral.
- If the petition is denied, the student is notified in writing that he or she will be terminated from the graduate program upon expiration of the limit.

Students who have been terminated under such circumstances may apply for readmission to the program; however, readmission is not guaranteed.

- c. **Minimum Grade Requirements** To remain in good academic standing students should meet the minimum GPA requirement specified by the graduate program or 2.800 (on a 4.000 scale), whichever is higher. Students who have filed a master's degree plan should maintain a 2.800 GPA for courses included on the degree plan. Only courses with grades of A, B, C (including C-) and S may be counted toward the degree. Students who have not yet filed a degree plan ~~must~~ should maintain an overall GPA of 2.800. ~~Graduate programs may require a higher GPA for individual major fields and may apply the requirement to the overall GPA instead of only to degree plan coursework.~~ Students who fall below the program's minimum GPA requirement may be terminated from the program.

Note: Students must have at least a 2.800 GPA for courses included on the degree plan at the time of degree clearance.

- d. **S/N grades for courses** A minimum of 2/3 of the course credits included on a degree plan must be taken A/F.

Exception

Programs with a distinctive student population or approved joint-degree programs may request a program-wide exception to the five-year time limit for earning the master's degree.

Effective Date

This policy applies to all students admitted after January 1, 2013. Students who matriculated before January 1, 2013 may choose to continue under the policies in effect when they initially matriculated in their graduate program.

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

This policy creates the framework for communications to students about degree requirements and the student's progress; sets minimum standards for satisfactory progress in doctoral programs; establishes clear standards and procedures for administering and grading doctoral written and oral preliminary examinations. This policy establishes uniform and procedures for doctoral preliminary examinations.

The policy also assists the student and advisor in planning for timely completion of program requirements, provides timely evaluations to students as they proceed through program; alerts student and advisors to problems, and provides opportunity to develop best approach for addressing those problems; and creates a clear record in cases where program decides to terminate student.

POLICY 2

DOCTORAL DEGREE: PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND PROGRESS – 10.31.2013

POLICY STATEMENT

Students are responsible for knowing all program requirements of their doctoral program when they matriculate. If program requirements change, students may elect to continue under the requirements in effect when they matriculated, provided they have remained in good standing.

The advisor and the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) for the program are jointly responsible for helping each student plan and appropriately complete the requirements in a timely fashion. The DGS is also responsible for ensuring that each student receives training appropriate to the discipline in the responsible conduct of research and ethical teaching and scholarship.

Programs and collegiate units may have additional and/or more stringent requirements.

I. Pre-Matriculation Requirements for Programs

Programs must, before students begin their first term of study:

- Provide each student a current graduate program handbook, specifying the program's requirements and policies governing successful degree completion
- Assign each student a temporary advisor.

II. Progress Review

- a. Annual Review Programs must review the progress of each doctoral student at least once a year and must provide the results to the student in writing.
- b. Degree Plan Doctoral students must have an approved degree plan on file with their collegiate unit prior to taking the preliminary oral exam.
 - i. If a student intends to complete a minor, the minor must be declared on the degree plan prior to taking this exam. The degree plan must be centrally archived in the system of record.
 - ii. It is recommended that the degree plan be filed, at minimum, three months prior to the exam date.

III. Performance Standards

- a. Continuous Enrollment Students are required to enroll every semester (fall and spring) from the time of matriculation until degree conferral.
- b. Time Limit for Earning the Doctoral Degree All requirements for the doctoral degree must be completed and the degree awarded within the shorter of eight calendar years after initial enrollment to the graduate program or the more restrictive time frame specified by the program.

Students who are unable to complete the degree within the time limits described above may petition the program and collegiate unit for one extension of up to 24 months. Students must obtain the approval of their advisor/s and program DGS and submit the petition for an extension at least six months prior to the end of the time limit.

- a. If a petition is approved, the student is notified in writing of the expectations for progress and of the month/year of degree conferral.

- b. If the petition is denied, the student is notified in writing that he or she will be terminated from doctoral candidacy and from the graduate program upon expiration of the time limit.
- c. Under extraordinary circumstances, students may file a second petition for an additional 24 month extension after the first 24 months have expired; however such petitions after the initial extension must be reviewed and approved by the advisor/s, program DGS, and Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education.
- d. Students who have been terminated under such circumstances may apply for readmission to the program; however, readmission is not guaranteed.
- e. Minimum Grade Requirements To remain in good academic standing students should meet the minimum GPA requirement specified by the graduate program or 3.000 (on a 4.000 scale), whichever is higher. Students who have filed a doctoral degree plan should maintain a 3.000 GPA for courses included on the degree plan. Only courses with grades of A, B, C (including C-) and S may be counted toward the degree. Students who have not yet filed a degree plan ~~must~~ should maintain an overall GPA of 3.000. ~~Graduate programs may require a higher GPA for individual major fields and may apply the requirement to the overall GPA instead of only to degree plan coursework.~~ Students who fall below the program's minimum GPA requirement may be terminated from the program.
- f. S/N grades for courses A minimum of 2/3 of the course credits included on a degree plan must be taken A/F.

IV. Doctoral Preliminary Written and Oral Examinations

- a. Each doctoral candidate must pass a written examination in the major field.
 - I. The doctoral preliminary written examination will be graded either pass, pass with reservations, or fail in accordance with program standards.
 - II. For students who pass with reservations, conditions to be met must be given in writing to the student within ten working days, including a timeline for completion.
- b. Every doctoral student must pass a preliminary oral examination in the major field in programs where such an examination is a degree requirement. The preliminary oral examination is conducted as a closed examination, attended by only the student and the examining committee.
 - i. The oral examination may not take place before examiners have certified that the candidate received a passing grade on the preliminary written examination and that any reservations have been removed.
 - ii. The doctoral preliminary oral examination will be graded either pass, pass with reservations, or fail.
 - iii. If a student fails the exam, he or she may retake the examination once. All committee members, or all committee members save one must approve this option.
 - iv. The second attempt to pass the preliminary oral examination must use the same committee members unless an emergency situation necessitates a substitution.
 - v. If the committee does not approve a retake, or if the student fails the second attempt, the student will be terminated from the program.
- c. The doctoral preliminary oral committee must consist of at least four members, including the advisor/s. All members of the committee and the candidate must participate in the

preliminary oral examination. Committee members and/or the student may participate remotely as long as all conditions for remote participation in the examination are met.

- I. At least three members (including the advisor) must be from the student's major field.
- II. At least one member must represent a field outside the major. (If the student has declared a minor, the outside member, or one of the outside members, must represent the minor field.)
- III. Members cannot satisfy the requirement with respect to more than one field.

Exceptions

Programs with a distinctive student population or approved joint-degree programs may request a program-wide exception to the eight-year time limit for earning the doctoral degree.

Doctoral programs with approved degree performance standards and progress requirements that do not require preliminary written and oral examinations are exempt from IV.

Effective Date

This policy applies to all students admitted after January 1, 2013. Students who matriculated before January 1, 2013 may choose to continue under the policies in effect when they initially matriculated in their graduate program.

