

2009-10 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MAY 6, 2010

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 3

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 4

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 5

The third meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2009-10 was convened in Coffman Theatre on Thursday, May 6, 2010, at 2:33 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, 17 civil service members, 115 faculty/academic professional members, and 23 student members. President Bruininks presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS

Information

University Senate

Amendment to the Procedure on Hiring Senior Administrators: Senate Committee Involvement (Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester)

Approved by the: University Senate March 4, 2010

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

Faculty Senate

Amendment to the Policy on Grading and Transcripts: Final Grade Due Date

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 3, 2009

Approved by the: Administration February 19, 2010

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Policy on Grading and Transcripts: Scholastic Dishonesty

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 3, 2009

Approved by the: Administration March 15, 2010

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Policy on Class Scheduling for Undergraduate and Graduate Classes

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 3, 2009

Approved by the: Administration March 15, 2010

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Policy on Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 3, 2009

Approved by the: Administration March 15, 2010

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Policy on Teaching and Learning: Instructor and Unit Responsibilities

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 3, 2009

Approved by the: Administration March 15, 2010

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Faculty Compensation Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 4, 2010

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Policy on Expected Student Academic Work per Credit: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester

Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 4, 2010

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Presidential Faculty Compensation Proposal

Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 25, 2010

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

2. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Bonita Anderson

Staff

Business Affairs – University of Minnesota Crookston

1941 – 2010

George Bledsoe

Staff

Physical Plant Operations

1933 – 2010

Jack Boerigter

Professor

University of Minnesota Waseca
1926 – 2010

June Breedlove
Staff
Office of the Bursar
1932 – 2010

Leallan Croatt
Staff
U Card Office
1945 – 2010

Betty A. Davis
Staff
Physical Plant Operations
1931 – 2010

Frank E. DiGangi
Professor
Pharmacy
1917 – 2010

Dennis E. Evenson
Staff
Buildings and Grounds
1949 – 2010

Catherine Fejes
Staff
AHC Human Resources
1958 – 2010

Edward J. Fritz
Staff
Information Technology
1960 – 2010

William H. Fuhr
Professor
Chemical Engineering and Materials Science
1932 – 2010

Nancy A. Hagberg
Staff

Chemistry
1946 – 2010

Dorothy A. Johnson
Staff
Accounting – University of Minnesota Duluth
1929 – 2010

Joann Johnson
Staff
Health, Physical Education, and Recreation – University of Minnesota Duluth
1932 – 2010

Roland R. Kasch
Staff
University Laundry
1928 – 2010

Catherine Kulesov
Professor
Russian
1924 – 2010

William R. LaBissoniere
Professor
Wilson Library
1929 – 2010

Brian A. LaMotte
Staff
University Dining Service
1977 - 2010

Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr.
Professor
Educational Policy and Administration
1936 – 2010

Alvin Ollenburger
Professor
Education – University of Minnesota Duluth
1926 – 2010

Richard L. Pyle
Professor

Psychiatry
1931 – 2010

Jane Riedel
Staff
Independent and Distance Learning
1928 – 2009

Robert D. Rukavina
Staff
Auxiliary Services – University of Minnesota Duluth
1929 – 2010

Nicholas Shank
Staff
Art
1941 – 2010

Evelyn M. Vernes
Staff
University Bookstore
1919 – 2010

Gloria Volkmann
Staff
Food Stores
1926 – 2010

Marilee Ward
Staff
University Senate
1921 – 2010

STUDENTS

Rebecca A. Preisler
University of Minnesota Crookston

3. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

**Planning for person-based computing devices in learning strategies and learning spaces
Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

Planning for person-based computing devices in learning strategies and learning spaces

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee encourages the University's academic community to be aware of the increasing availability, affordability and technical capability of person-based mobile computing devices and begin now to consider how to support and incorporate these devices into student learning strategies and learning spaces.

COMMENT:

Members of the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee have received reports from the Office of Classroom Management (OCM) and Office of Information Technology (OIT) about the increasing prevalence and sophistication of person-based mobile computing devices (devices such as the iTouch, WiFi-enabled PDAs, Internet-capable cell phones, netbooks and tablets) among students. These devices are now, and increasingly will be, carried by students for many non-academic reasons, and it would be prudent and efficient to also utilize these devices in planned learning spaces in support of progressive learning strategies. OCM and OIT are already planning for this new wave of academic computing, but faculty and administrators may not yet be fully aware of the trend or the opportunities it provides.

The purpose of this communication is to bring these devices to the attention of the wider academic and administrative community, to encourage consideration of the physical and virtual infrastructure adjustments that will be needed to facilitate interconnectivity of this wide array of devices, and to broaden the discussion of how to incorporate these devices into new and effective learning strategies. The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee notes, in particular, that the University infrastructure should facilitate interconnectivity of these devices with each other and with the display and Internet accessibility provided for by the laptop Projection Capable Classroom Standard and Active Learning Classroom Standard.

The Subcommittee is aware of the potential financial burden on students caused by a shift in learning strategies to require use of these devices, and encourages the University to support a range of mobile devices that could be chosen by students. The Office of Admissions and others engaged in recruiting new high school and new advanced standing students should be alerted to the range of supported devices so that they can provide guidance to incoming students and their families about the university's utilization of technology in learning.

