

2005-06 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MARCH 2, 2006

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 3 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 3 STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 4

The third meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate was convened in Coffman Theatre, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, March 2, 2006, at 2:30 p.m., as a joint meeting of the bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 23 academic professional members, 18 civil service members, 106 voting faculty/faculty-like academic professional members, and 21 voting student members. Vice Chair Judith Martin presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

University Senate

Resolution on Employee Retention During Strategic Planning

Approved by the: University Senate December 1, 2005

Approved by the: Administration *See comment

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

* The administration strongly supports the principle of employee retention throughout the strategic positioning process. Accordingly, the Office of Human Resources (OHR) has identified three goals: 1) maximize career opportunities for and development of all faculty and staff; 2) minimize involuntary staff reductions in affected colleges; and 3) promote ability and agility of staff in line with newly focused academic directions and administrative structures. OHR has been very proactive in designing creative and supportive programs and services to maximize employee retention and to assist both managers and employees during this time of change, including the University Talent Connection that is mentioned in the resolutions (please see www1.umn.edu/ohr/strategic for more specific program information). The additional retention measures described in the Senate resolutions are thoughtful and [the President] appreciates the time and attention devoted to drafting and advocating for them. Consequently, [the President] is sharing them with Vice President Carrier and her leadership team for consideration.

Faculty Senate

Regents Policy on Openness in Research

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 29, 2005

Approved by the: Administration October 19, 2005

Approved by the: Board of Regents December 9, 2005

Policy on the Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 1, 2005

Approved by the: Administration January 31, 2006

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

Amendment to the Faculty Compensation Policy
Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 1, 2005
Approved by the: Administration January 31, 2006
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Leon L. Adcock
Professor
Obstetrics & Gynecology
1923 – 2005

Margarita F. Billings
Assistant Professor
Food Science & Nutrition
1915 – 2006

Stanley Erlandsen
Professor
Genetics, Cell Biology & Development
1941 – 2005

Leo C.T. Fung
Professor
Urologic Surgery
1963 – 2005

Christie Geankoplis
Professor
Chemical Engineering & Material Science
1921 – 2005

David J.W. Grant
Professor
Pharmacy
1937 – 2005

Marjorie Hartig
Physician
Boynton Health Service
1915 – 2005

Frank Hirschbach
Professor
German, Scandinavian & Dutch
1921 – 2005

Anita Hofer
Civil Service
Library
1911 – 2005

William Krivit
Professor
Pediatrics
1925 – 2005

Merle K. Loken
Professor
Radiology & Nuclear Medicine
1924 – 2005

Omelan Lukasewycz
Professor
Medicine – Duluth
1942 – 2006

William A. Madden
Professor
English
1923 – 2005

Ralph G. Nichols
Professor
Agriculture
1907 – 2005

John Parker
Professor
James Ford Library
1923 – 2006

James W. Rowell
Associate professor
Mathematics/Statistics – Duluth
1958 – 2006

George Seltzer
Professor
Industrial Relations
1918 – 2005

Roxanne Struthers
Professor
Nursing
1952 – 2005

Sandra J. Thompson
Professor
Institute on Community Integration
1956 – 2005

Uldis Treibergs
Civil Service
Physical Plant

1923 – 2005

Dwain Warner
Professor
Bell Museum of Natural History
1917 – 2005

Tibor Zoltai
Professor
Geology and Geophysics
1925 – 2003

STUDENTS

Christa M. Anfinson
General College

Kamala Fortune
University of Minnesota – Crookston

Joseph Hartman
College of Science and Engineering – Duluth

Noah S. Martin
College of Science and Engineering – Duluth

Germain J. Vigeant
College of Liberal Arts

3. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE **Administrative Change to Grades Reported in Instructor Class Lists** **Information for the Faculty Senate**

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) voted to request that the administration change the information in class lists provided to instructors. The grading system for which a student has enrolled in a course will no longer be included. The instructor will give all students a letter (A-F) grade; for those students who are enrolled S/N, the computer will automatically convert the letter grade to an S (if it is C- or above) or N (if D+ or below).

The Committee made this recommendation following Senate action to require that an S = C- in all courses where S/N enrollment is permitted. The Senate was informed that Duluth faculty are not shown the grading base students have chosen; several Senators asked that the Twin Cities campus adopt that practice as well. SCEP concurred.

The Committee does not believe this requires a change in the grading policy.

RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

4. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE **Bylaws to Establish an Administrative Retirement Plan Fiduciary Committee**

Information for the Faculty Senate

RETIREMENT PLAN FIDUCIARY COMMITTEE

BYLAWS

SECTION I. MISSION STATEMENT.

The Retirement Plan Fiduciary Committee has the authority from the president to advise the Trustee on fiduciary matters relating to the University- sponsored retirement plans. Specifically, the committee will monitor and evaluate ongoing University-sponsored retirement plans and formulate recommendations to benefit plan participants, defray plan administration expenses, and reduce Board fiduciary risk.

SECTION II. APPOINTMENTS.

Subd. 1. Membership. The president or delegate shall appoint the members of the Retirement Plan Fiduciary Committee, who shall consist of:

1. the chair of the Faculty Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs;
2. the Chief Investment Officer of the University;
3. three at large members to include one each from the faculty, professional and academic (P&A) and civil service units. Each delegate shall also have a background in finance and/or investments;
4. the Director of Retirement Programs (non-voting);
5. delegate from the Office of Asset Management (non-voting).

Voting right shall exist for those plans which the representative member is eligible.

Subd. 2. Chair. The Chief Investment Officer shall chair the Retirement Plan Fiduciary Committee.

Subd. 3. Membership Terms. The term for all members, except for the at-large members, shall be coterminous with that member's relevant position or appointment.

Subd. 4. At-Large Member Nominations. The at-large members will be nominated from their respective governing groups. The Faculty Retirement Subcommittee will be responsible for nominating the faculty representative. The CAPA Benefits and Compensation Committee will be responsible for nominating the professional and academic (P&A) representative. The Civil Service Committee will be responsible for nominating the civil service representative.

Subd. 5. At-Large Membership Terms. The initial appointments of the three at-large members shall be two years with an option to renew for an additional two years upon mutual consent of the chair, trustee and appointed member.

Subd. 6 Vacancies. Vacancies are filled in a manner consistent with subdivision 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

SECTION III. RESPONSIBILITIES.

The Retirement Plan Fiduciary Committee shall advise the president and plan trustee. The committee shall:

1. review plan expenses;
2. monitoring investment returns;
3. recommend investment fund choices;

4. recommend investment fund and plan sponsor terminations in exigent circumstances;
5. evaluate fiduciary risks and responsibilities associated with the University-sponsored retirement plans.
6. receive written comment from the Faculty Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs with regard to the above actions.