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

This policy creates the framework for communications to students about degree requirements and the student's progress; sets minimum standards for satisfactory progress in doctoral programs; establishes clear standards and procedures for administering and grading doctoral written and oral preliminary examinations. This policy establishes uniform and procedures for doctoral preliminary examinations.

The policy also assists the student and advisor in planning for timely completion of program requirements, provides timely evaluations to students as they proceed through program; alerts student and advisors to problems, and provides opportunity to develop best approach for addressing those problems; and creates a clear record in cases where program decides to terminate student.

POLICY 3

POST-BACCALAUREATE CERTIFICATE PLANS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF REGENTS – 10.31.2013

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.
- ed. Only courses with grades of A, B, C (including C-) and S may be counted toward the degree.

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.

Note: Students must have at least a 2.800 GPA for courses included on the degree plan at the time of degree clearance.

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.

WILLIAM DURFEE
CHAIR, FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

3. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Kaler began by addressing the topic of campus safety which is the most pressing issue facing the Twin Cities campus. There is nothing more important to him than ensuring that everyone works and learns in a safe and secure campus. He is angry and frustrated that crimes continue to take place around campus against students, and it is completely unacceptable. However he assured senators that the University is working to fix this issue.

He hopes that the communications being issued have been helpful and summarized a few points. Since October 17 University Police have logged 200 hours of overtime in marked vehicles and as undercover officers. The UMPD response team continues its collaborative work with the Minneapolis Police Second Precinct and Transit Police. At the request of Chief Hestness, Hennepin County deputies have assisted with patrols the past two weekends. As of Monday, UMPD officers have engaged in on and off campus activities that have resulted in 21 arrests. The Gopher Chauffeur program has been expanded to provide rides for students on Thursday through Sunday nights. The Minnesota Student Association (MSA) is currently hosting a phone bank and tonight is hosting a letter-writing campaign to city council representatives to support increased lighting and patrols around campus.

Everyone should expect to be safe and secure, but the University community needs to recognize that criminals are targeting students. Late Tuesday, Vice President Wheelock sent a letter to Mayor Rybak and City Council President Johnson. She reminded city leaders that everyone thrives when its citizens are safe and secure. In his view, the safety of this campus is critical the University's image and perception across the state.

The University has been doing its part. Since 2004 it has invested \$16 million in campus security system resources including 1700 security cameras, 2600 card access readers, and the new Text-U system. In Vice President Wheelock's letter, she urged the city to increase its resources to address these issues in an active partnership with the University.

For this group it raises the issue of how open campus can and should be. Should the response be wearing of name badges, more card access readers, or more locked buildings? These are important questions that will need to be discussed in the next month. He has also had faculty members tell him that they did not know what to do in emergency safety situations. He has asked the Provost and Vice President Wheelock to develop information in an educational approach.

President Kaler said that aggressive law enforcement is paying off. The University knows in this process that it may stop someone who ultimately will not be issued a citation or arrested. Low-level enforcement has been a proven strategy for reducing more serious crime in Minneapolis and other cities, but he knows that this strategy can cause concerns about racial profiling which is a serious national problem. He stated that he, Chief Hestness, and Vice President Wheelock do not tolerate profiling. Instead UMPD officers police behaviors. If someone has suspicious behavior, they are stopped. If someone reports an incident of profiling on campus, it will be investigated. He is confident that the University is pursuing the correct strategies, but it will take time and help to address the damage being caused by a handful of criminals.

He then noted that Brooks Jackson has been appointed as the new Vice President for the Academic Health Center and Dean of the Medical School. He is a world-renowned HIV/AIDS researcher and respected faculty member from Johns Hopkins. When he became President over two years ago, he identified improvement of the Academic Health Center and the Medical School as priorities. An external review and strategic planning by Medical School faculty has helped chart this course. The University has also created a new way of working with Fairview

Health Services to deliver exceptional health services and patient care. The University will also break ground later this month on a new ambulatory care center. He expressed his appreciation to Dr. Friedman for his leadership over the past three years.

Lastly he noted that the Regents will dedicate a work session at their meeting next week to undergraduate tuition and financial aid policy. As state support has declined over the past decade, the University has moved closer to a high tuition/high aid model. It is important for the Regents to discuss the implications and tradeoffs for this model.

4. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

NONE

5. PROVOST'S REPORT

Provost Karen Hanson started by thanking the College of Liberal Arts search process and search committee for their work in identifying candidates. Concerns have been raised about the lack of diversity in the finalist pool, but she noted that some candidates that were identified by the search committee did not choose to become finalists. Additionally, Professor Ann Waltner is stepping down as the director of the Institute for Advanced Study and an international search is underway for her replacement.

She received the draft graduate education report yesterday. She will be discussing it with the committee next week and it will be broadly released before the end of the semester. She thanked Professor Scott Lanyon and all the committee members for their hard work.

Provost Hanson noted that the discussion continues of a College of Biological Sciences/College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences merger. Internal and external listening sessions are taking place and stakeholder meetings are being scheduled. A preliminary report will be sent to her before the end of the semester.

Lastly Strategic Planning work continues. A vision statement has been drafted. Next consultation will take place with external stakeholders and students. This work will continue into the next semester.

6. QUESTIONS TO THE PROVOST

Q: Why is there no one on the Special Graduate Education Committee who represents the arts disciplines on campus?

A: Unfortunately it was impossible to ensure representation from all sectors without appointing a committee that was too unwieldy. When the committee was first appointed, representation issues were noted and additional members were added. She encouraged everyone to provide their input through comments to the report.

Q: At the last Senate meeting there was a discussion of the obstacles to interdisciplinary teaching and research. However, the same question should be asked for teaching within one's discipline or department as obstacles now inhibit curriculum development and maintenance. It began with restructuring liberal requirements (LE), followed closely by Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and now additional requirements to maintain LE certification. How can faculty innovate in the curriculum if it requires 18-24 months of advance planning?

A: The newly-established curriculum committee should help sort out who has responsibilities in each area and eliminate poaching of courses due to the budget model. Faculty as a body have responsibility for the curriculum and she does not see an issue with this body making sure that course offerings are appropriate to the mission of the college. There is also no way to avoid attention to SLOs due to federal and accreditation standards. She does not see these levels of reviewing being eliminated, but if there are specific burdens, those can be addressed.

7. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Amendments to the Board of Regents Policy: Commercialization of Intellectual Property Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To amend the Board of Regents Policy: Commercialization of Intellectual Property as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

SECTION I. SCOPE.

This policy governs patents and the ownership, commercialization, and dissemination of intellectual property rights in technology created at the University of Minnesota (University).

SECTION II. EXCLUSIONS.

Subd. 1. Copyright. With the exception of the commercialization of intellectual property rights in software owned by the University, this policy shall not apply to the ownership or use of copyrighted works that are governed by other Board of Regents (Board) or administrative policies.

Subd. 2. Trademarks. With the exception of intellectual property rights in University trademarks that identify University---owned plant varieties or that are commercialized in conjunction with other technology covered by this policy, this policy shall not apply to the use of University---owned or licensed names, trademarks, or service marks.

