

2006-07 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

NOVEMBER 30, 2006

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

The second meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2006-07 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, November 30, 2006, at 2:34 p.m., as a joint meeting of the two bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 23 academic professional members, 19 civil service members, 130 faculty/academic professional members, and 18 student members. Vice Chair Mary Jo Kane presided.

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

University Senate

Statement on the Food and Beverage RFP

Approved by the: University Senate September 28, 2006

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

John F. Anderson
Professor
Veterinary Medicine
1932 – 2006

Jill Barnum
Professor
Post-Secondary Teaching and Learning
1947 – 2006

Sylvan Burgstahler
Professor
Science and Engineering – Duluth
1928 – 2006

David C. Lykken
Professor
Psychology
1928 – 2006

Grace C. Peterson
Professor
Mathematical Science
1914 – 2006

Eduard Stadelmann
Professor
Horticultural Science
1920 – 2006

Conrad Straub
Professor
Environmental Health
1916 – 2006

Harry C. Walker, Jr.
Associate Professor
Radiology
1924 – 2006

STUDENTS

Thomas M. Boucher
University of Minnesota – Crookston

Abigail Jennings
University of Minnesota – Crookston

Laural A. Capistran Murphy
University of Minnesota – Crookston

3. INTRODUCTIONS

**Dean Darlyne Bailey, College of Education and Human Development;
Dean Allen Levine, College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences**

Professor Carol Chomsky, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), introduced Darlyne Bailey, Dean of the College of Education and Human Development and Allen Levine, Dean of the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences.

4. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Carol Chomsky, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that SCC has met twice since the last University Senate meeting. The committee has reviewed proposed changes to the Code of Conduct policy which has now been presented to the Regents. The changes are designed to make the Code more applicable to all employees, more easily understood, and pulls conduct principles from other policies. SCC will also be involved in how best to communicate these changes.

SCC also reviewed changes to the Student Code of Conduct, which dealt primarily with off-campus jurisdiction and an increased list of sanctions. Input was provided as an advisory group prior to Regental approval.

The committee also met with Chancellor Jacqueline Johnson from Morris to talk about her vision for the campus.

Lastly, the committee has worked to strengthen connections and communications between constituent groups through reporting at SCC meetings.

**5. UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 2.b and 2.c of the University Senate Rules as follows (language to be added is underlined, language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~). As an amendment to the University Senate Rules, the motion requires a simple majority.

ARTICLE II. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the University Senate)

...

2. Terms of Membership, Chairing of Committees, and Removal of Members for Absences

...

b. Student appointments to committees of the University Senate shall be made for terms of two years. Student members of committees must be registered for at least six credits for each semester in the academic year. Graduate students who have completed course work and are not required to maintain continuous registration during interim periods of study in preparation for written and oral examinations must be certified by the individual department director of graduate studies.

c. Terms of committee service begin July 1 and terminate June 30. No non-student member is eligible to serve more than two consecutive full three-year terms on any one committee, and shall be eligible for reappointment only after a one-year interval of nonmembership on that committee. No student member is eligible to serve more than ~~four~~ two consecutive ~~one~~ two-year terms on any one committee. No committee member is eligible to serve on more than two committees of the University Senate, the Faculty Senate, or the Student Senate at a time. These rotation procedures and limitations do not apply to ex officio representatives.

...

COMMENT:

Last year a concern was raised about continuity of student membership on committees. The Student Committee on Committees discussed the issue and determined that it would be appropriate to assign students to two-year terms on committees, and therefore only have half rotate off each year. This amendment modifies the typical student committee appointment and student term limits.

**JOSHUA BEININGEN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

**6. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 5 (C) of the University Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the University Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the University Senate (124) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

ARTICLE II. COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the University Senate)

...

5. University Senate Committee Charges

...

C. DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE

The Disabilities Issues Committee recommends University policies, procedures, programs, and services concerning faculty/academic professionals, students, ~~and~~ staff, and guests of the University with disabilities.

Membership

The Disabilities Issues Committee shall be composed of at least 7 faculty members, 2 academic professional members, 2 students (at least one graduate and one undergraduate), 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Faculty, academic professional, and student members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. Civil service members shall be appointed by the Civil Service Committee.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To advise the president and administrative offices, including the Disability Services Office and the University ADA Coordinator, on policies, programs, and services for students, ~~and~~ employees, and guests of the University.
- b. To promote compliance with laws relating to students, ~~and~~ staff, and guests of the University with disabilities.
- c. To review policies and practices in light of legal compliance aspects, deployment of resources, and effectiveness in meeting the needs of the University community, and to recommend changes.

- d. To inform the University community to the special concerns of its members with disabilities and of the available resources.
- e. To recommend to the University Senate and the Senate Consultative Committee resolutions, actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

COMMENT:

Disabilities Issues members agreed that aside from serving the University community, the committee also serves the broader community, guests who visit the campuses and University websites, that the committee should be attentive to access issues for them as well, and that this should be explicitly reflected in the charge.

[This proposed amendment was approved by the Committee on Committees, November 14, 2006.]

**PATRICK MCNAMARA, CHAIR
DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Q: What is the scope of the word ‘guest’ and the implications for University resources?

A: The committee is defining ‘guest’ as anyone who is on campus for a University program or event, or anyone accessing a University website. There are already existing policies that require departments to have an accessible website. Most websites are not tested, but the Disabilities Issues Committee is aware of the need.

A senator spoke in favor of the motion, noting that the language does not say what measures will or will not be taken, but simply states that the Committee wants to be able to discuss general issues of access.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved 153 in favor and one opposed.

APPROVED

**7. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 5 (A) of the University Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the University Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the University Senate (124) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

ARTICLE II. COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the University Senate)

...

5. University Senate Committee Charges

...

A. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS

The Advisory Committee on Athletics provides consultation and advice to the President, the senior administrator responsible for athletics, and the departments of intercollegiate athletics on policies and other major decisions. All policies formulated by the Advisory Committee on Athletics will be reported to the Senate Consultative Committee for action and to the University Senate for information after the Senate Consultative Committee has acted. The University Senate has the authority to reverse or modify a decision by the Senate Consultative Committee.

...