SECTION IV. MEETING PROCEDURES.

Subd. 1. Meeting Schedule. The Retirement Plan Fiduciary Committee shall meet a minimum of four times per year. The meetings should proceed following each quarter end as committee members schedules allow.

Subd. 2. Voting. Any recommendation of the committee receiving a majority vote shall be forwarded by the committee chair to the trustee and president for consideration.

COMMENT:

The University is creating the Retirement Plan Fiduciary Committee to formally monitor and evaluate University-sponsored retirement plans from a financial perspective. The Committee will be responsible for reviewing plan expenses, monitoring investment returns and fund choices and evaluating and reducing fiduciary risk. This Committee will have representation from faculty, professional and administrative and civil service employee groups, and will have direct ties to the Senate Faculty Retirement Subcommittee through its chair. The Retirement Plan Fiduciary Committee will report to the President through the Chief Financial Officer and, ultimately, to the Board of Regents. This is not an administrative committee in the usual sense, although it will report up through the administration. It is a committee that will take on the fiduciary responsibility of these plans and is charged with acting in the best interest of the plan participants as a whole.

**JEAN BAUER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

5. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

6. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

**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 names 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 2006-09. First pair: Professors Donna Bliss and Nelson Rhodus; Second

Pair: Professors Emily Hoover and Terry Roe ; Third Pair: Professors William Durfee and John Koepke. A simple majority is required for approval.

FIRST PAIR

DONNA BLISS: 1992*, Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing. University Senate member: None. Committee participation (past and present): None.

NELSON RHODUS: 1985*, Professor of Diagnostic/Biological Sciences, School of Dentistry. University Senate member: 1993-997. Committee participation (past and present): Nominating, 2002-08; Capital Projects/Campus Master Planning, 2004-07; AHC Faculty Consultative, 2005-08.

SECOND PAIR

EMILY HOOVER: 1982*, Professor of Horticultural Science, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences. University Senate member: 1991-94. Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 1996-99 (Chair, 1997-98); Consultative Committee, (Ex Officio, 2003-05); Educational Policy, 1999-2001, 2003-05 (Chair, 2003-05); Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, 1995-96; Professional Studies Provostal Faculty Consultative, 1996-98.

TERRY ROE: 1971*, Professor of Applied Economics, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences. University Senate member: 1995-96. Committee participation (past and present): Finance and Planning, 1997-2005; Consultative, 2005-06.

THIRD PAIR

WILLIAM DURFEE: 1993*, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: None. Committee participation (past and present): Disabilities Issues, 1998-2003 (Chair, 2001-03); Academic Freedom and Tenure, 2003-06 (Chair, 2005-06).

JOHN KOEPKE: 1995*, Associate Professor of Landscape Architecture, College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture. University Senate member: None. Committee participation (past and present): None.

*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, certified as willing to stand for election, may be made by (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculties, provided that the petition is in the hands of the Clerk of the Senate the day before the Senate meeting, and (2) nominations on the floor of the Senate. The faculty representatives of the Senate shall reduce by vote the slate to twice the number to be elected.

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

Gary Balas, Institute of Technology
Carol Chomsky, Law School

Megan Gunnar, College of Education and Human Development
Scott Lanyon, College of Biological Sciences
John L. Sullivan, College of Liberal Arts
Jennifer Windsor, College of Liberal Arts

The terms of Jean Bauer (College of Human Ecology), Daniel Feeney (College of Veterinary Medicine), and Terry Roe (College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences) expire at the end of the academic year.

**W. ANDREW COLLINS, CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**8. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

Draft Policy and Protocol on the Evaluation of Instruction

February 15, 2006

PREAMBLE

The University of Minnesota seeks to achieve instruction of the highest quality so that students learn to their maximum potential. The evaluation of instruction is one way to help ensure excellence in instruction, so the Faculty Senate adopts the following policy and protocol on evaluation of instruction.

There are at least three reasons to evaluate instruction: (1) to improve instruction, (2) to provide information for (a) salary and promotion decisions based on merit and (b) faculty tenure decisions, and (3) to assist students in course selection. This policy and protocol is intended to meet all three objectives. With respect to the second, the purpose of this policy and protocol is to define what shall constitute adequate documentation for student and peer review of faculty and instructional staff teaching contributions.¹

The required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student evaluation of teaching. Academic units must make provisions for peer review for faculty being considered for tenure, promotion, and salary increases, and for other instructional staff being considered for reappointment, promotion, and salary increases. The peer review information for individuals is to be supplemented by information from student evaluations of all their courses.

Students must be made aware that their ratings will be used in making personnel decisions. A small number of questions, common to all courses throughout the University, will be used in the

¹ In this policy and protocol, the term "instructor" includes all who deliver instruction regardless of academic rank, appointment status, and so on. At some points in the policy, there will be a distinction between (1) tenured and tenure-track faculty, and (2) all others who deliver instruction; in the latter case, the language will refer to faculty and instructional staff.

student evaluations of instruction. The use of common questions provides one means of making judgments on teaching effectiveness University-wide and allows calculation of statistical norms. This type of information can be used with other types to identify very good instructors who deserve rewards as well as instructors who may need assistance in improving their classroom effectiveness. This information does not have the resolution necessary to allow fine discrimination between instructors in intermediate categories. In addition to questions that request a numerical response, survey forms must include provisions for written comments by students.

POLICY

--Every course with a University course number shall be evaluated by the use of student rating forms every time it is offered, except that thesis-only credits, directed or independent study, internships, and classes with fewer than five students shall not be evaluated using such forms. **[Note: The Senate Committee on Educational Policy will appoint an ad hoc subcommittee to develop guidelines for departments to evaluate small classes, internships, directed/independent study, and so on. Those guidelines do not have to be in place to adopt this policy.]** A department that wishes permanently to exempt a course or courses from use of the standard student evaluation form must receive written approval from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.²

Data and information from student evaluations shall not be used in isolation from peer evaluation and (for faculty) research and service in evaluating faculty and instructional staff.

The directions for students written on the student rating forms should stress the three purposes of the form: evaluation of instructors, improvement of teaching, and assistance to future students in selecting courses (the "student release" questions). The instructions should be written in a manner that will motivate students to complete the forms. The instructions should explain why demographic data are being collected.

The student rating forms shall be anonymous. Instructors may require students to participate in course evaluations but any system for gathering student evaluations, whether paper or electronic, shall include an opt-out provision allowing students to decline to respond to questions,

--Students may not be required to fill in a student rating form for any course. This provision applies to all courses at the University, including multiple-instructor courses that are otherwise covered by a different evaluation protocol.