Subd. 3. Equity Interests. This policy shall not apply (a) to the University's acquisition of equity securities in a publicly held company or appointment of a voting member to the governing body of a publicly held company or (b) to the acquisition of equity securities of a publicly held company by a University employee.

Subd. 4. Student---Created Technology. This policy shall not apply to technology created or reduced to practice by University students to fulfill a University course requirement unless (i) the development of the technology was funded, in whole or in part, by an external sponsor; (ii) the technology was an improvement of an invention in which the University holds the intellectual property rights; (iii) a University faculty member or other University employee was a co---inventor of the technology; or (iv) substantial University resources were used to develop or reduce the technology to practice. This policy does not prohibit the University from conditioning participation in a University course or other University---sponsored activity on an individual's assigning to or licensing to the University the rights in technology created or reduced to practice in the course or activity.

...

SECTION V. OWNERSHIP OF TECHNOLOGY.

Subd. 1. Ownership. The University shall be the sole owner of all rights, titles, and interests (including intellectual property rights) in and to technology:

(a) created by University employees in the course of their employment;

~~(b) created by students or post-doctoral or other fellows in the course of their academic duties or appointments; or~~

(e)(b) created by individuals, including employees, students, or post---doctoral or other fellows, using substantial University resources.

Subd. 2. Assignment of Intellectual Property Rights. Inventors assign to the University all rights, titles, and interests, if any, in and to technology owned by the University.

Subd. 3. Ownership Under Third Party Agreements. Ownership of and rights in technology are subject to the terms of written agreements between the University and third parties under which the University, solely or in collaboration, conducts research or other activities. Under these agreements, the University may claim, disclaim, or otherwise grant or accept rights in technology as appropriate and desirable.

Subd. 4. Waiver of University Rights. Consistent with administrative policies and procedures, the president or delegate is authorized to waive or otherwise assign to an inventor all or part of the University's rights, titles, or interests in or to a technology created by the inventor.

Subd. 5. Rights to Publish. At the University's request, inventors shall delay the publication or public disclosure of any descriptions of technology for a brief period of time to permit the registration, application for, and protection of the intellectual property rights in the technology

Subd. 6. Rights to Third Parties. The president or delegate may assign, license, or otherwise grant a third party the right to use technology royalty---free or in exchange for cash, stock or other securities, or other tangible or intangible property.

...

COMMENT:

This change addresses an issue faced by students doing course-related projects not related to university research, for example students in capstone design courses in engineering departments. Under current policy, inventions created by students while working on such projects belongs to the University. Because students are receiving an education, for which they pay tuition, it is appropriate that the results of that education, including inventions, should belong to the student. Further, University ownership of inventions created by students in courses is a barrier for companies who wish to sponsor projects in engineering capstone courses. The policy change fixes this problem by allowing students to retain ownership of inventions created in courses, so long as those inventions are not connected to existing University intellectual property or to a

University sponsored research project. The Senate Research Committee and the Faculty Consultative Committee approved this change unanimously.

**WILLIAM DURFEE
CHAIR, FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**8. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Update from the Special Committee on Graduate Education
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

Professor Scott Lanyon, Chair of the Special Committee on Graduate Education, joined the meeting to discuss some of the work being done by the committee this semester in advance of the release of its report after December 16. This committee was formed after the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) last year heard concerns about graduate education in many different settings. These comments were shared with the President and Provost, and a decision was made to have FCC and the Provost jointly charge a committee to make recommendations.

The committee's scope focused on PhD research degrees that were part of the National Research Counsel. Committee members were recommended from all colleges and many top-ranked programs, but some appointments could not be made due to the fast timeline that was included in the committee's charge.

The committee used 12-18 months of previous input from FCC meetings each year with faculty and department heads/chairs and data from the April Graduate School survey. Four subcommittees were established and asked to complete preliminary reports. Four listening sessions were held on campus to hear complaints, concerns, and aspirations.

As noted, the draft report will be presented to the Provost and Professor Durfee, FCC Chair, tomorrow. Today he will highlight the general observations from the committee.

First is that graduate education is central to a successful University and an effective way to improve national and international standards even though this notion is rarely expressed. How post-baccalaureate education is defined is also key as just using graduate or professional is too simplistic and conveys similarities that do not exist. The current budget model makes sense financially but not academically when discussing post-baccalaureate education.

Second is that quality post-baccalaureate education needs to be put first. Academic goals should be established first and then funding should be determined; not the opposite approach.

Third is that interdisciplinary interests make post-baccalaureate education more complicated. There is a small set of intercollege scholarships available while many more exist in only one college. Students in all programs should have the ability to pursue all scholarships.

The fourth observation was to look at what is best for the students in terms of available funding, traditional inertia, and needs between faculty and students. The needs of students and their future employers should be equally important. In this area, the Graduate School has been a strong advocate but its ability has weakened.

Fifth is that all areas of the University need to see post-baccalaureate education as a core value of the University. The committee noted that there have been nine reports about post-baccalaureate education in 10 years. Some recommendations have been implemented while others have not. In most cases it was unclear as to who was responsible for implementing change. This report is different because it makes recommendations and lists who should be making them.

In closing Professor Lanyon noted that post-baccalaureate education is not a challenge but an opportunity for the University.

Q: What about the link to post-doctoral education at the University which appears to also be weakened?

A: Post-doctoral education was not included in the scope of this committee.

Q: Departments with strong faculty appear to be more attractive to potential students. How can other programs compete financially?

A: The report will indicate that strong faculty depend on a strong program which cannot be accomplished without financial backing.

Q: How did the committee define generic excellence through rankings versus distinctive synergies that exist in some programs

A: Rankings are just one view of a program. The listening sessions noted that breadth brings opportunities but can make nimbleness more difficult.

9. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Changes to the Student Rating of Teaching Form Discussion by the Faculty Senate

Recommended Changes to the Student Rating of Teaching Form As of November 21, 2013

Goals of revision:

- Respond to increased student demand for releasing information that may aid in course selection by releasing course related information from the SRT that does not violate Minnesota state data privacy law.
- Revise the SRT by eliminating items that have been problematic, adding new items, and incorporating items from the current student release survey.

Overview proposed revision (see detailed description on pages 2-3):

- Eliminate the student release survey in its current form. Few instructors opt-in to release the results of the survey and survey questions overlapped with similar questions on the SRT.
- Retain six core items from the current SRT that are frequently used in personnel reviews and for promotion and tenure files.
- Revise the SRT to incorporate selected items from the Student Release survey.
- Identify a subset of SRT items (#7-11) that will be released to student without violating the Minnesota Data Practices Act.
- Include a new question regarding the use of instructional technology (if applicable to the course).

- Eliminate the open-ended question “what could you have done to be a better learner” and replace with the question “what suggestions do you have to improve this course” (see pages 2-3 for rationale).

Revised SRT questions

1. The instructor was well prepared for class.
2. The instructor presented the subject matter clearly.
3. The instructor provided feedback intended to improve my course performance.
4. The instructor treated me with respect.
5. The instructor set high expectations for learning the content.
6. I would recommend this instructor to other students.