COMMENT:

Up until the revision of the Senate constitution in 2005, the two athletics committees both recommended policy to the Assembly Steering Committee (the Twin Cities subset of the Senate Consultative Committee, under the structure when there were two governing bodies, the University Senate and the Twin Cities Campus Assembly). The Steering Committee approved the policies (or not), and then reported its action to the Assembly. When the constitution and bylaws were revised, this language was inadvertently dropped.

The logic of that reporting and approving relationship remains the same: there are policies that the Advisory Committee on Athletics (ACA) is responsible for, some of which are quite detailed and arcane. These policies come up for revision periodically and new policies are established from time to time. It would be a considerable demand on the time of the University Senate to have to consider each of these policies every time an amendment is needed.

The Senate Consultative Committee recommends that the University Senate approve this change in the bylaws, reverting to the practice in place before 2005.

**CAROL CHOMSKY, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 165 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

8. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENT Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 2.a of the University Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the University Senate Bylaws, the motion requires

either a majority of all voting members of the University Senate (124) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

ARTICLE II. COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the University Senate)

...

2. Eligibility for Membership

a. Only individuals eligible to vote in Senate elections are eligible to serve on University Senate committees or to serve as chair of University Senate committees, except that no individual holding a position carrying as any part of its title President, vice president, chancellor, provost, executive director, counsel, ~~attorney~~, controller, or chief of staff may serve as a voting member of a University Senate committee, nor may the University Librarian or anyone who is a dean. Individuals with less than a one-third time appointment as assistant or associate dean shall be eligible to serve as a voting member and chair of a University Senate committee. Faculty members whose appointment responsibilities are primarily faculty but who incidentally have an administrative title and responsibilities within an academic department or its equivalent are eligible to serve as voting members and chairs of University Senate committees. Alumni members are not subject to the eligibility rule of this section. An individual serving as a voting member of a University Senate committee who is appointed to a position which would bar them from service as a voting member on the committee shall resign from that committee. If the individual is appointed only to an interim or acting position, the chair of the Senate Consultative Committee may, with the consent of the Senate Consultative Committee, waive the requirement that the individual resign from the committee.

...

COMMENT:

On occasion Senate committee members are appointed on an interim or acting basis to administrative positions, the occupants of which are barred from voting membership on committees by Article II(2)(s) of the University Senate bylaws. Sometimes these interim or acting appointments are short-term and the position can vary in level. As a general rule, the Senate Consultative Committee believes that individuals appointed to such administrative positions should step aside, but that there should be exceptions allowed. (In one recent case, for example, one Senate committee member was appointed interim associate dean in his college; the committee chair and committee members, however, very much wished him to remain on the committee and voted unanimously that he should do so.) If this bylaw amendment is approved, the following guidelines will govern the action of the SCC chair or vice chair when the question arises.

The Senate Consultative Committee was made aware of the inclusion of the title "attorney" in the bylaw listing individuals with titles that disqualify them for membership on University Senate committees. The same language appears in the Faculty Senate bylaw. The Senate Consultative Committee and the Faculty Consultative Committee recommend deletion of "attorney" from the list.

The intent when including this title was to ensure that attorneys in the Office of the General Counsel did not serve on committees because of considerable potential for a conflict of interest. All of the lawyers in the Office of the General Counsel hold some version of the title of

"counsel," and are thus barred from committee membership by inclusion of that title in the bylaws. There are employees who hold the title of "attorney," however, who should not be disqualified from committee service, such as clinical instructors in the Law School and lawyers who work for the student legal service offices, because there is no inherent conflict of interest in their work and committee service.

The Senate Consultative Committee and Faculty Consultative Committee thus recommend to the University Senate and the Faculty Senate that the bylaws be amended accordingly.

Note: In the guidelines that follow, the amended bylaw is repeated because, for administrative purposes, the guidelines would be maintained as a separate document for use by (both FCC and) SCC. The redundancy is intentional.

Guidelines for Senate Committee Members Who Receive Interim Administrative Appointments

The Bylaws of the Faculty and University Senate provide that "no individual holding a position carrying as any part of its title President, vice president, chancellor, provost, executive director, dean, counsel, attorney, controller, or chief of staff may serve as a voting member of a [Faculty or University] Senate committee, nor may the University Librarian or anyone who is a dean. Individuals with less than a one-third time appointment as assistant or associate dean shall be eligible to serve as a voting member and chair of a [Faculty or University] Senate committee. Individuals whose appointment responsibilities are primarily faculty but who incidentally have an administrative title and responsibilities within an academic department or its equivalent are eligible to serve as voting members and chairs of [Faculty or University] Senate committees. An individual serving as a voting member of a Faculty Senate committee who is appointed to a position which would bar them from service as a voting member on the committee shall resign from that committee. If the individual is appointed only to an interim or acting position, the chair of the [Faculty or Senate Consultative Committee, as appropriate,] may, with the consent of the [Faculty/Senate Consultative Committee, as appropriate,] waive the requirement that the individual resign from the committee."

On occasion, individuals serving on or chairing Senate committees or subcommittees will be appointed, on an interim or acting basis, to an administrative post whose occupant would, under Faculty and University Senate bylaws, be barred from continuing committee service. The following guidelines apply in those instances:

1. The general assumption is that the individual will resign from the Senate committee, whether serving as chair or committee member.
2. At the request of the committee chair (or another committee member if the individual given the interim administrative appointment is the committee chair), or on the initiative of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) or Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), the FCC/SCC chair may waive the requirement that the committee member resign from the committee. (In the absence of the FCC/SCC chair, the FCC vice chair may issue the waiver.) The FCC/SCC chair should consider the following factors in deciding whether to waive the requirement:
 - Whether the individual given the interim appointment is a candidate for the permanent position (if not, the waiver request should be viewed more favorably);
 - If the interim appointment is for a short period of time (if so, the waiver request should be viewed more favorably);

- The level of the interim appointment (e.g., vice president versus associate dean; the "lower" the level, the more favorable should be the view of the request for waiver);
 - The opinion of the chair of the committee in question.
3. While it is possible that an individual with an interim administrative appointment might be permitted to continue to serve as a committee chair, normally it would be expected, even if the individual remains on the committee, that he or she would step down as chair for the duration of the interim administrative appointment. The FCC/SCC chair may, however, overrule this expectation as well.
 4. Before notifying the committee chair or the faculty member in question,
 - (a) the FCC/SCC chair will notify the FCC/SCC of his or her decision to grant or deny the waiver, and
 - (b) FCC/SCC by majority vote may overrule the decision of the chair to grant or deny the waiver request.