--The teaching performance of all instructors, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, is subject to evaluation. This policy and protocol applies to all instructors regardless of whether they are tenure-track/tenured, term/P&A, or adjunct faculty or hold any other kind of teaching appointment at the University. Specific provisions are noted for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

--Personnel decisions (e.g., merit and salary reviews, promotion, tenure for tenure-track faculty) for all faculty and instructional staff whose salary is based in any part on teaching shall include review by appropriate department, college, and University officers, as set forth in pertinent rules and policies, all numeric data from the teaching evaluation forms from their courses.

² This policy and protocol shall apply to student evaluation of courses having no more than two instructors. In other cases departments and/or colleges that wish to develop alternative evaluation procedures must seek written approval from SCEP. SCEP is open to discussion with units in which student evaluation procedures must meet national accreditation standards.

--For tenured and tenure-track faculty, faculty peers must evaluate course objectives and syllabi, handouts, assignments and tests, theses and dissertations, and examples of graded student work in order to measure their quality and appropriateness. Faculty and instructional staff must do the same for all other instructors who are not tenured or tenure-track faculty. Peers must also assess the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, contributions to departmental teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions, such as development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications on discipline-specific teaching techniques. Peer review could also include assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline), survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction, or assessment of an instructor's classroom performance via personal visit or videotaping of the class.³

--The information collected pursuant to this policy to evaluate teaching effectiveness for personnel decisions remains confidential.⁴ The results must be shared with the faculty member being reviewed. Access to information on a specific instructor must be restricted to those responsible for decisions on reappointment (where applicable), promotion, tenure (where applicable), and salary adjustments.

--Faculty must always be allowed to respond to student rating results when those results are used for performance evaluation; faculty members must be permitted to add written comments to their files

--All student evaluation data used in personnel decisions must be accompanied by the response rates for the data.⁵

--Responsibility for implementing the provisions of this policy and protocol rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences, deans and department heads, all of whom must clearly convey to faculty the emphasis being placed on teaching in decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and merit-pay increases.

--Department heads and chairs should be evaluated in part on the extent to which they effectively implement this policy and protocol.

PROTOCOL

--Department heads and tenure and promotion review committees will be provided with comprehensive information on the interpretation and use of student rating data (including questions of reliability and validity) in making personnel decisions, and information on practices of peer evaluation of instruction.⁶

--The student rating form shall contain the following questions, with the verbal anchors as identified:

³ It is to a faculty member's benefit to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during his/her evaluation. This policy is not meant to exclude continued use of other mechanisms for peer review that may already be in place in academic units, such as classroom visitation.

⁴ As required by Minnesota state law at the time this policy is adopted.

⁵ The Senate Committee on Educational Policy is concerned about the very low response rates when students are asked to fill out evaluation forms on the web, outside of class.

⁶ Responsibility for providing this information rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the chancellors, and the deans. Training for new department heads/chairs and for deans should include this information as well.

How would you rate the instructor's overall teaching ability?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How would you rate the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How would you rate the instructor's respect and concern for students?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Very Poor Satisfactory Exceptional

How much would you say you learned in this course?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Almost Nothing Amount Expected An Exceptional Amount

--All student rating forms shall have spaces for two questions permitting open-ended comments: "Describe things about the course that you found helpful" and "What suggestions do you have for improving the course?"

--The disposition of written comments on student evaluation forms shall be decided by each college or campus.

Faculty and departments are free to add additional open-ended questions to the required form, but such questions will be in addition to rather than replace the required questions.

--Directions given on student evaluation questionnaires will include the following statement:

"Your responses to this questionnaire are important because they will be used in tenure, promotion and salary decisions for your instructor. Your thoughtful written comments are especially requested, and may help your instructor improve future course offerings. The results of this evaluation (including the evaluation forms) will not be returned to the instructor until after the final grades are submitted for this course." [Suggestion has been made to list these points in bullet form.]

--The evaluation form will ask for information on the student's major, GPA and class year, as well as whether or not the course is in the student's major and whether the course is required or elective for the student. There will also be a request, marked optional, for information on the student's age, gender, and race or ethnicity. [Note: Information about the class size and type (lab, lecture, seminar, etc.) will be included, but this information will be compiled elsewhere.]⁷

--The following question shall be included in the demographic section of the student evaluation form. The data from this question shall be linked to specific building and room numbers and the summary data by room number shall be provided to the chief academic officer and appropriate classroom management office on each campus to help guide decisions on facilities resource

⁷ Age/gender/ethnicity information shall be requested because the information obtained can be useful to instructors in demonstrating how different groups respond to his/her teaching; problems with different race/gender/age groups can be identified and addressed. Other personal information--class year, GPA, major, and whether the class was elective or required--will be requested (not marked optional) because these factors have been shown in prior research to have an effect on student evaluations.

allocation.⁸ [It has been suggested the information should be collected, but not in a demographic section.]

How would you rate the physical environment in which you take this class, especially the classroom facilities, including the effect of the environment on your ability to see, hear, concentrate, and participate?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Poor		Satisfactory			Exceptional	

-- The instructions on the evaluation forms shall state that harassing comments or comments on irrelevant factors are not helpful for evaluation of instruction. Faculty should be provided with guidelines on how to process and interpret open-ended student comments, particularly those that are inappropriate.

-- Administering student evaluations will be the responsibility of each instructional unit. Student evaluations used in promotion and salary decisions will be administered at the beginning of a class period, during the last two weeks of instruction for the term. The instructor may give instructions but must not be present while the forms are being completed and collected. The evaluations will be handed out, completed, and collected without the instructor being present. Once collected, evaluations will be put in a sealed envelope or box. It is suggested that a student be asked to hand out and collect the forms. Each instructional unit shall develop its own practices for ensuring that the completed forms are delivered to the appropriate office. If the forms are delivered to the department office, the department should deliver the envelopes to the data processing center without opening the envelopes. The instructor must never touch or see completed forms until after grades are turned in.

--Each campus will determine the appropriate manner of administering and evaluating student evaluation forms. To facilitate tabulation of the results of standardized questions on the student evaluation forms, each campus administration will provide the instructor and the unit chair/head with a summary of the data; the original questionnaires will be returned to the instructor. This summary will include appropriate statistical characterization of the responses to each question and, where a statistically meaningful data base exists, comparison to the responses for the same question on a campus, college, department, and program basis. To make comparative analysis more meaningful, there will also be comparisons on the basis of class type (e.g., large lecture, small discussion, laboratory, upper or lower division, elective, needed to meet university or major requirements). As resources permit, other types of statistical processing and comparisons may be added at the request of faculty or instructional units.