Course related items 7-11 will be released to students

7. I have a deeper understanding of the subject matter as a result of this course.
8. My interest in the subject matter was stimulated by this course.
9. Instructional technology employed in this course was used effectively (1 2 3 4 5 6 N/A).
10. The grading standards for this course were clear.
11. I would recommend this course to other students.

WRITTEN COMMENTS SECTION

- What did the instructor do that most helped your learning?
- What suggestions do you have for improving this course?

Detailed Description of Proposed Changes

Variable	Suggested Action
Written Comments	<p>Eliminate item 2: <u>What could you have done to be a better learner?</u></p> <p>Proposed New Item: <u>What suggestions do you have to improve this course?</u></p> <p>Rationale: Item 2 has been problematic for many instructors since its inception. The proposed new item is used in many evaluation forms and balances the current item #1 that focuses on “what the instructor did that most helped your learning”.</p> <p>Eliminate item 3: <u>Additional Comments</u> No revisions or new items proposed</p> <p>Rationale: While item #3 allows students to speak broadly about issues unrelated to items 1 and 2, this item can serve as a catalyst for statements about the instructor that are derogatory and personal. Suggestions on improving the course—a primary and reasonable focus of student feedback—are handled by a revised item 2 (above) and should be sufficient.</p>
Student Release Survey Questions	<p>Eliminate this section as a stand-alone area and incorporate revised or new items into the front page of the SRT after the core items</p> <p>Maintain items: #6 I would recommend this instructor to other students. #11 I would recommend this course to other students.</p>

	<p>Item for Revision: Has a reasonable grading system Proposed Revised Item: The grading standards for this course were clear.</p> <p>Item for Revision: Compared to other courses at this level, the difficulty of this course is...</p> <p>Proposed Revised Item: The instructor set high expectations for learning the content.</p> <p>Rationale: The Student Release Questions are not meeting the goals for which they were intended (help students choose appropriate coursework) given the low percentage of faculty who release these items. The items also have varying scales and replicate to some extent certain core items.</p> <p>Keeping items on “recommending this instructor to other students” and “recommending this course to other students” seems reasonable as they connect well with what students ultimately want to know.</p>
<p>Additional Items for the SRT</p>	<p>Proposed New items #9. Instructional technology employed in this course was used effectively (needs to have a Not Applicable option at the end)</p> <p>Revised student release items 10. The grading standards for this course were clear. 11. The instructor set high standards for learning the content.</p> <p>Rationale for Proposed New Item: <u>Technology:</u> The current and regular attention given to eLearning on campus warrants its acknowledgement in the SRT. Unless “technology” is understood in a very broad sense, however, this item will elicit concerns from students and faculty in many courses in which overt technology is not a key component of instructional delivery. This fact suggests that a “not applicable” box be made available for students to check.</p> <p>Other items dealing with specific aspects of technology—online discussions, websites, software availability, etc—are too narrow to be included in an all university form.</p>

WILLIAM DURFEE
CHAIR, FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Will Durfee, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), noted that the current opt-in system for release of data to students from the Student Release Questions (SRQs) is confusing for faculty and leads to minimal data available for students. The issue is that questions that refer to the instructor are considered private data, requiring the opt-in for release,

while questions that refer to the course are considered public data not requiring consent for release. The current form has been in place for many years and the proposed changes will provide better information that is easier to release.

Q: Why is some data considered private and other data not?

A: It is outlined in the Minnesota Government Data Practices Agreement.

A senator noted that the current 10 questions are too many and require too much time for responses. Also some instructors rotate teaching a course so those evaluations are less useful for students.

Another senator noted that accessibility/disability issues are not requested on the form in addition to the physical environment. These questions are key to on-line courses.

Q: Is there data on the use of the current SRQs by students?

A: The Office of Measurement Services (OMS) maintains the data, but as less than five percent of faculty release this information, the percentage of student use is also extremely low.

Q: Are faculty required to release this data?

A: Under the proposed policy change release will be obligatory.

A senator stated that many faculty are unsure if they have already provided consent for release in the past and therefore might not do it again.

Another senator said that she likes the question that asks students to self-estimate the amount of work that they did in the course as it is useful information to review in conjunction with the written responses.

A senator felt that if faculty are required to release this information, then students should be required to complete the forms.

Q: Will there be a threshold to release of the information for small courses?

A: Yes to protect student identity.

10. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Issues Arising from the CAFE Study and the Suicide of Dan Markingson
Action by the Faculty Senate
(30 minutes)

PREAMBLE:

In May 2004, Dan Markingson, while enrolled in a clinical trial of an antipsychotic drug (the CAFE study) at the University of Minnesota, committed suicide. Since then individuals and groups within and outside the University have raised questions about the study, how Markingson was recruited into it, his treatment during the study, and the circumstances of his suicide.

On October 21, 2013, a letter co-authored by six bioethicists from outside the University, with 175 co-signatories, was addressed to President Eric Kaler and Professor Eva von Dassow, as chair and vice-chair (respectively) of the Faculty Senate, and to members of the University of

Minnesota Senate. The letter asked the Senate to endorse and request an independent investigation of the issues arising from the Markingson case and the CAFE study. That letter is available at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsenate/docs/131205toronto_letter.pdf. The list of additional co-signatories is available at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsenate/docs/131205toronto_signatures.pdf.

On November 20, 2013, fourteen faculty senators co-signed a request to the Faculty Consultative Committee to place this matter on the agenda of the December 5 Faculty Senate meeting for discussion, and further requesting that a resolution calling for an independent investigation be presented for discussion and action. That letter is available at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsenate/docs/131205letter_to_fcc.pdf.

The FCC discussed the letter and the issues it raises at its meetings on Oct. 24, Nov. 14, and Nov. 21. While these discussions have not reached a conclusion, and members of the FCC have varying views, a consensus emerged that it is appropriate to bring the matter before the Faculty Senate at this time. The FCC wishes to emphasize the following points.

First, it is important that those participating in decisions about this matter familiarize themselves, with the history of the case and investigations conducted to date.

Second, as the FCC studied this issue, two things became clear: that the Markingson tragedy specifically had been investigated several times from different perspectives, and that those investigations did not address the broader question of whether the University's current policies, procedures and practices, some of them changed since the Markingson case, reflect both best practices in clinical research on human subjects and the faculty's high ambitions for ethical behavior. Members of the FCC also recognize that external evaluations can have the advantage of fresh perspectives not biased by familiarity with current practice, and are a way for the public to have the utmost confidence in the integrity of the research conducted at the University of Minnesota.

For this reason, the FCC feels that the way forward is to recommend that an independent and transparent examination be undertaken to evaluate the University's procedures, practices, and policies governing clinical research on human subjects, and in particular clinical research involving adult participants with diminished functional abilities. While the specific charge for such an examination requires further work, FCC believes issues to address may include investigator conflict of interest, institutional conflict of interest, consent policies and procedures, case management of enrolled participants, mechanisms for overseeing such research and mechanisms for addressing adverse events.