**CAROL CHOMSKY, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 166 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

**9. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Statement on Tuition Benefits
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following statement:

Statement on Tuition Benefits for Dependents of University Employees

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs is disappointed and puzzled by the President's reaction to the recommendation from the Faculty Senate that the University offer a tuition benefit to the dependents of University employees. We offer the following observations.

1. The University is the outlier on the matter of tuition benefits for dependents if one compares it with other institutions in the state and in the Big Ten. MNSCU and the private institutions offer such benefits, as do seven of the eleven Big Ten schools. We are also well aware that members of the public are surprised to learn that University faculty and staff receive no break on tuition for their dependents.
2. We see the tuition benefit for dependents as one step toward the possibility of a tuition-reciprocity pact among employees of Big Ten or CIC schools. It is not possible to enter such a pact, should it be created, if the institution does not offer tuition benefits to its own employees.

3. Many of us on the Committee are aware of examples where a valued colleague has left the University, recruited away in part because our competitor was able to offer tuition benefits to his or her children/dependents. Adopting a tuition benefit would not only be a relatively inexpensive way to prevent the loss of at least some of the faculty who will help lead the University to the top three, but would also give us more leverage to recruit stellar faculty from private colleges and universities.

4. We remind the administration of the sophisticated study conducted by Professor Fossum and his colleagues a few years ago, which concluded that the cost of the tuition benefit would be outweighed by the cost to recruit and replace individuals who accept offers from other institutions because of the tuition benefit offered at the competing institution. A tuition benefit reduces employment costs by reducing employee turnover.

5. We are not persuaded by the argument that only 2% of University employees would use the benefit in any one year. We understand that half or more of the University's employees would make use of the benefit during their careers here. It seems to us unlikely that the administration would propose to drop faculty sabbaticals or phased retirement because only a tiny fraction of employees use the benefit in any one year.

6. The Committee continues to believe that a tuition benefit will improve the effectiveness, or at the very least the commitment, of its workforce.

7. We have been told that the question to be addressed, when allocation of resources is at stake, is where the University can get the greatest return on its investment. We accept that as a rational standard for making decisions. We suggest that the calculation would lead one to conclude that the modest amount of money required should be invested in a tuition benefit would generate a return, in employee morale, commitment, and retention, that is greater than many other investments might generate.

As we did last year, we again strongly recommend:

- that the children/dependents of all full-time University employees (as defined by the University) having accrued 5 or more years of uninterrupted University service be granted a 50% tuition reduction upon being regularly admitted to an approved undergraduate program leading to a bachelor's degree;
- that the tuition reduction apply for the first four years of a child/dependent's enrollment, during periods in which the child/dependent student is in good academic standing; and
- that the percentage of tuition covered by the benefit increase by 10% for each additional year of uninterrupted service through year 10.

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
November 14, 2006

**GEOFFREY SIRC, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A senator said that this benefit has been discussed by CAPA since 1997 and is a provision that academic professionals continue to ask to be added. However, CAPA has not taken a position on this particular resolution.

Another senator said that Civil Service senators would like to support this motion.

A senator stated that some discussion on the provision has been on the equity of its application. She suggested that the benefit be structured like MnSCU, in which an employee can either use the tuition benefit for themselves or for a defined dependent or spouse/partner. Another option would be to cap the benefit.

Q; What are federal audit implications of this benefit? Is this University required to pay for the tuition with real money?

A: The Faculty Affairs Committee did a report in March 2000 on this benefit which could answer these questions.

A senator then noted that the resolution calls for the benefit after five years of uninterrupted service. However, the Human Resources system records each summer break as a break in service. He hoped that the spirit of the resolution would not disqualify people with less than 12 month appointments.

Another senator then questioned whether the financial resources for this program could be better targeted to apply to more employees or in strategic retention cases.

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

APPROVED

10. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks spoke to the University Senate about the biennial budget request. This year, the needs of the University needed to be presented in a compelling way and the University needed to work diligently to get the attention of legislators regarding the long-term financial needs of the University. When the legislature convenes in January, 25 percent will be new members, with significant changes in the senior leadership positions in both the House and Senate.

The University has a strong, aggressive proposal. 70 percent of the proposal concerns compensation for faculty and staff. It includes general compensation and funding to target incremental compensation to recruit and retain employees in key competitive areas.

The proposal also includes investments to attract, retain, and support the education of students at all levels. Many of the ideas from strategic positioning are in the implementation process and will receive funding as well. Technology and related infrastructure is also a large piece of the proposal as the University is the backbone of the state's technology strategy. Facilities, operations, and maintenance are also included.

A second part of the budget deals with investments in health workforce, science and engineering, environment and agriculture, and renewable energy.

If approved, this will be a 9.5 percent increase in the University's budget for two years. It would allow the University to reduce tuition increases from seven percent to 4.5 percent.

The speculation today is that the state will be in a good fiscal condition, but there is a high pent-up state demand for funding. It will not be easy to have the University's case heard. The

University is considering a different approach. Usually it takes proposals through the Higher Education Committees first. Instead, the University will be taking its proposal apart and taking funding issues to relevant committees as well to broaden the conversation about the University and its future.

There will also be two capital requests. One will reintroduce the biomedical science facilities authority and the second will be a modest request for HEAPR funds.

He then turned to two items that were recently in the newspapers, the University of Minnesota – Rochester and UMore Park.

The University has been an active participant in bringing higher education to Rochester since 1966. It is a unique community of highly educated citizens with a high number of active alumni and a vibrant business center. Mayo has had a long-standing relationship and academic research partnership with the University. There are also strong research partnerships with other Rochester businesses.

The Rochester community has long felt that the University should be more strongly represented in the area and through legislative action a Governor’s commission was created. Funds were also appropriated for the University to expand its academic programs. The University has made a commitment to work with the community.

He said that he is not exactly sure what this means for Rochester, but knows that some aspects of collegiate life will not be present, such as athletics or a marching band. It will however, involve the full range of the University’s academic mission, including research partnerships, technology transfer, and targeted educational needs mostly for graduate and professional students.

Some core principles have been framed to guide this work, one of which is that Rochester will not be developed through current campus resources.