-- Every instructional unit shall have a policy on peer review of faculty and instructional staff teaching efforts and contributions to teaching, both for purposes of promotion decisions and for teaching-based salary increases. Each unit shall determine what documentation will be used for peer review, and (for faculty) how to evaluate theses and dissertations as well as (for all instructors) samples of graded student work. The documentation is to be used as a basis for evaluating the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter as well as the quality of the instructor's instructional activities. Each unit shall determine who shall have access to the documentation for purposes of peer review, and which materials will be retained for future reference.

The documentation shall reflect what each unit determines to be an appropriately cumulative record of the instructor's contributions to the instructional mission of the University. It is the

⁸ Variants of this question should be developed for classes that use multiple rooms, for field study class, for on-line classes, and for other classes that differ from the lecture-in-one-room format.

responsibility of the instructor to update the documentation regularly. It is the responsibility of the unit to retain appropriate portions of this material, including cumulative summaries of student evaluations of the instructor's courses. Each unit shall assume responsibility for maintaining the confidentiality of commentaries or conclusions based on the contents of the documentation.

The documentation for each instructor shall contain an appropriately cumulative listing of courses taught by the instructor, a comprehensive syllabus for each course, and examples of exams, assignments and handouts prepared by the instructor. Units may also wish to include, where appropriate, a listing of undergraduate and graduate students undertaking independent study under the supervision of the instructor, information about student performance on certification exams, and a listing of other activities that pertain to the teaching mission of the unit (e.g. participation in teaching-related committee work or curriculum development, publication of textbooks or study guides, participation in educational development programs, etc.) Documentation may also include a one- to-two page self-assessment of the instructor's teaching strengths and weaknesses. Instructors have the option of adding any other materials they believe are indicative of their contributions to teaching.

--Instructors are encouraged to adopt a mid-semester course evaluation process so that the course can be improved as it is delivered.

--The student evaluation form shall also include the following questions, the responses to which shall, with the consent of the instructor, be made available to students.⁹ The responses to these questions may not be used in any reappointment, promotion, salary, or (for tenure-track faculty) tenure decisions.

[NOTE: The Senate has delegated to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy final authority to approve new questions to be used; they will be inserted here.]

--In addition to the questions required by the preceding sections of this policy, a question bank will be provided for the student evaluation process.¹⁰ The questions would be supplemental to the required questions, would be selected by the instructor, and would be used primarily for improving teaching. Because the supplemental questions from the question bank are to be used for improving teaching, summary results should go to the instructor only. Use of supplemental questions from the question bank is optional. Provision will be made for instructors, should they choose, to add a reasonable number of custom questions that are not included in the bank.

Departments or schools may also require questions from the question bank or from other sources to be used on all forms used in their area. These additional required questions could be used either for evaluation of instructors or for improving teaching, courses or programs. If for the evaluation of instructors, summary results should go to the department. If for improvement of teaching, courses, or programs, summary results should go to the instructor only if the results are to be used by the instructor, or to curriculum committees if the results are to be used for program improvements. Data from questions that are to be used only for improving teaching should not be released by the University to anyone other than the instructor. Data from questions that are to be used for program improvements may be released to department heads and curriculum committees.

--Departments shall develop and make available to instructors a written policy that defines (1) which data from student rating forms will be used for personnel decisions and available to department heads and committees charged with reviewing instructor performance, and (2) which

⁹ On the web, for instance.

¹⁰ The University administration will provide the question bank on a website.

data will be made available to curriculum committees for improving courses and programs. (It is assumed that all information from the four required questions will be used for personnel decisions; the written policy required by this section refers to any additional questions that a unit may require on the evaluation forms.)

--Department and college administrators should be held accountable for timely assessment of the evaluative materials assembled for each faculty member. However, for peer review of the documentation for the purpose of promotion or of teaching-related merit pay increases, the faculty in each unit should be free to decide whether they want their dean or head or chair to take responsibility for assessing the quality of teaching, on the basis of the materials, or whether they prefer that the evaluation be done by an advisory group from within the unit or college.

--Each semester, an appropriate University administrator should send a message to every instructor who is receiving data from a course evaluation with a request to make the release questions available to students.¹¹

When adopted, this policy and protocol replaces all earlier policies, protocols, and questions approved by the University or Faculty Senates.

COMMENTS:

The draft Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction presented today includes the language from alternative one, presented at the December 1, 2005, Faculty Senate meeting. This alternative states that the disposition of written comments shall be decided by each college or campus.

Additionally SCEP has made two additional changes. The first change is in footnote 2, in which, SCEP recommends in order that any requests of exemptions to the campus-wide policy on the student evaluation of courses be made in writing to SCEP, in order both to involve faculty governance in such matters as well as to allow SCEP to make sure that the spirit of the evaluation policy is respected when exemptions are necessary, especially for courses with multiple instructors in units in the Academic Health Center where accreditation issues govern practices for course evaluation by students. SCEP is willing to take such accreditation issues into account in considering such requests for exemptions.

The second change SCEP recommends in order to accommodate current practices in some units that are intended to increase participation for online student evaluation of courses. We believe that the anonymity of students can be protected when students are required to go to a website to evaluate a course as long as once they are at the site, they have the option not to complete the evaluation. We believe that this policy will become ever more important as more units at the university move toward electronic evaluation of courses, because the main concern with electronic evaluation has been that the participation rates have been so low that the resulting data is not reliable. Requiring students to go to an evaluation website but allowing them then to opt out if they wish is already being used in some units in the AHC, and it has resulted in high participation rates.

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

¹¹ Reminders each semester coupled with a very easy method to grant permission should increase the number of instructors who choose to release their data. The course release information should be cataloged by course along with instructor and should have a link at the entry for the course in the on-line Course Guide. This will make it easier for students to find information about a course

Professor Richard McCormick, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), noted that this item would be brought to a final vote later this spring, but that this version reflects how written comments should be handled as noted at the December Faculty Senate meeting, as well as two additional changes.

There was discussion at the last meeting about looking at the four basic questions on the evaluation. A joint subcommittee of SCEP and Faculty Affairs Committee will reconsider these questions based on the latest research available.

9. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

10. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

Professor Fred Morrison, Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that the legislative session started yesterday. This year is a capital bonding request year, and there is a chance that an academic bill of rights might also be brought up, although there are no hearings scheduled on this topic.

The capital plan this time is streamlined, with funding for:

- HEAPR funds to repair current buildings
- Carlson School of Management undergraduate expansion, which will free up other space on the West Bank
- Duluth School of Business
- Science Classroom Building
- Biological Sciences buildings to assist the Medical School with transformational research

The Governor has supported a large part of this request and committees will take up the bill in two weeks.

11. STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY ADDRESS

Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to present the State of the University to you today.

The University of Minnesota is a statewide resource that cuts across geographic areas and regional economies, and does a remarkable job of changing to meet the evolving needs of our state. In this, our 155th year, "The question before us," as William Rainey Harper once said, "is how to become one in spirit, though not necessarily in opinions."