The Subcommittee also expresses concern about the potential cost of proprietary software, and encourages the development and implementation of campus-wide standards, interfaces and protocols that are compatible with open source operating systems and software, support for open source software, and the use of web-based file creation, storage, and sharing sites such as Google Docs.

THOMAS MICHAELS, CHAIR
CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

4. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements
Information for the University Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

The Policy on Grading and Transcripts requires that "data on the mean grade point average by designator and course level, on the percentage of As awarded by course level, and on overall collegiate grade point averages will be prepared for grades awarded each Fall Semester...for all undergraduate students...[and] reported annually to the Faculty Senate."

COMMENT:

These data are also available on the web at: <http://www.irr.umn.edu/grades/>

SCEP Grading Distribution															
Fall 2009															
Data as of 1/29/2010															
	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Campus	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	Pct A's										
UMNCR	3730	2.79	39.06%	741	2.69	30.77%	1916	3.09	47.91%	233	3.22	48.50%	13	3.4	61.54%
UMNDL	21171	2.81	36.48%	7066	2.83	31.63%	10876	3.02	38.99%	4508	3.21	46.94%	730	3.23	51.92%
UMNMO	4042	2.98	42.90%	1155	3.04	41.90%	1572	3.11	44.21%	581	3.45	55.25%			
UMNTC	53891	3.05	42.00%	10886	2.91	34.81%	47130	3.2	43.92%	16599	3.2	43.40%	6291	3.31	53.31%
University of Minnesota, Crookston															
Academic Grp	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	Pct A's										
Acad Aff	3730	2.79	39.06%	741	2.69	30.77%	1916	3.09	47.91%	233	3.22	48.50%	13	3.4	61.54%
University of Minnesota, Duluth															
Academic Grp	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	Pct A's										
Acad Supp	1453	3.51	64.49%				111	3.91	96.40%						
Bus/Econ	848	2.71	26.30%	1484	2.71	22.37%	2790	2.81	25.77%	897	2.93	29.88%			
Cont Ed	44	3.92	97.73%	44	3.92	97.73%	14	2.67	35.71%						
Ed/Hum Srv	2789	3.09	46.58%	1294	2.98	39.72%	3113	3.18	50.72%	1139	3.49	56.89%	98	3.54	75.51%
Fine Arts	3756	3.11	48.52%	551	3.01	41.20%	447	3.13	50.56%	616	3.46	71.27%	23	3.89	91.30%
Lib Arts	6963	2.84	30.76%	1069	2.94	34.33%	2888	3.09	39.20%	678	3.31	46.06%	297	3.34	48.08%
Medicine													45	2.77	46.67%
Pharmacy	44	3.18	54.55%												
Sci/Eng	5302	2.52	23.18%	2624	2.7	28.66%	1497	2.86	31.13%	1172	2.99	36.86%	269	3.08	46.10%
UMD-Acad A	16	3.58	62.50%				11	4	36.36%						
University of Minnesota, Morris															
Academic Grp	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	Pct A's										
Acad Aff	550	3.3	48.36%	51	2.95	37.25%	97	3.51	27.84%	31	4	100.00%			
Div Educ	441	3.74	39.91%	195	3.45	61.03%	78	3.49	47.44%	301	3.72	60.47%			
Humanities	1362	3.19	56.98%	311	3.15	46.30%	429	3.26	55.71%	70	3.29	44.29%			
Sci/Math	915	2.86	34.10%	414	3.01	35.02%	271	2.95	34.32%	139	3.1	35.97%			
Social Sci	774	2.7	26.36%	184	2.78	30.98%	697	3.05	42.90%	40	3.39	67.50%			
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities															
Academic Grp	Grades	GPA	Pct A's	Grades	Pct A's										
AHCS	129	3.18	42.64%				17	3.36	41.18%	564	3.09	29.96%	175	3.77	56.57%
Bell Mus															
CBS	2281	2.78	23.98%	1151	3.27	44.74%	1450	2.92	31.93%	1390	2.98	36.47%	54	2.98	37.04%
CCE	26	3.38	61.54%	39	3.67	35.50%	610	3.19	37.21%	580	3.24	48.79%	60	3.63	73.33%
CDES	1067	3.14	35.43%	514	3.2	37.35%	1198	3.24	43.07%	999	3.15	32.03%	94	3.36	42.55%
CPANS	2704	3.14	39.24%	387	3.37	57.62%	2258	3.21	47.92%	1078	3.36	44.81%	158	3.43	61.39%
CLA	25130	3.2	46.86%	641	3.18	47.58%	25108	3.23	47.51%	3618	3.25	48.23%	1805	3.38	60.83%
CSOM	449	3.2	29.40%	1374	2.91	27.66%	5280	3.16	28.07%	1789	3.36	42.26%	615	3.15	39.51%
Dent				72	3.12	27.78%	129	2.97	28.68%	50	0	0.00%			
EHD	6645	3.25	60.36%	465	3.11	39.14%	3536	3.39	54.50%	1313	3.15	46.46%	1641	3.56	65.27%
Health Sci	218	3.64	77.06%	30	4	100.00%									
HIPA	87	3.6	78.16%				74	3.73	82.43%	123	3.48	62.03%	43	3.54	59.53%
IT	13012	2.67	25.04%	5739	2.75	29.69%	3881	2.89	28.96%	3759	3.03	36.29%	1465	3.06	36.45%
Med	78	0	0.00%				1809	3.03	38.03%	172	3.29	45.35%	100	3.5	61.00%
Nursing	88	4	28.41%	97	3.5	62.89%	291	3.63	72.51%	832	3.53	62.02%	20	3.78	10.00%
Pharmacy	758	3.42	61.87%				78	3.8	63.33%	33	3.79	84.85%	42	3.23	61.90%
Pub Health	570	3.5	67.37%				600	2.96	43.50%						
SRVWA				143	3.91	93.01%	121	3.77	86.96%						
Ugrd Ed Ad	257	3.92	61.48%	29	2.92	13.79%	186	3.52	61.83%	29	3.43	24.14%			
UMR Chance	332	2.87	24.10%												
VMed				205	2.27	12.68%				23	2.7	26.09%			
VP Sys Adm	60	3.61	75.00%				504	3.66	75.00%	240	3.87	96.25%			