7700 acres in Rosemount, named UMore Park, is the largest single tract of underdeveloped land held by an institution and adjacent to a metropolitan area. The population in this area will greatly increase in the next 10-20 years. The University wants to be thoughtful and creative about this property, while protecting environmentally sensitive areas. There will be about a 5000 acre regional park in and around this area as a partnership with many state organizations.

It is also important to develop a long-term master plan. He would like to discuss what will be needed to finance the future of the University. He is convinced that the University will need to leverage its own resources more creatively. The real challenge is to engage the academic community with the broader community to talk about sustainable development in this area.

11. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: Will Rochester be considered a coordinate campus, like Morris, for governance purposes?

A: At the present time, the answer is no. The campus will not be authorized and accredited to give degrees. This will be done through the Twin Cities campus. If the campus evolves, then there will need to be a discussion with this body.

12. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

13. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

14. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

15. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Carol Chomsky, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that the committee has consulted on a number of issues: the biennial request, the false claims act litigation and its potential impact on institutions, undergraduate admissions processes and outcomes, status of minority admissions and admissions related to intercollegiate athletics, internal communications, and the proposed changes to the Tenure Code.

FCC has continued to talk about a variety of issues that were raised at the department chair meetings earlier this semester. Some members are traveling to Morris in December to meet with faculty groups. FCC has also planned three open discussions with faculty senators on December 1, 12, and 14. She urged senators to attend if they have issues or concerns, since FCC will be conveying these to the administration later in December.

16. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE

Professor Martin Sampson, Faculty Legislative Liaison, stated that much will happen at this year's legislative session as well as the reappointment or replacement of four Regents. This session will also include mandates from legislators asking the University to run itself differently. As the Liaison, he attends all hearings on legislative requests and hearings of overall importance to the University. A faculty voice can be helpful to legislators. Also, this role requires brief statements to all faculty as well as pleas to contact legislators.

17. FACULTY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT

Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 2.b and 2.c of the Faculty Senate Rules as follows (language to be added is underlined, language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Rules, the motion requires a simple majority.

ARTICLE IV. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Faculty Senate)

...

2. Terms of Membership, Chairing of Committees, and Removal of Members for Absences

...

b. Student appointments to committees of the Faculty Senate shall be made for terms of ~~one~~ two years. Student members of committees must be registered for at least six credits for each semester in the academic year. Graduate students who have completed course work and are not required to maintain continuous registration during interim periods of study in preparation for written and oral examinations must be certified by the individual department director of graduate studies.

c. Terms of committee service begin July 1 and terminate June 30. No non-student member is eligible to serve more than two consecutive full three-year terms on any one committee, and shall be eligible for reappointment only after a one-year interval of nonmembership on that committee. No student member is eligible to serve more than ~~four~~ two consecutive ~~one~~ two-year terms on any one committee. No committee member is eligible to serve on more than two committees of the University Senate, the Faculty Senate, or the Student Senate at a time. These rotation procedures and limitations do not apply to ex officio representatives.

...

COMMENT:

Last year a concern was raised about continuity of student membership on committees. The Student Committee on Committees discussed the issue and determined that it would be appropriate to assign students to two-year terms on committees, and therefore only have half rotate off each year. This amendment modifies the typical student committee appointment and student term limits.

**JOSHUA BEININGEN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**18. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Amendment to the Classroom Expectations Guidelines
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Classroom Expectation Guidelines as follows (new language is underlined):

Classroom Expectation Guidelines

...

III. Expectations of Instructors:

...

5. Instructors are responsible for evaluating and returning examinations and other student work with sufficient promptness to enhance the learning experience. Instructors should specify a time frame for retaining student work (e.g. homework, midterm exams, etc.) during the semester. Term papers and comparable projects are the property of students who prepare them; instructors who desire to retain a copy for their own files should state their intention to do so. (It is permissible for a faculty member not to return examinations, but students must then be permitted to review the exam in order to request clarification of a grade.) Instructors are strongly encouraged to provide sufficient graded feedback early in the term and before the deadline for withdrawing from classes to enable students to assess their progress in the course. Instructors are responsible for submitting examination answer sheets for scoring by the Office of Measurement Services (OMS) in a secure manner. Specifically, instructors or their designate (departmental office employee or teaching assistant) must submit exams personally or via campus courier to the OMS office, 103 U Stores Building, or to a drop location in 301 Eddy Hall or 130 Coffey Hall. Do not use campus mail.

...

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy was advised by the Office of Measurement Services that occasionally faculty use campus mail to send exam answer sheets to OMS for scoring. This is not secure. OMS asked that this language be added to the Classroom Expectations Guidelines to clarify how to submit answer sheets.

**RICHARD MCCORMICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A senator made an amendment to change the wording from 'must submit exams' to 'must submit examination answer sheets.'

Professor McCormick, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), accepted the amendment as friendly.

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

APPROVED

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

ITEM 1 FOR DISCUSSION:

[Section 7.11 draft 11-20-06]

7.11 General Criteria. What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each candidate has established and is likely to continue to add to a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both (fn X). This determination

is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service (fn 5). Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, and technology transfer will be taken into consideration, when determined to be relevant by the department or equivalent academic unit, in evaluating the candidate's satisfaction of criteria; such contributions can involve scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and discipline-related service.

Specific details on the nature and weight of these contributions in the individual academic unit are given in the statements required by subsection 7.12 ("Departmental Statement"), but the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness. Service standing alone, without a distinguished record of teaching and scholarly research or other creative work, is an insufficient basis to award tenure. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.

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

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

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

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

"Service" takes the form of (1) discipline-related service, which includes both service to the profession and outreach to the local, state, national, or international community based on one's academic expertise; and (2) institutional service, which includes administrative, committee, and related service to one's department or college, or the University. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.

ITEM 2 FOR DISCUSSION:

9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor. The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement,(fn X) and (3) established the national or international reputation ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service (fn 5). Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, and technology transfer will be taken into consideration, when determined to be relevant by the department or equivalent academic unit, in evaluating the candidate's satisfaction of criteria; such contributions can involve scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and discipline-related service.

Specific details on the nature and weight of these contributions in the individual academic unit are given in the statements required by subsection 7.12 ("Departmental Statement"), but the

primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness. Service standing alone, without a distinguished record of research or other creative work and teaching as an associate professor, is an insufficient basis for promotion.