Therefore, the FCC suggests to the Faculty Senate the following resolution:

Resolution on the matter of the Markingson case

WHEREAS the faculty of the University of Minnesota are committed to upholding high ethical standards in the conduct of research;

WHEREAS questions continue to be raised about the policies and procedures followed in the Markingson case;

WHEREAS the University has suffered reputational harm in consequence of this tragic case and its aftermath;

WHEREAS the faculty seek to ensure through independent evaluation that the University's ethical standards for clinical research on human subjects meet or surpass the norm,

BE IT RESOLVED that an investigative panel external to and independent from the University of Minnesota be constituted for the purpose of conducting an inquiry examining current policies, practices, and oversight of clinical research on human subjects at the University, in particular clinical research involving adult participants with diminished functional abilities. The administration, in collaboration with appropriate faculty governance committees, shall initiate the constitution of such an independent panel and shall support its inquiry. The panel shall have authority to obtain any records it deems necessary for a thorough inquiry, to the extent consistent with applicable law. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the panel shall issue a report that will be made publicly available, within the limitations of regulations governing the protection and privacy of individuals, including research participants.

**WILLIAM DURFEE
CHAIR, FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Will Durfee, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), stated that this issue began in May of 2004 when Dan Markingson was enrolled in a clinical trial at the University and committed suicide. Since that time there have been a number of investigations, questions, and news reports regarding issues of consent, treatment, and circumstances of the suicide.

What prompted today's resolution was a letter to the Senate in October that was signed by six bio-ethicists and co-signed by an additional 175 faculty. Then 14 faculty senators sent a letter to the FCC in November asking that this item appear on today's agenda.

FCC discussed this item at three meetings and determined that one way for the University to move forward is to review the policies and procedures that are in place now. He noted that these are exceptionally difficult studies when the adult participants have diminished functional abilities. The University sets standards for these studies, and it should be noted that the University has always passed through a voluntary process. However there is a sense among faculty that they want to hold the University to a higher standard and have a reassurance that this University is doing as well as everyone else.

Professor Durfee noted that one friendly amendment was made after the agenda was printed. The last paragraph now reads, "BE IT RESOLVED that a panel external to and independent from the University of Minnesota..."

A senator noted that a concern has been raised that senators do not rush to judgment as not all facts are known. However the following facts are known. First is that significant number of prominent people have raised doubts about the way research is conducted at the University. Second is that all faculty are responsible for and dependent on the integrity of research. Everyone is under this cloud and only a credible investigation into that case and what has happened since will remove this cloud. There are only three possibilities. One is that nothing wrong was done. This is the strongest reason to want an investigation to be done. A second possibility is that there were things done wrong in which case if the body does not support a review, it is complicit in a cover-up. The third possibility is that while nothing specific was wrong, policies could be better. The University knows that this is true. These possibilities are not exclusive but overlap, however they are exhaustive.

Another senator spoke about practices and expectations for human subjects as the chair of the executive panel of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). As was noted by the previous speakers, the University should not have anything to fear in an investigation if there are no problems. She

then spoke about what is happening right now with human subjects research. The IRB is a bi-partite body that is supported by the University and funded through the Vice President for Research. The committee itself is constituted as a federally-mandated committee of peers. The committee itself is responsible to the Board of Regents through a federal-wide assurance plan. The committee is responsible for maintaining and upholding federal and special regulations. For some time the University has been a leader in supporting assessment through the Association for Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AAHRPP). This is an important, independent body and the University is committed to meeting or exceeding those expectations through a rigorous self-study of policies and a site visit.

A senator stated that she is sad that this matter is still being talked about 10 years later but she agreed that this issue has left a cloud over the University. She is looking for a productive way to dispel this cloud. The reputational harm to the University is real. In a similar case from the Children's Hospital, the outcome included a review, the development of a teaching case, and a named lecture in pediatric grand rounds. There was much concern about how to ameliorate and remedy a terrible harm to a family, which is such a contradiction to this case. It is crucial that the University maintain the highest standards of scientific and ethical integrity and that it be demonstrated to the public. As this cloud still exists, any previous demonstration has been unsuccessful in convincing colleagues and the public. Signatories on the letter are prominent people in the field of clinical trials. The University should be a leader in this investigation to prevent a case happening again in the future.

A senator then proposed a friendly amendment to the second whereas clause so that it would read, "WHEREAS questions continue to be raised about the policies and procedures followed in the case of Dan Markingson, a 26-year-old participant in a clinical trial who committed suicide in 2004."

Professor Durfee did not accept this as a friendly amendment. The senator then made a motion for this amendment and the motion was seconded. A vote was then taken and the amendment was approved.

Another senator then proposed a friendly amendment to the last sentence so that it would read, "At the conclusion of the inquiry, the panel shall issue a report that will be made publicly available and that the results be reported back to the Faculty Senate such that senators have an opportunity to ask questions and discuss the report, within the limitations of regulations governing the protection and privacy of individuals, including research participants."

Professor Durfee did not accept this as a friendly amendment. The senator then made a motion for this amendment and the motion was seconded. A vote was then taken and the amendment was approved.

A senator said that he has served on the IRB at five institutions and the University's is the most rigorous, comprehensive, and impressive that he has seen. However, if faculty do not have confidence in that process, then the University should not shy away from an independent inquiry.

Another senator said that he teaches clinical research and knows that this tragedy was investigated. However most people only know half truths and distortions of the facts. The University should never stop questioning and reviewing its practices. While he is concerned with the origin for this resolution, he still supports the inquiry proposed.

A senator noted that human subjects and informed consent is a very difficult area, but it is never too late to make things right if mistakes do exist.

Stephen Olsen, investigator for this study, stated that this issue has been a personal ordeal for him. He feels badly about the death of Dan Markingson, which was a tragedy, but it is not a surprise that people participating in many types of studies die during the course of the trial. The information that has been largely publicized has been by one person who does not have the full scope of the truth and selectively releases the information that he does have. People who have reviewed the full record have not found anyone in violation of the law or ethical practices. He has not been able to defend himself due to privacy regulations, but the family can be asked for full disclosure.

A senator believes that something went wrong in the study and there were faults with the initial investigation. Scholars have asked for broad review and she is thankful for this resolution from the FCC.

Another senator felt that she did not have enough information to make an educated vote on this issue, but wondered if another review was needed on this topic.

A past participant in University research studies then spoke. He urged the University to set a standard for excellence in all research.

Another senator noted that there are other ways to examine ethical behavior and procedures besides using this case as the foundation for re-examining this behavior. The protocol proposed in the resolution is narrow-minded. If senators believes that ethical standards should be improved, then why should it be done by this route.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion as amended was approved with 67 in favor, 23 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

APPROVED

11. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

12. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

13. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2013-14 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

DECEMBER 5, 2013

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2013-14 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, December 6, 2013, at 11:49 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 38 student members. Chair Prahith Chakka presided.

1. DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KALER

President Kaler joined the meeting. He began by noting that he started holding student office hours last semester and the response has been positive. The next date is tomorrow from 3:30-4:30 pm. He appreciates the questions that have been asked, ranging from fossil fuel divestment to the University budget to helping a student with his job interview video.