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A's and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed.

CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

5. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Statement on Risk Aversion
Information for the University Senate

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning has consulted numerous times in recent years both with administrators responsible for risk management and with those responsible for financial management. We have also heard from numerous faculty and staff on issues related to administrative mandates and the workload involved in the University's internal business

processes. A common theme in most of the conversations is that the University has been in a risk-averse mode. We are now concerned that this risk-averse stance has been too severe for too long, and as a result is creating unwarranted administrative burdens on colleges, departments, faculty, and staff--a particularly serious problem during this time of reduced funding.

The Committee has discussed the University's appetite for risk and endorses a movement to increase the institution's tolerance for risk in appropriate areas, including, for example, human resources, research, student, financial, and other enterprise systems, and capital planning. The Committee (1) wishes to hear periodically from University officers about discussions with the Regents and administrators about reducing the level of risk aversion in various areas of University endeavor, and (2) asks that the administration present to the Committee a plan that identifies the rules/regulations that might be modified if the University pursues a stance of less risk aversion.

Adopted unanimously March 25, 2010.

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

6. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Editorial Change to the University Senate Rules

Information for the University Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

The charge to the Senate Consultative Committee allows it to make editorial changes to the University Senate documents, including its rules, to reflect changes in titles of administrative offices or officers; the changes will be reported to the University Senate for information. The following change is being reported for information (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

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

1. Ex Officio Members of University Senate Committees

...

- **All-University Honors**--Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Office of the Vice President for University Relations (two ~~three~~ representatives, including one from Alumni Relations ~~and one from the University Development Office~~); Office of the President (Office of Development); Office of the Chancellor – Duluth; Office of the Chancellor - Crookston

...

MARTI HOPE GONZALES, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

7. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Editorial Change to the Faculty Senate Rules

Information for the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

The charge to the Faculty Consultative Committee allows it to make editorial changes to the Faculty Senate documents, including its rules, to reflect changes in titles of administrative offices or officers; the changes will be reported to the Faculty Senate for information. The following change is being reported for information (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

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

1. Ex Officio Members of Faculty Senate Committees

...

- **Educational Policy**--Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (two representatives, Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education; Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Education); ~~Dean of the Graduate School~~; Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences

...

MARTI HOPE GONZALES, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

8. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), welcomed senators to the final meeting of the year. She said that SCC was cancelled on March 25 to allow for the Faculty Senate to meet and vote on the salary reduction proposal.

Today the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) met with Lynn Zentner and Kathy Brown to understand the process and specification implications of the changes to the Conflict of Interest Policy. Throughout this review, it has been a model of consultation which will continue with FCC this summer before being brought to the University Senate in September for action.

SCC met with Vice President Kathleen O'Brien and Police Chief Hestness regarding the increase in crime alerts to campus. There is a voluminous amount of data, but the University has taken a

passive approach to decrease these numbers through means such as key cards and 2000 video cameras on campus. The intent is to minimize the vulnerability of people while at the University.

9. MINUTES FOR MARCH 4, 2010 AND MARCH 25, 2010

Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/100304sen.html>

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/100325sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

10. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Space Use and Cost

Action by the University Senate

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning received from Vice President for University Services Kathleen O'Brien and Associate Vice President Michael Berthelsen (Facilities Management) a set of questions related to space use and cost planning. The Committee is very aware of environmental and financial reasons to optimize space utilization on campus. In this time of fiscal constraints, it is critical for the University community to make efficient use of our resources. The Committee strongly supports these efforts and recommends to the University/Faculty Senate that it adopt the following principles.

1. To maximize energy savings, the U would need to be willing to set operational boundaries for space use. The largest drivers of energy are hours of operation and being able to predictably *turn buildings down* when unoccupied. To do so would impact the environment or possible operation of select buildings with one or a few users. Is the U ready to implement such changes?

The University should identify which buildings can be closed, locked, and "turned down" outside of normal business hours, or outside of business plus evening hours, those which can only be closed after business plus evening/Saturday hours and those which must remain open 24/7 because of unique requirements. The Committee invites University Services to draft standards, for Committee consultation, by which to make decisions about building hours.

2. We know that single purpose buildings (examples: labs, classrooms, offices) are both cheaper to build and to operate. However, this would require some adjustments to current practice. Is the U ready for such changes?

Buildings that are composed entirely of large lecture classrooms are desirable for their efficiency. Buildings that house graduate students, labs, faculty offices, and small classrooms/seminar rooms will still be required.