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

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

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

ITEM 3 FOR DISCUSSION:

[Section 7.12 draft 11-20-06]

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

(fn 1) "Departmental" refers to an academic department or its equivalent, such as division, institute, or unit.

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

DISCUSSION:

Professor Carol Chomsky, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that the Tenure Code changes being proposed today came out of the Faculty Culture Task Force Report, whose charge was "To study and define the requirements for a faculty culture that will support the strategic goal of transforming the University of Minnesota into a top three public research university" and to recommend "...whether present hiring, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review standards are written, communicated, and implemented across departments and colleges in a way that promotes the University's goal of becoming one of the top three public research universities in the world." There was much consultation that led to these task force recommendations, and several recommendations dealt specifically with the tenure and promotion process.

Draft sections of Tenure Code changes from the Faculty Culture Task Force then went to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AF&T). This committee has met all fall to produce a draft for discussion today.

Professor Tom Clayton, Chair of AF&T then said that while his committee has done much work, there is still a large amount ahead. This revision process has been open and he has been

receiving suggestions for changes regularly and each suggestion has been considered by the committee. Today's draft should also be viewed as tentative and will change following today's meeting.

The committee has heard less about sections of the Tenure Code than post-tenure review. Following revisions to the Tenure Code, AF&T will revise procedures and regulations for reviewing the performance of probationary tenure-track faculty and post-tenure review. All five are so closely interrelated that the committee cannot finish the Tenure Code changes until the other items have been revised as well.

He then assured senators that this is an open process and it is the faculty committee leading the process.

Vice Chair Kane then reminded senators that the purpose of today's meeting is for the FCC and AF&T to hear the questions, concerns, and comments of the faculty. She noted that Provost Sullivan is present at today's meeting and is listening to the comments and questions. He will be invited to speak at the end of the discussion.

A senator said that while this is a much improved document, there are still two concerns that he has. The first is from the charge of the task force, which was to become one of the top three research institutions. However, each campus is not primarily a research campus. The foundation for a national and international reputation is a challenge for an institution whose mission is to be a liberal arts campus. AF&T should figure out if there is a need for a per campus mission statement.

Also, the statement on interdisciplinary work, and possibly public engagement, is too weak. There is a chance here to deal with individual academic freedom and to assert that interdisciplinary work is a fundamental right of faculty and there is a right to have this work evaluated as part of a promotion and tenure decision.

Another senator said that a reference to academic freedom has been dropped from Section 7.11 and instead the service clause has been changed to include discipline-related service, which would be against academic freedom. He asked that discipline-related service be struck.

A senator then noted that the College of Pharmacy is enthusiastic about the Faculty Culture Task Force Report, but was hoping to see a statement about mentoring under the expectations for full professors. Also, faculty are finding it hard to finalize their own 7.12 statements before they know what they are supposed to be consistent with and use for a reference.

Q; Will current probationary faculty have a choice as to which version of the Tenure Code they use when applying for promotion and tenure?

A: Yes.

A senator then referred to service on line 39 of the document. She agrees that discipline-related service should be struck, but noted that in this section 'outreach' is used, while the same process is referred to as 'public engagement' in Section 9.2. She suggested 'public engagement with local, state, national, and international communities' be used.

Another senator then said that community-engaged teaching and research does not fit in the section on service. She then said that focusing on Tenure Code changes at this time can create some anxiety since one could assume that the University becomes a top three research institution by building a good faculty through knocking off the bad parts instead of through recruitment and retention. The University should be hiring probationary faculty members with the clear

expectation that they will receive tenure and that their colleagues are committed to mentoring and assisting them. It will be much harder to recruit and retain faculty if the public perception is that faculty here do not usually receive tenure.

A senator then noted that the phrase scholarly research needs to include creative research as is the expectation for some disciplines. The language seems to emphasize scholarly or traditional research. He asked that the language be reworked to include creative research.

Q: When this draft was circulated to colleagues, many asked for a current draft for comparison or a red-lined version. Is one available?

A: A red-lined version was tried, but there are too many language changes to track it this way. It was suggested that the common sections be read in parallel by all faculty.

A senator then stated that her department is concerned about the proposed timeline since the 7.12 statement is critical for defining the department. It would like time to deliberate the language within the department and college. Also, if faculty can choose under which Tenure Code to be evaluated, the timeline is clear for promotion from assistant to associate professor, but what about a time limit on promotion from associate to full professor?

Another senator then applauded the attempt to rewrite the Tenure Code to mirror the expectations and aims of the University in the 21st century. The real change is that instead of asking a tenure candidate to demonstrate potential to continue to contribute, the new wording is that "...each candidate has established and is likely to continue..." This puts some teeth in the Tenure Code that is not there now.

However, she argued against eliminating discipline-related service because it is crucial to some disciplines. If there were changes, she asked that they be inclusive instead of privileging some forms of service versus others. As for teaching, she would like a more explicit statement as to what constitutes a satisfactory teaching record for all levels and during post-tenure review.

A senator then summarized some of the comments heard by the Faculty Culture Task Force. The first concern was the use of the word 'potential' in the Section 7.11, which many felt was too weak for the goals of the institution. A second concern about Section 7.11 was that the paragraph does not achieve its purpose, which is to provide a University-wide set of norms and criteria that applies to all. There was also concern that Section 7.11 was incomplete in reference to interdisciplinarity, public engagement, and promotion from associate to full professor.

There were two concerns that the task force heard on a regular basis about the process itself. The first was the coordinate campus concerns, which is on the forefront of conversations in AF&T and the Provost's Office. The second is asking why this document is being revised at all.

Another senator said that this should be an opportunity to set up conditions under which interdisciplinary work can flourish. In particular she referred to language in lines 9-11. She stated that departments should not be the sole decider of when interdisciplinary work is relevant. Faculty need and deserve a more consistent environment for this work.

A senator thanked the committee for crafting a document that is trying to balance the needs of the University versus each campus. In lines 6-7 of Section 9.2, criteria for promotion are stated. While numbers one and two are well-stated, criteria three is too prescriptive and puts artificial restriction and focus on research and scholarly achievement. While coordinate campus members are engaged in scholarly research and have external reviewers, this statement is counter to the coordinate campus emphasis in its missions on teaching. She asked that AF&T look for a way to make this language more flexible.

A senator then said that this has been a long process for the Faculty Culture Task Force with much consultation from across the University system. He noted that clear expectations included in Section 7.11 would help the University retain its faculty.