He noted that the University is undertaking a Strategic Planning process. A 30 member workgroup has been appointed, which includes two student members – Megan Mason and Mick Hedberg. A survey was sent to the campus and over 1200 responses were received. He has been listening and learning over his two years on campus and believes that now is an opportune time to rethink how resources are used and be more ambitious. The University needs to have pride in what it does – it is a nationally-known undergraduate institution, it delivers solutions to industry, it is athletically strong as well as a cultural powerhouse, it has world class philanthropy, and values its sustained state support. The goals for the process are to make the institution better and more affordable.

President Kaler then addressed campus safety which is a critical issue after a rash of crimes on and near the Minneapolis campus. He can say that Vice President Wheelock and Chief Hestness are working everyday on this issue and understand the effect that it is having on the University community. University police have already logged 200 hours of overtime, both marked and undercover. University Police are also coordinating with the 2nd Precinct, Hennepin County, and MetroTransit which has led to 21 arrests.

The campus response has been an expansion of the Gopher Chauffeur to Thursday nights. The Minnesota Student Association (MSA) has also initiated a street smart pledge for students and a letter writing campaign to the Minneapolis City Council to request lighting improvements and more police.

The University's response has been to write to the Minneapolis Mayor and City Council to increase the police presence around the University from the 2nd Precinct. While robberies have increased around campus, he did note that there has been a 43 percent decrease in crime from 2002-2012. In that time, the University has installed 2600 card readers for building entrances and started the Text-U system.

In response to the crime alerts, President Kaler stated that the University is required to send notices to the community, but this is not a mandate for the 2nd Precinct.

Q: What is the status of gender neutral housing options on each campus?

A: He realizes that this option is important to a sector of the University population. The Morris campus has a task force exploring this option and the Twin Cities campus is reviewing a proposal. He anticipates a pilot program in 2015-16.

Q: What long-term solutions are needed by the University to address light rail through campus?

A: While light rail will make campus more accessible, it will also present some challenges. Fortunately, the University will only need to secure three stops on campus. However, backing will also be required from the City of Minneapolis. Adding to this issue is that 7000 new beds are being added to the campus area and 7000 additional beds are permitted. The new Mayor understands that the University can be a partner in shaping the area around campus to promote safety and restore single families.

Q: What can the University do to educate students on safety earlier in their career?

A: More information needs to be provided during Welcome Week on safety and the role that alcohol plays in these situations.

Q: With students now being targeted during daylight hours, what are specific goals from the University to address these concerns?

A: The letter the University sent to the City of Minneapolis included specific requests. That letter can be shared with the Student Senate.

Q: What efforts are being considered to improve faculty teaching?

A: Improvements to teaching and learning are part of the Strategic Planning workgroup charge. He is looking for a higher level of engagement from faculty in and out of the classroom.

Q: As a student who was in a class in Anderson Hall during a robbery, the instructor did not know what to do during this event. What training will be provide for faculty?

A: He also heard this comment during his office hours and he was very surprised that the instructor did not know what to do. He has asked University Services to create an online module this week to provide this content.

Q: How is the University addressing the issue of under-represented minorities on campus?

A: The University needs to embrace and own this problem. Faculty and graduate students need to get into communities of color early to aspire minority students to come to the University. One example of this is the University Outreach Center in Northeast Minneapolis which will serve as a pipeline for students in that area. The University also needs to put more thought towards attracting and retaining faculty and staff of color, including putting aside funds for strategic hires.

Q: What is the forecast for state funding to hold down tuition going forward?

A: There is good news from that state in that with the latest state forecast, even after paying the K-12 shift, there is a surplus of \$825 million. Some of these funds will be used to reduce taxes, but there is still a considerable amount that will be available this session. Additionally, the state economy is improving and the unemployment rate is well below the national average. He is hoping to, at most, propose a moderate undergraduate tuition increase and begin to address graduate and professional student tuition.

Q: What are your thoughts on open educational resources?

A: Open access textbooks are great and it is hard to understand why basic courses require a physical textbook when they contribute to the overall cost of attendance. For scientific publications, open access can be done as long as peer review is preserved since that adds value to the publication process.

Q: Graduate student fees are a large part of costs for these students. Is there a way to include them in the tuition?

A: Fees are used to reflect costs that are incurred in addition to tuition. The University is looking at these fees as one way to lower the overall cost of attendance.

Q: Much research being done is profit-driven, but that does not always address issues facing Minnesota. Can research be supported without grants or other profits?

A: This is the heart of the MnDRIVE initiative, funding research that needs to be done and is an integral part of the University's land-grant mission

Q: In what ways can students ensure that affordable education is supported?

A: Students can be involved in the Minnesota Student Legislative Coalition and attend Support the U Day. Students and their parents can also meet with or write to their legislators to give them a story and face to represent the University's investment.

Q: Of the candidates for the Vice President and Dean position, why was Brooks Jackson chosen?

A: There were three finalists for this position. Brooks Jackson is head of the Pathology Department at Johns Hopkins, which has a culture of excellence, and he has an international presence as a scholar. He was also the principal investigator on the largest NIH grant in history and has garnered \$50 million in philanthropy. Lastly, he has Minnesota roots as he did his residency and was a faculty member here, which allows him to understand the University's culture.

Q: The Council of Undergraduate Students did a report last year, and over 10 semesters the University's international students had the highest fees in the Big Ten. These costs were double the next highest institution as most other institutions subsidize international student services. What is the University providing that is above its peers?

A: When both tuition and fees are considered together, the University is lower than most in the Big Ten. The \$125 per semester being charged is to enhance resources for this population as their needs are above or beyond that of national graduate students.

Q: With the start of Obamacare, will student health care costs be decreased?

A: The University is looking at MNSure to see how it could be adapted and made affordable for University students.

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:

No report.

**3. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT**

Prahith Chakka, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, asked senators to think about their vision for spring semester. He will be meeting with all senators next semester, either individually or in small groups, to hear their thoughts and issues. He also encouraged senators to participate in the Strategic Planning process.

4. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – Rachelle Alcini noted that Crookston is requesting funding for a new wellness center on campus so senators have been touring the current facility.

Duluth – Frank Farleo stated that UMDSA will be working to support funding for its building in this year’s bonding request.

Morris – Joey Daniewicz said that MSCA is reviewing the new writing requirement and transfer credits. They are also involved in the gender neutral housing issue, student employment, and a campus tobacco policy.

Rochester – Karl Freese noted that RSA is concerned with overcrowding at a campus center and is looking to other spaces to use on campus.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly – Ashley Hall stated that GAPSA is looking at higher education affordability, is planning an open education forum for spring, and it reviewing the tuition structure for professional and international students.

Minnesota Student Association - Ryan Olson said that MSA is encouraging a letter writing campaign today to address campus safety. The Student Representatives to the Regents will be presenting a report next week and one issue being addressed is updates to the sexual assault policy. They are also participating in advocacy for this year’s bonding bill.