3. If the U has less space with the same program, it would need to schedule its classes and events more intensely. With the advantage of technology to see all spaces, it is possible to centrally schedule. This would mean giving up some control of space assignments. Is the U ready for such a change?

The Committee invites Facilities Management and the Office of Classroom Management to collect and present information/data on the usage rates for common use classrooms, departmental classrooms, and other spaces it deems pertinent to the discussion. The current classroom management system should be reviewed for flexibility and responsiveness to teaching needs. The Committee will review these data and proposed management plans.

The University should consider adding a summer semester to improve space utilization.

4. Technology advancements have made it possible to change space assignments and utilization. Is the U ready to reduce its fixed office space and move toward more remote office work and generic office space for faculty and staff while on campus?

Flexible office space is becoming the norm throughout the country in industry and elsewhere. Cubicles with movable partitions are already the norm in many University facilities. As remodeling and new construction is planned, this approach should dominate. Traditional offices with doors should be the default position for faculty members, given their role and responsibilities.

5. What suggestions do you have on how we can reduce recurring and necessary costs to maintain buildings so that more funding is available for programs?

The items described above are aimed at more efficient utilization of current space and reduction of energy costs. These efficiencies should enable taking buildings 'off line' and closing space, furthering reduction in costs and reducing the environmental impact.

Adopted unanimously January 24, 2010.

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

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**11. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Modifying Appointments of Academic Professional and Academic Administrative
Employees for Financial Stringency
Discussion by the University Senate**

Modifying Appointments of Academic Professional and Administrative Employees for Financial Stringency

POLICY STATEMENT

The University reserves the right to modify the appointment terms of Academic Professional and Academic Administrative (P&A) employees in order to address financial stringency. Specifically, the University may: 1) reduce P&A salaries or percentages of appointment during the term of an employee's appointment; 2) impose unpaid furloughs or other mandatory unpaid absences; 3) postpone compensation; or 4) take other actions as determined by the University in its sole discretion. All P&A appointments are made subject to this right, effective June 1, 2010.

Authority

The President will determine whether a financial stringency exists. The authority to modify terms of appointment under this policy will reside with the Vice President for Human Resources

Implementation

Any modification of terms of appointment under this policy must:

- a. Have a defined term, not to exceed two years unless renewed by the Vice President for Human Resources under this policy;
- b. Be communicated to affected employees in a timely fashion in advance of implementation.

REASON FOR POLICY

This policy allows the University to take extraordinary action to reduce personnel costs in the face of unusual financial difficulties facing the institution. It complements policies and provision for other employee groups.

NOTICE

Due to the large volume of comments and questions related to this draft policy, it is not possible to respond to individual comments. A general response follows.

It is important to understand that the reason this policy has been brought forward at this time is to enable implementation of the Temporary Reduction in Pay of 1.15% previously announced for 2010- 2011 for P&As. There are no further compensation adjustments anticipated under this policy in this fiscal year.

Based on the most frequently raised concerns, the following aspects of the policy will be clarified or eliminated:

1. This policy grants the President and Vice President for Human Resources the ability to implement certain responses to a declared Financial Stringency, but does not allow for individual units or colleges to undertake such actions with respect to P&A employees in an individual unit or college.
2. Notification in a "timely manner" will be further defined in relation to actions taken under this policy.
3. **Item #4 ("take other actions as determined by the University in its sole discretion") will be eliminated.**

Your comments continue to be invited on this draft through the end of the review period (5/12/10).

**MARTI HOPE GONZALES, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that while the Tenure Code includes a procedure for salary reductions for faculty, there was no policy to enable this same step for academic professional (P&A) employees. Therefore Human Resources created this policy. The alternative was to terminate all P&A contracts and rehire everyone at the reduced rate. This policy has been drastically modified since it was first proposed.

Sarah Waldemar, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that Human Resources confirmed that the notice of non-renewal or adequate notice is not changed by this policy. CAPA will see it again before it is finalized but they have appreciated the consultation during this process.

Q: Why was Item #4 originally included in the policy?

A: The policy was meant to allow for this year's salary reductions and any future salary implications. Item 4 was meant to clarify the policy for use by central administration for all P&A but not eliminate the notice period nor allow individuals units to implement cuts.

A senator said that he was pleased that the policy is only meant to be applied to all P&A and hopes that this is made clear in the final version.

Another senator was pleased that the term 'fiscal emergency' was addressed in this policy for P&A.

A senator opposed the policy stating that it allows the employer to violate the employment contract and provides no right of appeal for employees. It would also allow central administration to make pay cuts, at any time, and for any reason as only the Regents can challenge the administrative decision.

Professor Gonzales reminded senators that the policy is under review until May 12.

12. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks began by thanking the Faculty Senate for the productive and animated discussions that took place on the issue of compensation. He then thanked the faculty leadership for revising and improving this plan. He recognizes that there are legitimate differences of opinion on this issue in the University community that need to be acknowledged and respected. This is a difficult time and this action was necessary for a variety of reasons. First it preserves hundreds of vitally-important jobs for people who would not be able to take a lay-off. It also protects critical academic and support programs that would have otherwise had deep cuts. These issues will continue to be discussed along with health care changes stemming from federal legislation changes.