The University of Minnesota, Morris, is generously hosting this year's State of the University address. Morris is one of the finest public liberal arts institutions in the country, and it owes a great deal to the leadership of Chancellor Sam Schuman, who has led this institution since the year 1998. We've been fortunate to benefit from "Chancellor Sam's" visionary leadership, which has improved the school's academic foundation and the student experience so significantly. As he moves on to pursue other interests, I want to thank him and his wife Nancy for their many contributions to the Morris Community. Please join me in applauding them for their very important work.

I'd also like to welcome some special guests: Regents Dallas Bohnsack and Steven Hunter, Senior Vice President Robert Jones, Vice President Linda Thrane, Carol Wilcox, Mayor of

Morris, and, last but not least, Susan Hagstrum, First Lady of the University of Minnesota. We are looking forward to attending the inauguration of Charles Casey as chancellor of the University of Minnesota Crookston tomorrow afternoon.

I'd also like to welcome those joining on our Duluth, Crookston, Rochester, and Twin Cities campuses, including Regent David Metzen and Regent Patricia Simmons, and members of the University Senate chaired by Professor Judith Martin.

The State of the University is strong, and we are making great strides in the quality of our programs and the impact of our public mission.

The academic profile of incoming freshmen system-wide has improved once again, with the average ACT composite score and high school rank the highest ever.

The University of Minnesota continues to attract and enroll a freshman class that is increasingly diverse.

At nearly 32,000 applications system-wide, we have already surpassed last year's total by more than 3,000 applications.

Freshman to sophomore retention and four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates continue to improve across our campuses.

Our scholars successfully competed for and secured \$561 Million in sponsored research this past year, 98% of all such funds awarded to researchers in Minnesota's colleges and universities. We are fifth in royalties nationally, and *New Scientist* magazine named us fourth among all U.S. universities for our success in commercializing intellectual property from research.

93,000 donors—a record number—made gifts and pledges to the University last year, including an unprecedented 51,000 alumni.

And we gained ground in renewing our partnership with the state. We were able to limit annual tuition increases to single-digits this year and next, and fund more than \$70 Million in new strategic academic priorities over the same period. Through the 2005 bonding bill, we are modernizing classrooms and laboratories and preserving our capital assets. I want to extend my special thanks to the Legislature, its leaders, the Governor and the thousands of members of our Legislative Network who supported the University in the 2005 legislative session.

Legislative Request.

We'll need to continue to strengthen our partnership with the state this year.

Our 2006 capital request puts students first, by making a fundamental investment in their educational experiences. It creates opportunities for groundbreaking research that will benefit the state and its communities, and support the University's land grant mission.

The request would allow expansion of our business schools in the Twin Cities and Duluth, modernization of science classrooms and biomedical sciences research space, and improvement of three of the University's statewide research centers and field stations, including the center here at Morris.

This session we're also putting forward a novel proposal for long-term funding of high-cost but essential biomedical science research facilities. Does that mean we're decreasing our commitment to other vital areas of academic research? Absolutely not. But the biomedical sciences comprise more than \$300 Million annually—more than one-half—of the University's

distinctive research portfolio. The University contributes to the creation of new knowledge and more effective treatments for medical disease, and to the training and research foundation of Minnesota's health care industry.

Minnesota is a world leader in the biomedical sciences. But as Will Rogers once said: "Even if you're on the right track, you'll get run over if you just sit there."

Twenty other states, including California, New Jersey, and Wisconsin, are making enormous research investments—"reaching," to use Senior Vice President Frank Cerra's words, "for the brass ring of biomedical science." In order to be competitive, the University must add approximately 5 state-of-the-art buildings and the researchers to fill them over the next ten years.

We are bringing to the Board of Regents—and asking the Legislature to consider—a proposal to create a new bonding authority dedicated to financing academic biomedical research facilities. These very expensive facilities are essential to the University's aspirations and Minnesota's future prosperity.

Many of you are familiar with the quality of Morris's education and its regional outreach center. It also has another distinction—it is building the only university sports stadium approved by the Legislature in years!

This is the third year we're bringing forward our plan to build a 50,000-seat football stadium on the Twin Cities campus, a facility designed to be a focal point for University life and state pride.

Stadium advocates: It is time to act now. Approval this session will avoid increased costs of \$30 Million and loss of more than \$50 million in private contributions. The Metrodome is not a financially viable long-term option for the Minnesota Gophers. We've assembled a plan in which the University funds 60% of the \$248 Million cost with non-state funds—mostly private contributions—and the state funds the remaining 40%. The plan has strong bipartisan support at the Capitol, including from the Governor, Senate Majority Leader, and Speaker of the House.

In this venue and many others, I have proudly made the case for the University's unique role in Minnesota's system of higher education, and the essential part a research university plays in any region's success. We must continue to share the U's story and its importance to Minnesota's elected officials.

Strategic Positioning.

Past: In last year's State of the University address, I highlighted the case for transforming the University, for fundamentally repositioning the University's academic and service commitments for the 21st century. I outlined a values-driven process to guide us toward achieving the bold, aspirational goal our community adopted—namely, to become one of the top three public research universities in the world within a decade, with an equivalent standard of excellence applied statewide to our coordinate campuses, research centers and extension offices, each according to its signature role and mission.

From establishing values and aspirations we moved quickly to wide-reaching recommendations for change and consideration of our long-term academic priorities. These recommendations were overwhelmingly affirmed by the Board of Regents and the University Senate.

Present. Today, the transformation of the University is very much a work in progress. More than 500 community members have been working since September on nearly 40 task forces and in hundreds of meetings. They've gathered input from the University of Minnesota and its extended communities and created ideas to shape our future. Eleven of our task forces have submitted their

reports, including those integrating the proud cultures of six existing Twin Cities campus colleges into three new colleges. I want to thank the members of these task forces, the college leaders, and the University community for their diligent and creative work.

Future. University leaders are reviewing task force recommendations to translate them into the priorities, directions, and daily work of the University of Minnesota.

We'll begin to report **our recommendations to the University community and Board of Regents this month, including names for two of our new colleges: The College of Design and the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences. We expect that the name of the College of Education and Human Development will remain the same.**

Teaching and Learning—Undergraduate and Graduate.

A central pillar of Strategic Positioning is our commitment to the education and support of a diverse undergraduate, graduate, and professional student population: We will maintain our current high levels of enrollment and increase diversity. We must also continue to improve access to the University of Minnesota, the educational experiences available to our students, and student outcomes.