Another senator then noted that there is a concern from extension and outreach faculty as to how they would fit into service criteria. He suggested that teaching be expanded to explicitly include extension and outreach as a teaching function.

Q: With this new Tenure Code, there is an expectation that the University still wants faculty to proceed to full professor status. What happens if an associate professor decides not to publish much but focus on teaching instead? What is the mechanism to address this issue?

A: This issue will be addressed by the annual review process and the annual conditions that are stated for this person.

Q: What are the repercussions for an associate professor who does not want to progress to full professor? Will post-tenure review address this issue? If so, will post-tenure review come before the Faculty Senate and when? Lastly, will the Faculty Senate vote on all the changes together?

A: All changes in the Tenure Code will come to the Faculty Senate first for discussion and then action as one package. The timeline is still unclear, as it depends on the progress of AF&T. It is possible that special Faculty Senate meetings might be needed.

Provost E. Thomas Sullivan appreciated faculty leaders for their work over the past few years on these issues. He said that the University is receptive for faculty to come and remain, and he welcomes suggestions for how to accomplish this. He then offered the following comments on some of the issues brought up at today's meeting.

There are significant differences in this process than 10 years ago. First, this is a faculty-driven process and discussion. Second, all parties are moving forward in good faith. There is caution in the process, but not fear.

In regard to interdisciplinary work, this is a new statement in the Tenure Code and came from the Faculty Culture Task Force Report. If the language is not strong enough, it can be modified. This is an attempt to value this work and to make sure that it is taken into account. The Provost's Office will also be developing a separate template for interdisciplinary work so that faculty who we recruit and retain will have clear distinctive guidelines as to the value and the standards for this work.

For discipline-related service, the current document limits service solely to discipline-related, so this is an opportunity to broaden that definition and give credit to institutional service.

On issues of timing, a June 7 memo was sent to all deans and departments to review their 7.12 statements, annual review processes, and post-tenure review documents. Subsequently, a best practices document has been created and distributed in the hope that it would be helpful but not dictate changes. The timing of 7.12 statements is important, but it is not fixed; three deans have asked for modest extensions which have been granted. He fully endorses the 7.11 template in this draft and though it will likely still change, he suggested that departments use this language as a proposed model in conjunction with the best practices document. He said that his office is willing to consult with departments on any questions that they have.

The coordinate campus statement is being included for the first time to help inform and assist the mission differences between the campuses. This language can be sharpened to create more comfort for coordinate campus faculty.

Public engagement needs to be parallel between 7.11 and 9.2, as well as clarified in both instances.

When faculty ask why now, his response is that the University participated in a recent national study of untenured faculty. A clear response from the University faculty is that there is a need for more clarity in promotion and tenure standards.

He said that teaching is being defined and emphasized according to its “effectiveness.” This is important for the University but will vary by department and college. More work can be done on this term.

Scholarly versus creative research he believes is addressed in the document as ‘creative achievement’ and has been inserted in additional places in the document.

For post-tenure review, it is contained in Section 7a of the Tenure Code and there is a Senate policy as well. He noted that associate professors who are not promoted to full professors will not be subject to post-tenure review.

Professor Chomsky reminded faculty to continue to comment on and revise language as it is drafted.

20. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

21. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

FOR INFORMATION:

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

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 2.a of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (82) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

ARTICLE IV. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Faculty Senate)

...

2. Eligibility for Membership

a. Only individuals eligible to vote in Senate elections are eligible to serve on University Senate committees or to serve as chair of University Senate committees, except that no individual holding a position carrying as any part of its title President, vice president, chancellor, provost, executive director, counsel, ~~attorney~~, controller, or chief of staff may serve as a voting member of a University Senate committee, nor may the University Librarian or anyone who is a dean. Individuals with less than a one-third time appointment as assistant or associate dean shall be eligible to serve as a voting member and chair of a University Senate committee. Faculty members whose appointment responsibilities are primarily faculty but who incidentally have an administrative title and responsibilities within an academic department or its equivalent are eligible to serve as voting members and chairs of University Senate committees. Alumni members are not subject to the eligibility rule of this section. An individual serving as a voting member of a Faculty Senate committee who is appointed to a position which would bar them from service as a voting member on the committee shall resign from that committee. If the individual is appointed only to an interim or acting position, the chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee may, with the consent of the Faculty Consultative Committee, waive the requirement that the individual resign from the committee.

...

COMMENT:

The Senate Consultative Committee was made aware of the inclusion of the title "attorney" in the bylaw listing individuals with titles that disqualify them for membership on University Senate committees. The same language appears in the Faculty Senate bylaw. The Senate Consultative Committee and the Faculty Consultative Committee recommend deletion of "attorney" from the list.

The intent when including this title was to ensure that attorneys in the Office of the General Counsel did not serve on committees because of considerable potential for a conflict of interest. All of the lawyers in the Office of the General Counsel hold some version of the title of "counsel," and are thus barred from committee membership by inclusion of that title in the bylaws. There are employees who hold the title of "attorney," however, who should not be disqualified from committee service, such as clinical instructors in the Law School and lawyers who work for the student legal service offices, because there is no inherent conflict of interest in their work and committee service.

The Senate Consultative Committee and Faculty Consultative Committee thus recommend to the University Senate and the Faculty Senate that the bylaws be amended accordingly.

**CAROL CHOMSKY, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the rules to consider an item of new business which deals with an amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws. A vote was taken and the motion was approved to allow the business to be considered.

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

APPROVED

22. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2006-07 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

NOVEMBER 30, 2006

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2006-07 was convened in 165 Peik Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 30, 2006, at 11:31 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 23 student members. Chair Joshua Beiningen presided.

1. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Joshua Beiningen, Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that SSCC met with Vice Provost Jerry Rinehart in October to discuss changes to the Student Conduct Code. This will be sent to the Regents for approval in December. There is also a report later on the agenda on the University's Sustainability Report, which is a follow-up to an idea from the September Student Senate meeting.

He noted that he and the vice chair were also contacted by the Student Representatives to the Regents asking for input for their semester report.

Lastly, he noted that he was contacted by the Public Affairs Leadership Students to send a Twin Cities representative to a meeting on an after-hours taxi service. Two senators noted that they were already planning to attend.

2. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – no report.