He has been asked about the implications of the state supreme court decision on the Governor's \$2.7 million unallotment action at the end of the last legislative session. The state supreme court ruled that the Governor did not have unilateral ability to reset the state budget and the unallotment provision is only a way to balance a budget after it has already been balanced at the start of the fiscal year.

The court's decision did not make a decision to eliminate the \$50 million unallotment for the University. The additional \$37 million cut was included in a bill from the House and Senate so both of these decisions will likely remain. However a federal waiver would be required to cut the University below the \$591 million amount. If a waiver was granted the University would need to revisit its budget decisions for the next year.

The University will argue strongly to the legislature for the restoration of the \$50 million cut through unallotment, but it will be an up-hill battle since the state has close to a \$3 billion hole in its operating budget.

He recognizes that this is a difficult period for everyone at the University. Everything needs to be done to keep the integrity, quality, and the ability of the University intact to fulfill its academic mission. The best way to do this is to protect jobs of talented people who carry out the mission of education, research, and commitment to the public good. What makes this difficult moving forward is the size of the budget challenge and the unlikeliness that it will be remedied anytime soon. Instead structural deficits in the state will continue to move forward and there will be little relief.

President Bruininks said that hopes that the University will continue to fight for financial access and affordability for students. When the cost of education for undergraduate is adjusted for

scholarships and need-based aid, tuition only increased three percent per year, which is good in comparison to other institutions. This standard will be hard to maintain in this environment but it is a goal.

The University also needs to reduce costs and set clear priorities. He thanked the Senate for raising the issue of space usage. For every one million square feet of space that is reduced, the University will save an estimated \$10 million. Everyone needs to look to use resources more effectively. Lastly the University needs to grow and stabilize resources. The candidates for governor should be asked about their commitment to higher education in the state. It bothers him that when state leaders are asked about the state's priorities, higher education is not mentioned.

The Universities academic priorities must be clear and consistent with its values and goals. Every level of the University should be asked what needs to be strengthened, what must be maintained at current levels, what can be reduced and consolidated, what things need to be stopped, and what can be done to more resourcefully grow resources that do not come from the state. However, the University must make a strong case to the state to maintain and increase state support.

To deal with the most immediate challenges, the University has been looking at ways to reduce capital costs. HEAPR funding requests to the state have increased to maintain buildings and systems that the University already has. There is no University debt on these funds.

There is much that can be done to grow non-state revenue. He encouraged people to be creative and expand the reach of current University programs.

President Bruininks stated that immigration reform and issues have been in the news lately. He recalled that the University Senate supported the Dream Act two years ago. This bill would allow undocumented Minnesota residents to qualify for in-state tuition status and state grant funding, but has not yet been approved by the state. He signed a letter this week with other University presidents asserting his strong, personal support for this legislation.

13. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: To whom was the letter from university presidents sent?

A: It was sent to the US Senate and the state's congressional delegation to initiate the process.

Q: What will be the transition for the new president?

A: He is the last person to ask as he is not engaged in the process or providing any advice to the Regents unless requested. This is a fabulous job at a great institution that has made academic gains in the last 10-15 years. It should attractive talented candidates. He encouraged senators to be involved in the process. He plans to take a year off and then return to the faculty.

14. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

15. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

Devin Driscoll, Council of Graduate Students (COGS) President, said that COGS created an award to recognize graduate education faculty. There were 60 applications this year and the following 12 faculty received the award:

- Victor Barocas, Professor, Biomedical Engineering, IT
- Robert (Robin) Brown, Associate Professor, Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature, CLA
- Alexander Heger, Associate Professor, Physics and Astronomy, IT
- Christopher Nappa, Associate Professor, Classical and Near Eastern Studies, CLA
- Michael Osterholm, Professor, Environmental Health Sciences, Medicine
- Claudia Parliament, Professor, Applied Economics, CFANS
- John Pastor, Professor, Biology, UMD
- David Pellow, Professor, Sociology, CLA
- Rory Remmel, Professor, Medicinal Chemistry, Pharmacy
- Gillian Roehrig, Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, CEHD
- Joe Soss, Professor, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, CLA
- Margaret Werry, Associate Professor, Theater Arts and Dance, CLA

16. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 3:19 pm.

17. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), noted that Professor Katherine VandenBosch was elected the 2010-11 FCC Chair and Professor Christopher Cramer was elected the vice chair. Transition meetings are being held with both people.

One issue for FCC has been the Conflict of Interest Policy. A meeting was held today to provide additional questions and make suggestions. She expressed gratitude to Lynn Zentner from FCC for addressing each of its concerns.

Under the Commercialization of Technology Policy funding is provided through patent royalties. AS these patents are ending, the office confronts this revenue loss while continuing its work. This policy will be brought to the Senate in the fall.

The FCC leadership met with Bill Funk regarding the presidential search, the vision for the process, and the need for a faculty voice in the process.

In closing she said that she learned a lot this year. She then thanked FCC, her current vice chair Michael Oakes, other committee chairs, Gary Engstrand, and the senators for their work as well.

President Bruininks thanked her doing a great job representing the University. She was then given a round of applause.

18. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE

Professor Martin Sampson, one of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons, said that there have been no recent changes in this session. He stated that the normal parts of this session have been the bonding bill and modifications to the higher education bill.