For Undergraduate students:

We will leverage our unique role as Minnesota's research university by strengthening students' connections with faculty on the cutting edge of their fields. **We will substantially increase support for programs like our Undergraduate Research Opportunities and service learning in the community.**

We will leverage the University's distinction as a provider of high quality graduate and professional programs by **strengthening existing priority admission and fast-track programs for our most accomplished students, such as Pre-Med Scholars and VetFast, and we will look closely at extending this option to other professional and graduate programs.**

We will build on successful improvements we've made to the student experience. Our undergraduate-related task forces have formulated promising **recommendations to enhance student learning, strengthen writing experiences for all baccalaureate students, create a Twin Cities Campus-wide honors program, and develop more consistent academic and career advising and faculty-student mentoring.**

To ensure that the access we provide our students is access to success, we will continue to strengthen programs that support transitioning students, such as freshman seminars and first-year experiential programs. **We will expand bridge programs for the summer between high school and college. And we will establish a new office on the Twin Cities campus to offer comparable support to transfer students.**

We must further improve student graduation rates. There has been significant progress, but **Provost Tom Sullivan and Senior Vice President Robert Jones will soon announce new system-wide expectations for strengthened advisement and career services, and new system-wide goals for graduation rates.**

For Graduate and Professional students, who comprise 40% of the student population on the Twin Cities campus, and 31% system-wide:

We raised the minimum stipend for research and teaching assistants by 10 percent.

We are investing more than \$8 million over the current biennium in new fellowship funds and other forms of graduate support,

Graduate School Dean Gail Dubrow is setting ambitious goals to increase diversity, foster interdisciplinary study, and introduce innovation into doctoral education. She is helping to develop a plan to ensure that in the future, every admitted graduate student is provided financial support.

Affordability.

We continue to work aggressively to ensure the University of Minnesota is affordable to students from low- and moderate-income homes.

For Minnesota residents who are eligible for Pell grants, we have expanded the Founders Opportunity Award to include not only all new full-time freshmen, but also all new full-time transfer students. Ultimately this award, which guarantees grant or scholarship aid equal to or exceeding the cost of tuition and required fees, is likely to benefit more than 4,500 students per year.

Scholarships and graduate-professional fellowships remain the University's top fundraising priority. After two years of fundraising through the Promise of Tomorrow Scholarship Drive, we have raised more than \$110 million toward our initial \$150 million goal. A thousand more undergraduate and graduate students are already benefiting from this program each year.

Research and Discovery.

Above all, it is our research enterprise that makes our educational programs different from every other college and university in Minnesota, and that makes our success so important to our state and our region.

A partial restoration of state support last year has allowed us to commit nearly \$20 million to make important research-related investments.

Areas of academic investment include the arts, humanities and social sciences through a new Institute for Advanced Study; health sciences and innovative biomedical technology; the neurosciences; environment and energy—including a possible new center for biofuels; nanotechnology; and food science and human health.

Significant infrastructure investments included funding for our libraries and capital equipment for research.

And to maintain our strongest academic units, **the administration allocated \$6 million this year for competitive market compensation for faculty and other employees who perform research and teach, and another \$6 million will be invested next year,** over and above regular compensation increases.

Community partnerships are another area of significant research-related investment. Under Vice President Tim Mulcahy's leadership, the University is working to aggressively develop and license its technology; to make our research enterprise more transparent, accessible and welcoming; and to ensure that our research strengths—where appropriate—are connected and aligned with Minnesota's needs and assets. With the state's help, we're developing exciting collaborations such as the Minnesota Partnership for Biotechnology and Medical Genomics, a historic agreement with the Mayo Clinic that this week awarded \$15 million to nine Mayo-University research teams.

Public engagement.

As a public research university, it is essential that our education and research improve the quality of life of the people and communities of Minnesota and beyond. Here are just a few examples of how we're doing that.

In Rochester, we are working with the community to meet growing needs for higher education, with plans to accommodate more students and increase research and technology transfer. One proposal is an expanded Center for Allied Health Programs, which would address critical workforce shortages throughout the state in medical technology, occupational therapy, and other areas. The University wants to play a leadership role in meeting these expectations, provided that funding from the State, local community resources, and other sources enables us to do so.

At Morris, researchers at the West Central Regional Outreach Center use the country's only large-scale wind-to-hydrogen research turbine to study how to store wind energy for times when the wind isn't blowing. And they're sharing what they're learning through conferences, curricula and innovative partnerships.

Researchers at our Natural Resources Research Institute in Duluth are providing assistance to people affected by the greatest natural and engineering disaster in U.S. history, Hurricane Katrina. The institute's Brian Brashaw was recently able to share knowledge with officials in New Orleans on evaluating wood for water damage without destroying the wood.

University of Minnesota Crookston has one of the strongest service learning components of any campus in the nation, and more than half of the faculty there have incorporated service learning into their courses.

Our new Consortium for Postsecondary Success will address an array of preK-12 issues. Its initial focus is the achievement gap that exists for economically disadvantaged students and students of color. The consortium will help define the University's role throughout Minnesota in improving preK-12 education for all students, and preparing many more Minnesota students for success in higher education. The University has an extensive history of engagement with our schools. But, as our task force found, we have an opportunity—and I believe an obligation—to move from essential but often fragmented initiatives to a better coordinated University-wide engagement.

Diversity; International; Management and Stewardship; Interdisciplinary.

Cutting across our mission of teaching, research and outreach are four issues I'd like to briefly address today: diversity, international aspects of the U, better service and stewardship of our resources, and opportunities to work across the disciplines.

Diversity.

The system-wide task force on diversity found that we cannot achieve our strategic positioning goal unless we sustain a genuinely diverse community. With that reality in mind, we are conducting a nationwide search for a new vice president to create and shape effective initiatives and programs in access, educational equity and diversity. We continue our efforts to recruit a diverse student population, including a new commitment of half a million dollars annually to recruit students of color. And, based on historical trends, we anticipate that 30 percent of the recipients of our newly expanded Founders Opportunity Award will be students of color.

International.

The Twin Cities Deans have noted that “the future diversity of the state is likely to be international, linking diversity and international efforts in important ways,” and that “future leadership to advance diversity and international education needs to be firmly connected with the academic affairs agenda.” We do a good job of connecting our students and the people of our state with the world, but we also have real potential to become a leading global university.

Retiring Associate Vice President Gene Allen has led our efforts to expand study abroad opportunities, increase undergraduate participation in them, broaden international emphasis in our curriculum, and facilitate international students on campus. We are seeking a worthy successor in a system-wide Director of International Programs who will help us build on the University's strategic international ties and connections.

Management and Service.

All of our efforts to improve our academic programs will be severely undercut unless we pay close attention to our service culture, our use of resources, our financial position, and our accountability. This work is critical to our efforts as a University "to become one in spirit," and it remains a focus of the strategic positioning process. As the Task Force on Administration and Productivity led by Vice President Kathleen O'Brien reported, our administrative operations must be the best among our peers—focused on service to faculty, staff, students, University units and the general public, and driven by performance objectives and defined results.