**5. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 3, 2013
Action**

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssenate/minutes/131003stu.pdf>

**BECKY YUST, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**6. RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Resolution in Support Operational Excellence

On September 13th, 2013, President Kaler announced that the University of Minnesota will achieve \$90 million in administrative cost savings between fiscal years 2014 and 2019¹. The University of Minnesota has conducted multiple studies to examine organizational effectiveness and costs, including an administrative cost benchmarking to pinpoint strategies for an impactful reorganization of spending. The announcement included intentions to direct the savings to activities related to the University of Minnesota's mission and used to curb growth in the net cost of attendance².

Administrative costs are an increasingly important factor that affects costs to students and quality of services. In the past two years, the University of Minnesota has introduced an increased focus on operational excellence and administrative cost savings, with \$34 million in administrative cost savings in the last two years³.

The increased financial burden placed on students is negatively impacting lives of students. The University should be focused on providing the best student experience, which includes limiting financial stresses and improving quality of services to students.

The Student Senate supports President Kaler's plan to implement these administrative cuts if they are targeted to these two areas: curbing growth in the net cost of attendance for all students and to improve the effectiveness of student services.

¹. http://www1.umn.edu/news/news-releases/2013/UR_CONTENT_456150.html

². Ibid.

³. Ibid.

**RYAN OLSON, MEMBER
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Ryan Olson presented this resolution as a way for students to support Operational Excellence if it will lead to curbing students costs.

Q: Where will student cost savings be made through Operational Excellence?

A: Operational Excellence does not specify where costs savings can be found but its goal is to curb attendance costs.

Q: How does this resolution differ from the resolution in Item 7?

A: Item 7 is aimed at the state while this resolution supports University efforts and can be used by students when advocating at the capitol.

Q: Why should the Student Senate support this proposal without knowing from where costs will be cut?

A: Cost savings will be made in areas identified from a third party report done last year for the legislature.

A senator suggested that the Student Senate be asked to support a specific plan for reallocation after it is created by the administration.

Another senator said that students support cutting costs, but when those contribute to a shrinking faculty, this does not benefit the education system or students.

A senator stated that the Student Senate does not need to approve this resolution in order for students to support these efforts. However, official approval should be withheld until the administration releases a plan.

With no further discussion a vote was taken and the motion was not approved.

NOT APPROVED

7. RESOLUTION ON AFFORDABLE EDUCATION Action

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Resolution on Affordable Education

In the last 11 years, tuition for in-state undergraduate students has increased over 110%, and tuition for non-resident has increased 12.4%.¹ This increase in the cost of tuition burdens students with high levels of debt and diminishes the student experience. According to the Student Experience in the Research University² survey, over 40% of University of Minnesota undergraduates believe that the cost of attendance, including grants and scholarships, is not manageable³.

The relationship with the State of Minnesota is crucial for University funding, which in turn affects tuition rates and cost of attendance for all students. State divestment in higher education has been a major contributing factor in the increases in cost of attendance experienced by University of Minnesota students.

In July of 2013, the Board of Regents approved a two year undergraduate resident tuition freeze, along with a commitment by the State to fund the University for the current biennium⁴ at a level that allows for a tuition freeze for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 academic years^{5,6}.

The Student Senate recognizes this commitment made by both the State and the University to keep undergraduate resident tuition rates low.

Additionally, the Student Senate supports further efforts by the University and State to limit the cost of attendance for all students, not just undergraduate residents.

The Student Senate is willing to take further action to assist in the University's efforts to limit these costs.

¹<http://www.oir.umn.edu/static/tuition/TuitionUMNTC.pdf>. Note that these rates do not include other elements of the cost of attendance, such as collegiate fees, other fees (e.g. student services fee, stadium fee), textbooks and supplies, and the cost of living.

² Survey results and further details available at: <http://www.seru.umn.edu/>

³ https://www.oir.umn.edu/surveys/seru/public/university_cost

⁴ The 2014-2015 biennial budget request can be viewed here: <http://govrelations.umn.edu/biennial-budget.html>

⁵ http://www1.umn.edu/news/news-releases/2013/UR_CONTENT_446543.html

⁶ http://www1.umn.edu/news/news-releases/2013/UR_CONTENT_443992.html

**RYAN OLSON, MEMBER
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Ryan Olson noted that this resolution is similar to the previous and allows the Student Senate to take action on the issue of affordable education.

A senator questioned how students can manage to graduate if tuition is so burdensome.

Another senator noted that this resolution does not state that students are unable to graduate, just that they are saddled with a large debt load after graduation. It is not trying to correlate graduate rates to student indebtedness.

A motion was made and seconded to remove the last sentence.

Q: How can the Student Senate assist in limiting costs?

A: It can discuss or approve any actions from the students or administration that will work to limit costs.

A vote was then taken on the amendment and it was not approved.

Another motion was made and seconded to add "As of the December 5 projection by the state legislature, the State of Minnesota has an \$825 million surplus" at the end of the second paragraph.

With no comments a vote was taken and the amendment was approved.

Q: How are non-resident students affected by this issue?

A: The goal would be to keep costs low for all students.

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

APPROVED

**8. RESOLUTION ON PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL STUDENT TUITION STRUCTURE
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Resolution on Professional School Student Tuition Structure

WHEREAS, ten years ago, the medical school implemented a program called the guaranteed tuition program. They were the first medical school to implement this program.

WHEREAS, this program was adopted was to satisfy the non-traditional student. It helped incentivize students that took time off from the program to complete the program in under 6 years.

WHEREAS, this program was also implemented to prevent the University of Minnesota medical program from becoming one of the most expensive programs in the nation.

WHEREAS, we believe that both graduate and professional programs should adopt guaranteed tuition programs similar to the program implemented by the medical school.

WHEREAS, each program has very different financial needs and requirements, guaranteed tuition programs would increase the appeal of the university.

WHEREAS, of 28 veterinary schools in the country, the University of Minnesota college of veterinary medicine program is one of the most expensive programs to attend. Residents are charged \$32,456 per year and non-residents \$56,210.

WHEREAS, many students who moved to and live in Minnesota face difficulties in meeting the residency requirements.

WHEREAS, each year that a professional student is enrolled in the program, tuition increases a certain percentage.

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents approved a fiscal year 2014 tuition freeze for resident undergraduate tuition.

BE IT RESOLVED that professional programs consider modeling the tuition structure implemented by the medical school in 2003.

BE IT RESOLVED that professional programs review their model for gaining residency status in Minnesota.

BE IT RESOLVED that professional programs consider freezing tuition for all, but particularly out of state students.

**ASHLEY HALL, MEMBER
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Ashley Hall stated that this resolution was passed by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA) but is now seeking broader student support. Many professional school students have a high debt load after graduation, but some colleges, such as the Medical School, have found ways to fix the tuition rate or offer in-state tuition to more out-of-state students. She would like to see these efforts expanded for all professional school students.

Q: The Medical School has moved from the 11th to the 5th most expensive institution and its policies push costs onto future students. What evidence do you have that supports reduced tuition?

A: Reduced tuition provides an incentive to non-traditional students. A cap on the percentage of tuition that pays for costs within the college would also help with student tuition costs.