They also watch for other smaller, but not always inconsequential bills. One this year required disclosure of costs for course books was approved but the University Bookstore is already in compliance so there is no objection. This bill however also shifted focus to when faculty submit book requests. There was consideration of mandating faculty to turn in book orders prior to students registering for the next semester's classes. For this last item, a basic responsibility for faculty is to update their syllabus and book request prior to teaching its class. However, for this requirement, some departments do not know, prior to students registering, who will be teaching a particular class for the following semester. Faculty support was received once this process was explained. The Minnesota Higher Education Office has been asked to keep an eye on costs and report to the legislature next year.

He said that an abnormal feature of this session has been the \$36 million cut to the University. The recent court ruling on the Governor's unallotments could also impact next year's budget.

Professor Carolyn Hayes, the second Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that she has been following the Light Rail Transit (LRT) agreement. A hearing on determining eminent domain was cancelled as a preliminary agreement has been reached between Met Council and the University. She thanked those faculty who were ready to speak if there was a hearing. She will be monitoring the effect this issue might have on the way that the University is viewed by the legislature. Some legislators thought that faculty did not have a strong opinion on this issue since they were voicing concerns.

In closing Professor Sampson thanked everyone that he has worked with during his years as a Faculty Legislative Liaison. He will be stepping down this summer, but it has been his privilege to serve. He has also been proud of the commitment to education from the President and the clear way that this is communicated to the legislature.

He was then given a standing ovation.

19. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Election Of Faculty Senate Officers

Action by the Faculty Senate

The chair of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee recommend the following officers for 2010-11:

Clerk	–	Professor	Stuart	Goldstein
Parliamentarian	–	Professor	Kristin	Hickman
Faculty Senate Vice Chair – Professor Carol Chomsky				

**MARTI HOPE GONZALES, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**20. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
2014-15 Crookston and Duluth Calendars
Information for the Faculty Senate**

Crookston 2014-15

Fall Semester 2014 (75 class days)

August 26	Tuesday	Classes begin
September 1	Monday	Labor Day holiday
October 10	Friday	In-service (no classes)
November 27-28	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 12	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 15-18	Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
December 18	Thursday	End of the term

Spring Semester 2015 (74 class days)

January 12	Monday	Classes begin
January 19	Monday	MLK holiday
February 16	Monday	In-service (no classes)
March 16-20	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
April 3	Friday	Floating holiday (no classes)
May 4	Monday	Last day of instruction
May 5-8	Tues.-Fri.	Final examinations
May 8	Friday	End of the term
May 9	Saturday	Commencement

May Session 2015 (14 class days)

May 11	Monday	May session begins
May 25	Monday	Memorial Day holiday

May 29	Friday	May session ends
<u>Summer Session 2015 (39 class days)</u>		
June 8	Monday	Classes begin
July 3	Friday	Independence Day holiday
July 31	Friday	8-wk summer session ends

Duluth 2014-15

<u>Fall Semester 2014 (72 class days)</u>		
September 1	Monday	Labor Day holiday
September 2	Tuesday	Classes begin
November 27-28	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 12	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 15-19	Mon.-Fri.	Final examinations
December 19	Friday	End of the term

<u>Spring Semester 2015 (74 class days)</u>		
January 19	Monday	MLK holiday
January 20	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 16-20	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 8	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 11-15	Mon.-Fri.	Final examinations
May 14	Thursday	Grad Commencement
May 15	Friday	End of the term
May 16	Saturday	Undergrad Commencement

<u>May Session 2015 (13 class days)</u>		
May 18	Monday	May session begins
May 25	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 5	Friday	Final examinations; End of May session

<u>Summer Session 2015 (38 class days)</u>		
June 8	Monday	Classes begin
July 3	Friday	Independence Day holiday
July 31	Friday	Final examinations; End of Summer Session

**CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

21. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
2013-14 Morris Calendar Amendments and
2014-15 Morris and Twin Cities Calendars
Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To approve amendments to the 2013-14 Morris calendar and the 2014-15 Morris and Twin Cities calendars.

Morris 2013-14

Spring Semester 2014 (74 class days)

January 24 <u>13</u>	Tuesday <u>Monday</u>	Classes begin
January 20	Monday	MLK holiday
March 14 <u>7</u>	Friday	First half semester classes end
March 17-21 <u>10-14</u>	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
March 24 <u>17</u>	Monday	Second half semester classes begin
May 9 <u>2</u>	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 10 <u>3</u>	Saturday	Study day
May 12-15 <u>5-8</u>	Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
May 17 <u>10</u>	Saturday	Commencement

May Session 2014 (14 class days)

May 19 <u>12</u>	Monday	May session begins
May 26	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 6 <u>May 30</u>	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2014

May 27 <u>19</u> -June 30 <u>20</u>	Summer session I (24 class days)	
May 26	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 30 <u>23</u> -August 1 <u>July</u>	Summer session II (24 class days)	
<u>25</u>		
July 4	Friday	Independence Day holiday

Morris 2014-15

Fall Semester 2014 (73 class days)

August 24-26	Sun.-Tues.	New Student Orientation
August 27	Wednesday	Classes begin
September 1	Monday	Labor Day holiday

October 17	Friday	First half semester classes end
October 20-21	Mon.-Tues.	Fall Break (no classes)
October 22	Wednesday	Second half semester classes begin
November 27-28	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 12	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 13	Saturday	Study day
December 15-18	Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations

Spring Semester 2015 (74 class days)