Interdisciplinary.

Throughout our strategic positioning process, the importance of interdisciplinary work has emerged as an important theme. The big questions that confront society in the 21st century require interdisciplinary teams of researchers who are strong in their disciplines but able to cross boundaries.

I have asked our senior academic officers to develop a system-wide strategy to assess, develop, and nurture interdisciplinary programs, and remove barriers to interdisciplinary research and education. They will help establish the University of Minnesota as a national leader in the conversation on interdisciplinarity and its best practices—most likely including a national conference hosted by the University in 2007.

One exciting area of interdisciplinary work where the University is poised for leadership is the environment, an area where we have many strengths, but where fragmentation keeps us from reaching our full potential. Provost Sullivan is beginning the early planning for **a system-wide Institute on the Environment** which, by coordinating efforts throughout the University system. The Institute would allow us to become more than the sum of our parts in this critical area. It would improve recruitment and retention of talent at the U, and the presentation of coherent priorities to funding agencies, enabling us to better respond to research opportunities—and donors.

Conclusion.

I said last year that "the pursuit of excellence at the University is in the best interest and service of the state."

We've shown we're willing to look hard at our current profile and direction. We've set a bold, aspirational goal for the University of Minnesota that is already yielding results. We're working toward real benefits for students, toward a culture dedicated to our land-grant mission that supports the highest levels of excellence in academic achievement and in service and productivity.

Benjamin Disraeli once stated: "The secret of success is constancy to purpose." It is time to begin to move this process from one centered around dozens of task forces with hundreds of members to one that pervades the culture of the University of Minnesota.

We are in a competitive global environment. Just as we are doing on an institutional level, our programs, departments and colleges must set higher aspirations and expectations, and find ways to free up administrative resources for academic investment and programs.

Each of us must rededicate ourselves to making the University one of the world's top public research university systems. We must each work to increase public recognition and support of the University, by communicating to our neighbors and elected officials the new excitement at the U, and the long-term importance of a leading research university to our region's future.

This is our opportunity to be a part of greatness. It is up to us to ensure a strong future for the State of Minnesota, while remaining connected to the noble values of our 155-year heritage.

Thank you. I'm glad to take your questions.

12. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: If there is value in incorporating students in shared governance, will the Morris example be expanded to the other campuses?

A: In a recent meeting with the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA), this was their question as well. The strength of the University is its history and commitment to this topic. The University needs to revisit how to engage students in the process at other levels, since they already serve in the Senate and with the Regents. At times students have not been engaged to the fullest extent or in a timely fashion, so Vice Provost Jerry Rinehart has been charged to create a task force to address this issue. Whatever the outcome, the University has a deep commitment to this principle.

Q: Remarks were made on a shared culture for the University and working on a pursuit of common goals. How does this lead to a minimized reliance on outsourcing?

A: In a knowledge-based culture, core competencies cannot be outsourced, but it does not make sense to maintain other areas internally. If there are things that the University needs to accomplish, it should look within itself first for people with technical competencies in the area.

A senator noted that when the University discusses the topic of diversity, accessibility, and success, it should be sure to include students with disabilities in this category. Educational tools and student life activities need to be created for this population as well.

President Bruininks noted that he has devoted much time to these issues, so will make sure that this group is included in discussions. Diversity should be celebrated in all forms, and every student attending adds to the culture of the campus.

Q: Please expand on the vision of the Institute of the Environment. Is this intended to be a research-centered institute or a college?

A: This institute would have a broad agenda to connect to student life by focusing on all aspects of the University's mission. It would combine the best research parts of the University to do research and discovery, education, policy formation, and public education of common needs. It would be a state-wide institute to bring all parties together and make the University a national and international leader in the area of the environment.

Q: As the University pushes to turn itself into more of a green campus, how do you see Morris' role in twenty years in terms of renewable resources?

A: Renewable resources was a broad interdisciplinary priority for the University a few years ago, and Morris has taken the lead with its efforts in wind energy and biomass, while becoming a center for applied translational research in the area. This issue has been identified by the state and

deans as a priority and the history of the state gives it a comparative advantage. The Morris campus is blessed in this area and will continue to lead the next wave of development and use.

Q: During out-state visits, how is strategic positioning momentum viewed by the public?

A: The public sees that it is important for the University to take control of its own future and make the University a better place in five to ten years. However, while most people do not understand the subtleties of the plan, they do know that change is hard, like what they are seeing, and think that the University is making the correct choices. People in this state feel deeply about the University and believe that the University belongs to them. They therefore respect the past and guard the future.

13. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor

2005-06 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2006

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 4

The fourth meeting of the Student Senate for 2005-06 was convened in Studio C, Rarig Center, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, March 2, 2006, at 11:31 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 28 voting student members. Chair Josh Breyfogle presided.

1. UPDATE ON STRATEGIC POSITIONING

Discussion

Chief of Staff Kathy Brown and Associate to the Chief of Staff Lynn Holleran joined the meeting to discuss strategic positioning. Ms. Brown noted that this is an exciting opportunity to make the University greater and to change things that are not the best.

The first group of 11 task forces on the academic side have made their recommendations. The executive officers recently had a retreat to discuss these 11 final reports and the preliminary reports from the next seven task forces focusing on the administrative side.

Relating to students, there is a commitment to improve undergraduate and graduate education, both for curricular and co-curricular needs. The emphasis will be placed on the total student experience. Then task forces are looking at how to help students from the start of their education, such as academic program knowledge, service learning, financial aid, co-curricular events, and degree completion.

There is also a value to diversity on campus, and it must be woven through all student offerings. The University is committed to this effort. As such, it is looking to hire a Vice President for Equity, Access, and Multicultural Affairs who will focus on systematic changes.

A third large theme of the strategic positioning process is interdisciplinary work. The University needs to accommodate student interests in terms of degrees or research opportunities and make sure that students benefits from interdisciplinary work.

The University will be shaping specific projects in the next six months and more reports are due later this spring. Mid-summer all the reports will be collated and action plans will be created to improve administrative services for students.

In closing she thanked students for their participation and engagement in the process.

Q: How have students been involved in the process? How can they continue to be involved?

A: Students have been involved in the process and served on most of the task forces on each of the campuses. The oversight steering committee also has student involvement. A group of 20 students who applied for the task forces also offered their services and gave perspective on the administrative services side. There were also outreach efforts to meet students and the broader community. The task force also reviewed emails and comments that were shared via the web.

As the process goes forward, students should participate in public forums and continue to comment on the web. Task force members will continue to be engaged in the process as well.

A senator noted that as projects are implemented, the University should offer them as educational experiences, such as internships, for students.

Q: How will students be involved in civic engagement efforts?