Duluth – Jeni Kiewatt said that UMDSA has been working on research for alcohol education reform, sponsorships for the Duluth taxi program, textbook rental, and a better neighbors program.

Morris – Adam Yust stated that MCSA discussed changes to the probation policy, holiday outreach opportunities, and LEED certification for all campus buildings. The campus assembly also approved the campuses strategic positioning plan, completed the undergraduate catalog revision, and continues to work on changes to the campus constitution.

GAPSA – Kristen Denzer noted that GAPSA is talking about lobby day and voted against an MSA transportation initiative to purchase a van and drive students on weekends.

MSA – Jeff Holtz said that MSA is working on Support the U Day, which is the new title for lobby day. MSA Night of Safety Walk was yesterday and had good turnout. They are also working on organizing a community concert for spring semester. Students can receive a ticket to the concert by performing 10 hours of community service. MSA Awareness Week is February 5-10.

Civil Service Committee (CSC) – Daniel Moore said that he attended the CSC meeting this morning, at which time the President attended to discuss increased funding for professional

development. The President stated that he is committed to doing what he can to grant the proposal request. CSC also discussed the tuition benefits resolution that is at today's University Senate meeting, heard a presentation on the biennial budget, heard the impacts of strategic positioning, and learned of the University's lobbying efforts from Government Relations.

3. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS UPDATE

Jaki Cottingham-Zierdt, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that CAPA has approved its four committees' work plans, which are available on-line. CAPA is excited about human resources guiding principles from the Regents. These principles center around a humane workplace environment, which is important during times of change.

The Communications Committee is trying new strategies to keep people returning, such as a wiki for professional development and web polls. She noted that if the Student Senate wants an opinion from professional staff, they can ask that a question be included in an upcoming poll.

Lastly, the Professional Development and Recognition Subcommittee is trying to quantify the value added by professional staff. If the University uses indices to determine whether it is meeting its goals to be a top-three research institution, CAPA knows that funding will go towards measures of progress.

4. MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 28, 2006

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/060928stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

5. STUDENT SENATE RULES AMENDMENT Action by the Student Senate

MOTION:

To amend Article VI, Section 2.b and 2.c of the Student Senate Rules as follows (language to be added is underlined, language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~). As an amendment to the Student Senate Rules, the motion requires a simple majority.

ARTICLE VI. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE STUDENT SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Student Senate)

...

2. Terms of Membership, Chairing of Committees, and Removal of Members for Absences

...

b. Student appointments to committees of the Student Senate shall be made for terms of ~~one~~ two years. Student members of committees must be registered for at least six credits for each semester in the academic year. Graduate students who have completed course work and are not required to maintain continuous registration during interim periods of study in preparation for written and oral examinations must be certified by the individual department director of graduate studies.

c. Terms of committee service begin July 1 and terminate June 30. No non-student member is eligible to serve more than two consecutive full three-year terms on any one committee, and shall be eligible for reappointment only after a one-year interval of nonmembership on that committee. No student member is eligible to serve more than ~~four~~ two consecutive ~~one~~ two-year terms on any one committee. No committee member is eligible to serve on more than two committees of the University Senate, the Faculty Senate, or the Student Senate at a time. These rotation procedures and limitations do not apply to ex officio representatives.

...

COMMENT:

Last year a concern was raised about continuity of student membership on committees. The Student Committee on Committees discussed the issue and determined that it would be appropriate to assign students to two-year terms on committees, and therefore only have half rotate off each year. This amendment modifies the typical student committee appointment and student term limits.

**JOSHUA BEININGEN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Q: Is the rotation process stipulated in the Senate Constitution?

A: No since it is a general practice.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 14 in favor and 7 opposed.

APPROVED

6. CELL PHONE/PDA RECYCLING Discussion about Project Re-cell

What is Project Re-Cell:

1. E-waste in the form of cell phones, PDAs, etc. is a major pollution problem for our water tables (because many get dumped into our landfills);
2. When I say many, I'm talking, at minimum, 50 million of these things that "turn over" each year, with less than 5% of the no-longer-used models collected for refurbishment or recycling;
3. Obviously, the U of M has tens of thousands of students who do cell phone plan "turn over" on a regular basis;
4. By putting out collection boxes for those old phones (for example, in student unions and dorms) you not only do the environment a favor, but...you get money back for those you collect (see attached price list for examples);
5. Project Re-Cell also collects PDAs and accessories like chargers and cables;
6. This money can then go to any U of M program/ nonprofit organization you want.

Other Information:

1. Phones that are refurbished/resold...have their memory chips erased;
2. Phones that cannot be refurbished...are worth \$.95 per scrap metal pound;
3. Project Re-Cell will inventory everything that's collected so you have records of what comes in and what we pay;
4. Project Re-Cell supplies the collection boxes (12" x 12" x 12" with a slot in the top for security/easy drop-in);
5. Project Re-Cell supplies the mailing labels; and
6. Project Re-Cell even pays for shipping them to our Idaho headquarters. (Translate: There's absolutely no cost to the U of M.)

So what would the University need to do?

- Say yes (make the decision to try this out);
- Identify the best locations for collection boxes to be placed;
- Once they arrive, put them out;
- Maybe do a little PR stuff re: letting students know you've started a cell phone/PDA recycling program;
- Have someone check the boxes periodically and when they're full: secure the contents (newspaper topping), tape them up, and either call me...or fill out a simple "Request for UPS Pick Up" form on our website (takes about five minutes). Within 24-48 hours a truck comes by...at the location of your choice. And three to four weeks later, a check is cut and sent your way.

[For more information, go to: <http://www.projectrecell.com/index.html>]

DISCUSSION:

Barb Fluor, a representative from Project Re-Cell, said that she works for this company because they have a policy of zero landfill and no exportation to developing countries. Currently, 50-80 percent of these materials are being sent overseas. The company that actually does the recycling has signed the Basel Action Network (BAN) pledge, which states that the company will not export or import an e-waste that contains toxic materials and it will not engage prison workers in handling these materials. She then asked senators for questions.

Q: Has this program been piloted on other campuses?

A: Recyclemania is campus-wise recycling contest that involves 32 campuses from across the United States, but it does not do any electronic waste. So far no campus has joined Project Re-Cell.

Q: How often are the collection boxes emptied? How does the University prevent people from taking phones from the boxes or throwing in their trash?