A senator noted that there are many additional factors that need to be considered when reviewing the Medical School budget and its effect on tuition.

Q: Is the College of Veterinary Medicine trying to reduce the number of spots for non-resident students?

A: No. While most other institutions only have a few spots for out-of-state students, each class in the College of Veterinary Medicine is composed almost 50 percent by out-of-state students and there is not a way to easily establish residency during the four year of the program.

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

APPROVED

**9. RESOLUTION ON PROVIDING GENDER-NEUTRAL HOUSING AT EACH
CAMPUS
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Resolution on Providing Gender-neutral Housing at Each Campus

WHEREAS, The University of Minnesota's Office for Equity and Diversity has a commitment to social justice that drives the desire to create an environment in which all students are given equal opportunities to succeed, and

WHEREAS, The University of Minnesota earned the top rating from Campus Pride for being an LGBT-friendly university, and

WHEREAS, The College Equality Index lists 39 colleges as providing gender-neutral housing, and

WHEREAS, Trans-identifying individuals are not necessarily able to feel comfortable within the current on-campus housing arrangements that limit their housing options, and

WHEREAS, The current system of on-campus housing arrangements are based upon an outdated, gendered system that often puts these individuals in uncomfortable living situations, and

WHEREAS, A roommate can be essential to first-year experience, and

WHEREAS, Promoting students to live in on-campus housing beyond a student's first year of attendance has become a goal of the University of Minnesota system, and

RESOLVED, That the University of Minnesota Student Senate urges that all the University's campuses provide this accommodation in its residence halls by the 2016-2017 academic calendar, making any necessary preparations in the interim; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That all campuses provide and advertise this accommodation to incoming first-year students; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the accommodation is implemented by allowing two or more people to live together regardless of gender, rather than allowing a set number of men and/or women to live in one unit.

**BEN BAGLIO, MEMBER
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Joey Daniewicz presented the resolution as a way to move this issue forward at the University to address needs for first-year students.

A senator disagreed that gender neutral housing was needed at each campus or should be implemented on each campus at the same time.

Another senator noted that students feel discriminated when there is not this option offered. It is best when the campus has a policy and procedure developed in advance of the need.

A senator then said that if this option is offered, it does not have an effect on other students at the institution, but can greatly affect how the student needing the accommodation feels about their experience on campus.

Another senator noted that this topic has not been discussed at Crookston and they would advise permitting each campus time to discuss and properly implement a policy if that is the decision from the campus.

Q; How would this process work?

A: Each campus would have some rooms set aside if needed. If not requested, then those rooms could be used by other students.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the last sentence to read "**RESOLVED,** That the accommodation be available on all campus and be implemented by allowing two or more people to live together regardless of gender, rather than allowing a set number of men and/or women to live in one unit."

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

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

APPROVED

**10. RESOLUTION ON CONFLICT MINERALS: BUYING AND SELLING OF
CONFLICT-FREE ELECTRONICS
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Resolution on Conflict Minerals: Buying and Selling of Conflict-Free Electronics

Whereas, University of Minnesota has declared its commitment to human rights and social justice in its governance documents and policies and has taken affirmative steps throughout its history to promote these values; and

Whereas, the United States Senate and the House of Representatives have found that armed groups bear responsibility for massive atrocities in the eastern Congo; and

Whereas, legislation signed into law (Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act of 2010) requires that companies submit an annual report to the Securities and Exchange Commission disclosing whether their products contain gold, tin, tantalum, or tungsten from the Congo or nearby areas; and

Whereas, the International Rescue Committee has found approximately 6 million civilians have been killed and countless more remain at risk as a consequence of attacks conducted by armed groups in eastern Congo; and

Whereas, the U.N. has urged the international community to weaken the aforementioned armed groups, and to cooperate with a U.N. peacekeeping force authorized under U.N. Security Council Resolution 1291; and

Whereas, the armed groups generate hundreds of millions of dollars each year by trading in conflict minerals; and

Whereas, University of Minnesota spent \$49,355,671 in 2012 on electronic products and have significant investments in companies which use conflict minerals from Democratic Republic of Congo in their supply chains;

The Student Senate believes that the University of Minnesota should not indirectly perpetuate the cycle of violence in eastern Congo through University purchases.

1. Decided that the University of Minnesota supports electronic companies and other industries implementing the necessary steps to thoroughly trace and audit their supply chains to ensure that their products are not financing atrocities in eastern Congo;

2. Decided that the University of Minnesota supports purchases from electronics companies that are moving towards conflict-free sources of raw materials when feasibly possible.

**PRAHITH CHAKKA, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Emily Milke, University student and President of the STAND student group, said that six billion people in the world have access to cell phones. The key minerals that make all cell phones work are tin, tungsten, tantalum, and gold, and the majority of these minerals come from Eastern Congo mines. However these mines are controlled by armed groups that pocket 90 percent of the profits. Six million people have died over control of the mines since 1998, which makes it the deadliest conflict since World War II.

The resolution today is the first step in a long solution to this issue. While the government knows about these issues, nothing has been done to stop the abuse. When her group met with President Kaler last spring about these concerns, he advised them to speak with existing student groups. The University of Minnesota spent \$49 million on technology in 2012 and tuition is the second-largest source of income for the University. Therefore another avenue is encouraged, which is students asking for change. There are no conflict-free products, so students must encourage electronic companies to tell their consumers if products contain minerals from Eastern Congo or the surrounding areas. Passing this resolution means that the Student Senate supports the University using student tuition dollars responsibly.

A senator said that he spoke against this resolution when it came to the Minnesota Student Association. The reason is that this is an international relations problem that should be dealt with at the federal level. The University should not be involved as it is not a political actor.

Another senator stated that institutions began morally-conscious investing in the late 70s and early 80s in response to apartheid. These efforts then spread to the state and federal levels.

A senator then noted that the job of this body is to improve the lives of students, not world peace. By considering resolutions that have nothing to do with the mission of this body, it makes other resolutions mean much less.

Another senator used President Kaler's words which were that the University needs to be ambitious and set standards of excellence.

A senator agreed that as an international land-grant institution, this topic is part of the University's as well as the Student Senate's mission.

Q: How is a conflict mineral defined and why does this resolution limit them to coming from Congo? If a country has human rights violations, they should be included as well.

A: This resolution is asking for general reform for conflict minerals. Eastern Congo was singled out as the worst area. If conflict mineral reform is made there, it will affect other areas.

Q: If the Student Senate agrees that reform is needed with conflict minerals, why are other areas not being considered for reform such as clothing and food?

A: The University is already making strides in other areas, such as clothing at the Bookstore from sweat-free shops. By supporting this resolution, students are supporting human rights in all sectors.

Q: How is this resolution the most effective avenue to achieve leverage in the Eastern Congo conflict? If the University wants to tackle this issue, it should pass a resolution denouncing the regime in Rwanda due to the troops that they have had in Eastern Congo for many years.

A: STAND has also asked this question and agrees that multiple reforms are needed for this problem to be resolved. This resolution is meant to address one way that college students can voice their opposition.

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

APPROVED

11. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

12. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

13. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:24 pm.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**