January 12	Monday	Classes begin
January 19	Monday	MLK holiday
March 6	Friday	First half semester classes end
March 9-13	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
March 16	Monday	Second half semester classes begin
May 1	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 2	Saturday	Study day
May 4-7	Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
May 9	Saturday	Commencement

May Session 2015 (14 class days)

May 11	Monday	May session begins
May 25	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
May 29	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2015

May 18-June 19	Summer session I (24 class days)	
May 25	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 22-July 24	Summer session II (24 class days)	
July 3	Friday	Independence Day holiday

Twin Cities 2014-15

Fall Semester 2014 (70 class days)

September 1	Monday	Labor Day holiday
September 2	Tuesday	Classes begin
November 27-28	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 10	Wednesday	Last day of instruction
December 11	Thursday	Study day
December 12-13, 15-18	Fri.-Sat., Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
December 14	Sunday	Study day

December 18 Thursday End of the term

Spring Semester 2015 (74 class days)

January 19	Monday	MLK holiday
January 20	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 16-20	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 8	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 9-10	Sat.-Sun.	Study days
May 11-16	Mon.-Sat.	Final examinations
May 16	Saturday	End of the term

May Session 2015 (14 class days)

May 26	Tuesday	May session begins
June 12	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2015 (39 class days)

June 15	Monday	Classes begin
July 3	Friday	Independence Day holiday
August 7	Friday	8-wk summer session ends

**CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**MOTION A
Action by the Faculty Senate**

Agenda Items 22. through 24. are interconnected and are offered as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. As amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (83) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

**22. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Faculty Consultative Committee**

MOTION 1:

Amend Article IV, Section 5(H) of the Faculty Senate bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

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

...

H. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Faculty Consultative Committee shall represent the faculty at large and not the individual campuses, institutes, colleges, schools, or departments of the University.

The Faculty Consultative Committee shall serve as the consulting body to the president and as executive committee of the Faculty Senate.

Membership

The tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Twin Cities campus and those tenured and tenure-track faculty members on the Duluth campus eligible to vote in elections for the Senate shall elect 9 members, and the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Morris campus shall elect one faculty member. Faculty members shall be nominated and elected by procedures established by each campus faculty, subject to the following provisions:

- All members of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall hold regular appointment at the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. Individuals holding, in addition to their professorial title, a University position carrying as any part of its title, for any percentage time, president, vice president, chancellor, provost, dean, executive director, librarian, counsel, attorney, or chief of staff at a collegiate or central administrative level may not serve on the committee. Individuals holding, in addition to their professorial title, an administrative appointment as department chair or department head (or its equivalent, such as center director) are eligible to serve on the committee.
- Each campus faculty shall submit a slate of twice as many candidates as are to be elected from its numbers. These candidates shall be nominated and certified as available according to procedures set forth by each campus assembly. The clerk of the campus assembly shall distribute election ballots and slates to all faculty members eligible to vote for members of the Senate and shall receive all returns. The election shall be held and completed by the end of spring semester. In case of a tie, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate by lot.
- For the purposes of this section only, the faculty on the Duluth campus who are eligible to vote in Senate elections shall be considered a part of the Twin Cities campus: They shall be eligible (1) to vote in elections for the Faculty Consultative Committee and (2) for nomination and election to the Faculty Consultative Committee in accord with the provisions established in these bylaws.

- The Nominating Subcommittee is responsible for identifying Twin Cities faculty candidates for the Faculty Consultative Committee. The Nominating Subcommittee shall consist of the Twin Cities voting members of the Faculty Consultative Committee (except the chair and vice chair), the chairs of Senate committees who are ex officio members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, and the immediate past voting members of the Faculty Consultative Committee. The Nominating Subcommittee shall elect a chair from among its members. The Nominating Subcommittee shall nominate twice as many faculty candidates for the Faculty Consultative Committee, who are confirmed as willing to serve, as are to be elected each year from the Twin Cities campus and from those faculty from the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections. To achieve balanced representation across the Twin Cities campus, the Nominating Subcommittee may choose to pair candidates. The final slate of candidates shall be announced in the Faculty Senate docket for a spring semester meeting. Additional nominations of eligible faculty, confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities faculty, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. If the nominees are paired, any additional nomination shall specify against which pair the nominee will run. In the event there are additional nominations, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall by vote in order to reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected. The vote shall be taken by secret ballot in a manner determined by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. The clerk of the Senate shall present the final slate the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation for its approval. The slate as approved shall be presented to the faculty for an election, conducted in accordance with ~~Article IV, Section 5(H), of the preceding paragraph~~ of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

[NOTE: Except for the underlining in the preceding paragraph, the language is taken verbatim from the existing bylaw setting out the process to be used by the existing Nominating Committee.]

In case of a faculty vacancy, the remaining members of the Faculty Consultative Committee by majority vote shall fill the vacancy by interim appointment until the next general election.

Articles II, Section 2(f), Article IV, Section 2(f) and Article VI, Section 2(e) of the Rules governing absences from committee meetings and Article I, Section 4 and Article III, Section 4 of Bylaws governing absences from Senate meetings shall apply to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

The chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall be elected by their respective members from among their number for a one-year term of office. Chairs shall be eligible for re-election to that position. The chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall serve as chair of the Senate Consultative Committee.