A: The campus would need to determine a safe place for the boxes; where they are either watched 24 hours or locked up at night. She hoped that as a pilot project, only a few boxes would be set out and that a few students would be willing to check the boxes. To actually recycle phones, the collection container can be sent in, with a new collection box sent in its place, or the content can be transferred into another box and then mailed in.

Q: If the University participates in phone recycling, what will happen to the number of phones that are donated to domestic abuse centers?

A: Across the United States, 25 million phones are already not being recycled, so it should not have a huge impact on domestic abuse centers. In other areas of the country, when Project Re-Cell representatives have contacted these centers about a possible impact, they usually state that they are sometimes overwhelmed with donations and then have a stockpile that do not know how to use.

Of five area battered women's shelters in the area, three said they had enough phones and did not need any other "streams" of donators. One said they actually had more phones than needed on occasion and at those times they sent them in to a company that recycles them, and only one said they needed more phones.

Q: What is the cost to the University to participate?

A: There is no cost. Project Re-Cell supplies the collection boxes and pays for shipping. The only cost is in the time needed to put out boxes and monitor their fill level.

Q: Can collection boxes be supplied to each campus?

A: Any campus can receive collection boxes if they choose to participate. Project Re-Cell just needs a contact phone number and address.

Q: What money does the University receive for phones collected?

A: If the phone is working, then the payment amount is listed on the handout. If the phone does not work, then the recycler melts down the components and the University receives 95 cents per pound. When the collection boxes are received, an inventory is done; a new web application will allow institutions to log-in and view their account and recently collected inventory.

Q: How is privacy of the donated phones guaranteed before they are mailed to Project Re-Cell?

A: Before the box is mailed, Project Re-Cell cannot control its contents. Any phone that Project Re-Cell receives has its memory chip cleared or the entire phone is sent to scrap recycling.

Q: Does money from recycled phones stay with the campus?

A: Yes.

Barb Fluor thanked the senators for listening to the presentation and asked that anyone interested in participating contact her.

Joshua Beiningen then asked senators how they wished to proceed with this project. He noted that the presentation was done at a Student Senate meeting to reach all campuses and because it fit with agenda items generated in September. However, further action needs to be determined by the body itself.

A senator said that he supports e-waster collection, but due to the different resources available at each campus, wondered whether this was an action for the Student Senate as a whole to approve or just up to each campus.

Another senator said that she still has concerns about privacy of phone information since the boxes are portable and most students do not delete phone memory.

The Student Senate decided to forward this item to each campus association for further action.

**7. ELECTION OF 2006-07 STUDENT SENATE/
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR
Election by 2006-07 Senators Only**

Daniel Moore, a student senator from the University of Minnesota - Morris, was elected Student Senate Chair.

**8. UNIVERSITY'S SUSTAINABILITY REPORT
Discussion with Leslie Krueger of University Services**

Leslie Krueger, Chief of Staff for University Services, joined the meeting to discuss the University's recent Sustainability Report and Regents policy on Sustainability and Energy Efficiency, which were both distributed.

She said that the Regents policy includes six guiding principles and four steps for implementation. One step in the implementation process is accountability, which includes performance measures on these principles and regular reports back to the Regents. Since this policy was adopted, this phase of implementation has been delayed due to that fact that there are different policies currently in place and a holistic view is needed to make changes. She is hoping that the Twin Cities campus master plan will guide this effort.

She then turned to the Sustainability Report, highlighting examples from teaching, research, service, and operations. These examples include interdisciplinary organizations that enhance sustainability and specific campus initiatives.

The first is the President's Initiative on the Environment and Renewable Energy (PIERE), whose goals are to coordinate efforts among the colleges and centers at the University.

A second is the Initiative on Renewable Energy and the Environment (IREE) which received state money to fund seed grants in four clusters: 1) hydrogen, 2) bioenergy and byproducts, 3) policy, economics, and ecosystems, and 4) conservation and efficient energy systems. To date, IREE has awarded \$8.5 million to fund 24 projects, such as the solar vehicle project, a study on ethanol plants, and wind turbine projects.

A third area is the newly-formed Institute on the Environment, a result of the strategic positioning process. It is an effort to organize interdisciplinary research and will have faculty and researchers that serve on a rotating basis.

A last area is the Center for Sustainable Building Research in the College of Design. It is meant to promote interdisciplinary work in architectural research and serve as a state resource for public agencies and building owners. The Center focuses on sustainable design, energy-efficient buildings, window and glazing research, building design process and evaluation, and building science.

Leslie Krueger then highlighted three specific projects at the University. The first is a solar-driven hydrogen fuel cell demonstration project that provides electricity with no carbon emission. A second project is a 1.65 megawatt wind turbine at Morris. Lastly is a proposed Morris biomass gasification research and demonstration facility. The University has received \$6 million from the state to explore the technology and a proposal will be presented to the Regents in February. If approved, construction would start in the spring.

She then turned to changes in University operations, and introduced Jerome Malmquist, Director of Energy Management. The University is looking at using biomass, specifically oat hulls, as an alternative source of fuel. After a long approval process, the University Steam Plant received clearance to burn 25,000 tons of oat hulls, which are a renewable source of energy and saves money. These oat hulls are a byproduct of cereal production.

Q: With the switch to whole grain cereal, does this affect the amount of oat hulls available?

A: Oat hulls have little to no food value, so it would likely not be used in whole grain cereal.

The University also participates in the Chicago Climate Exchange which is a voluntary, legally-binding, pilot program for reducing and trading greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Other participants in the program are Dow, Corning, Dupont, Ford Motors, and IBM. The University is one of the few institutes of higher education that participates.

The program includes carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydro fluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride and participants have agreed to cut emissions by four percent from their baseline by 2006. The University will participate in phase two, which will cut another two percent by 2010.

Q: Are cell phones included in the University's electronic waste?

A: Most electronic waste is computer equipment.

Q: A previous speaker discussed as pledge to not ship waste to developing countries. Does that University participate in this pledge?

A: The University contracts with a company to handle electronic waste after first trying to reuse it on campus. This company does have requirements on disposal, but she is not sure of the details.

Leslie Krueger mentioned that the University's recent Sustainability Report is available on the web at: <http://www.uservices.umn.edu/sustainableU/Sustainability&U.pdf> and she encouraged senators to stay involved on this topic.

9. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

10. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**