A: Regional and community engagement is at the early stages of development. Students should have an active role in pre K-12 engagement and working with the neighborhoods. Student involvement would be a benefit for both sides.

Q: What changes will be made to hiring, buildings, and classes during this process?

A: Strategic positioning is not meant to be a cost-saving exercise, but is meant to improve excellence. There are good reasons to redesign the colleges, such as academic synergy. Now the University needs to determine what is the best administrative structure and academic model for these colleges. It is also a chance to redesign jobs and functions within units, and make the University more service-oriented. These changes might involve job changes, but that is not the focus of these efforts.

In closing she asked students to email her with any additional comments.

2. MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 1, 2005 AND FEBRUARY 9, 2006 Action

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URLs. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/051201stu.html>

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/060209stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

3. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Josh Breyfogle, Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that SSCC members and student senators are working on projects this semester. He said that he was supposed to be working on improving communication with central administrators, but since he is in Duluth, he has asked Rick Orr to handle this task.

Alcohol abuse has been and still is a problem at Duluth. He is working with the administration to develop a system to stop binge drinking. Once it is in place for Duluth, he will share it with the other campuses.

4. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – DeAnn Roers said that Vice Chancellor Massey retired Tuesday and Chancellor Casey will be inaugurated on Friday by President Bruininks.

Duluth – Timothy Tangen noted that the city voted to expand the DECC Arena, in large part due to a 500 percent increase in student involvement in this voting period than for a city council election. The taxi program started Monday.

Morris – Nathan Hilfiker stated MCSA approved a college readership program for newspapers on campus for students. Technology fee proposal reviews start next week. Men’s soccer was approved as a new sport for next year. Campus had a good-bye celebration for Dean Schwaller and is looking forward to the next dean.

GAPSA – Kris Houlton said that President Bruininks attended a GAPSA meeting to talk about current issues. They also discussed a resolution to establish student involvement in decision-making bodies

MSA – Rick Orr said that the MSA President is attending a conference in Abu Dubai. A renter’s forum will be held this month. MSA is also looking at the stadium issue and student fees towards it. The group will also be participating in Spring Jam and student group Olympics.

5. UPDATE ON SPRING STUDENT SENATOR PROJECTS

A senator said that he looked at the issue of collapsible goal posts, which are taken down at the end of each game. The Morris stadium will incorporate these posts.

A senator then asked the Student Senate to approve a resolution calling for a four-year tuition freeze. Instead of trying to craft something at this meeting, senators decided to research the issue and bring a proposal back to the April 6 meeting.

A motion was then made and seconded to suspend the rules to take action on two items. The motion was approved with 26 in favor and none opposed.

MOTION 1:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution on Reports from the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators and Civil Service Committee

The Student Senate recognizes that with the expansion of the University Senate to include the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) and the Civil Service Committee that there is an ever-greater need for an increased effort toward communication.

The Student Senate believes that it is through communication and cooperation that we, as a governing body, can best serve our constituents, the University, and the University’s mission as a public land-grant institution.

Therefore, be it resolved that during each Student Senate meeting, time shall be allotted to both the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators and the Civil Service Committee to

provide a report concerning their respective governance bodies to foster more collaborative work between the bodies.

DISCUSSION:

Rick Orr introduced this item, noting that it is meant to create a better working relationship with CAPA and the Civil Service Committee. A closer relationship among the groups would offer more leverage when voting at University Senate meetings. Currently, the Student Senate has time to speak on the agendas of each of these groups. This resolution would extend them the same courtesy here.

Following the acceptance of three friendly amendments, the motion was seconded and approved with 22 in favor and 4 opposed.

APPROVED

MOTION 2:

To approve the following resolution.

Position Statement on Graduate and Professional Student Housing

The Student Senate recognizes that there is a lack of graduate and professional student housing on both the Twin Cities and Duluth campuses.

The Universities of Minnesota has a responsibility to its graduate and professional students to provide an adequate amount of graduate and professional student housing that is accessible to campus. This housing should be developed in a way that fosters community, which in turn will improve the culture of the University of Minnesota graduate and professional schools.

Therefore, be it decided that the Student Senate supports any efforts by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA) to urge the University of Minnesota Administration to create more graduate and professional student housing on both the Twin Cities and Duluth campuses.

DISCUSSION:

Rick Orr introduced this item after working with GAPSA and its president on this initiative.

A senator said that while she appreciated the spirit of the resolution, the resolution should be re-focused on affordable housing, not the overall lack of housing. While the University does not have control over market pricing, it can increase housing compensation through salary, housing subsidies, or scholarship

The motion was then withdrawn.

WITHDRAWN

6. REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Jeffrey Wencl, Student Affairs Committee (SCSA) member, said that the committee met with the athletics director in February to review the stadium proposal and hear about the proposed fee for

all students at the Twin Cities. The issue of plagiarism and how faculty perceive it was also discussed. A more complete report can be provided at the next meeting.

7. STATEMENT ON CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

A resolution on Civic Engagement was presented by a senator for action. The resolution provided general recognition and student commitment to the issue.

Q: Does the statement support mandatory engagement?

A: No. It just asks that these efforts be centralized in a campus office and that civic engagement offerings be noted in the class schedule.

A senator said that there is a discussion among graduate students on campus to be actively involved on campus and voice opinions on campus issues. Sometimes these opinions are dissenting, and there is some sense that this dissent should not be tolerated. This statement should include this view.

Following discussion by the senators, the following statement was approved:

Position Statement on Civic Engagement

The Student Senate recognizes that the University of Minnesota is a public land grant institution¹² and is inherently connected to the well-being of the community and state.

The Student Senate believes the mission statement¹³ of the University of Minnesota makes clear that the institution is to provide its knowledge and expertise to help solve problems in the greater community through public service and outreach.

The Student Senate also believes that students should have a commitment to carrying out the mission statement of the University of Minnesota.

Further, the Student Senate believes that civic engagement includes both service to their communities and active participation, dissent, and debate.

The Student Senate furthermore believes that students who are civically engaged in their communities become better citizens.

Therefore, the Student Senate strongly supports any existing or new initiatives dedicated to expanding civic engagement on University of Minnesota campuses around the state. The focus of these initiatives should be on the University of Minnesota system, and as well the greater local, state, national, and global communities.

The Student Senate also supports any initiatives stemming from Strategic Positioning designed to institutionalize opportunities for civic engagement into the University of Minnesota. The Student Senate asks that students have a strong voice in any proposed plans to institutionalize opportunities for civic engagement.

¹² The University of Minnesota – Duluth is also a public sea-grant institution.

¹³ The link to the mission statement of the University of Minnesota is:
http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/01_abt_gen_hist.php

APPROVED

8. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

9. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:21 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**