The ex officio members of the Faculty Consultative Committee are:

- The vice chair of the Faculty Senate (ex officio voting).
- The chairs of the Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative, Educational Policy, Faculty

Affairs, Finance and Planning, and Research Committees (ex officio nonvoting).
--The past chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee for the year following his or her service as chair, irrespective of the term to which that individual was originally elected (ex officio voting).

-- One representative of the faculty on the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections (ex officio non-voting). This representative shall be elected in accord with procedures established by the eligible Duluth faculty. The ex officio Duluth representative may send an alternate to Faculty Consultative Committee meetings.

--The faculty legislative liaison(s) (ex officio non-voting).

...

23. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT

Faculty Committee on Committees

MOTION 2:

Amend Article IV, Section 5(G) of the Faculty Senate bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

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

...

G. FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Faculty Committee on Committees

The Faculty Committee on Committees ~~proposes candidates for election to the Nominating Committee,~~ appoints members of certain ~~other~~ committees of the Faculty Senate and advises the Faculty Consultative Committee on the committee structure of the Faculty Senate.

Membership

The Faculty Committee on Committees shall be composed of at least 13 and no more than 15 elected tenured or tenure-track faculty members and at least 2 and no more than 4 elected academic professional members.

Of the faculty/academic professional members, 1 shall be from the Morris campus and the remainder from the Twin Cities campus. All faculty members of the Committee shall be elected by the faculty members of the Senate from their respective campuses. The Twin Cities faculty members of the Faculty Committee on Committees shall be nominated by the current Twin Cities faculty members of the Faculty Committee on Committees and shall be selected so that the membership of the committee corresponds approximately with the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty in each college. The academic professional candidates for the Committee on

Committees shall be elected in accord with procedures established by the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators. In case of a faculty/academic professional vacancy, the remaining faculty/academic professional members, by majority vote, shall fill the vacancy by interim appointment until the next general election.

The Faculty Committee on Committees shall elect its chair from amongst its members for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position. The chair shall also serve as the chair of the Senate Committee on Committees.

Duties and Responsibilities

a. To forward annually to the Faculty Senate for approval names of faculty members, academic professionals, and chairs it recommends for appointment to those committees of the Faculty Senate specified in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various campuses and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the faculty/academic professional member currently is serving; 3) the principle of rotation of committee assignments; 4) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student and graduate/professional student members; and 5) expressions of interest in committee service offered by faculty and academic professionals. In addition, the committee shall select senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Faculty Senate and its committees. The committee also shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, sex, and academic rank in constituting committees.

~~b. To forward annually to the Faculty Consultative Committee a slate of candidates to be considered for election to the Nominating Committee. The slate should contain twice as many candidates as there are positions to be filled on the Nominating Committee and the candidates shall be paired. The committee should give preference to candidates who have broad experience in governance at the University.~~

...

[re-letter the remaining provisions]

24. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT Nominating Committee

MOTION 3:

To amend Article IV, Section 5(K) of the Faculty Senate bylaws as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

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

...

~~K. NOMINATING COMMITTEE~~

~~The Nominating Committee is responsible for identifying Twin Cities faculty candidates for the Committee on Committees and for the Faculty Consultative Committee and for overseeing elections to those two committees.~~

~~Membership~~

~~The Nominating Committee shall consist of at least nine tenured or tenure-track faculty elected by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation in the manner described below. In case of a vacancy, the remaining members, by majority vote, shall fill the vacancy by interim appointment until the next general election.~~

~~For the purposes of this section of the Bylaws, action by “Faculty Committee on Committees” means action taken by the Twin Cities faculty members of the Committee on Committees and action taken by the “Twin Cities Faculty Delegation” means action taken by the Twin Cities tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the Faculty Senate.~~

~~The Faculty Committee on Committees each year shall submit to the Faculty Consultative Committee for its approval a proposed slate to be considered for election to the Nominating Committee. In those instances when an incumbent member of the Nominating Committee is eligible for re-election and is willing to serve, the Faculty Committee on Committees may present to Faculty Consultative Committee the name of that individual for confirmation of reappointment without another candidate on the ballot to fill the position. For all other positions, the Faculty Committee on Committees will propose a slate composed of twice as many tenure-track or tenured faculty members as there are positions to be filled, each confirmed as willing to serve. The Faculty Committee on Committees will strive to include a diverse pool of candidates and, to ensure that the Nominating Committee as a whole will include balanced representation from across the Twin Cities campus, the Faculty Committee on Committees shall select candidates from appropriate academic units, and the slate of nominees, other than those for reappointment, shall pair candidates from related academic units. The slate and the proposed reappointments shall be submitted to the Faculty Consultative Committee for approval. In the event that additional nominations are made by members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee shall vote by secret ballot to reduce the slate to twice the number to be chosen through contested election, continuing to strive for appropriate balance on the slate. The final slate and the approved nominations for reappointment shall be announced in the Faculty Senate docket for a spring semester meeting.~~

~~Additional nominations of tenured or tenure-track faculty, confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting at which the slate is to be presented; (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. Such nominees may be named to run against a pair of candidates or against a candidate for reappointment. To ensure appropriate balanced representation on the Nominating Committee, any additional nominations shall specify against whom the nominee will run.~~

~~After a final slate is selected as specified above, the clerk of the Senate shall present the final slate to the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation for a vote. The election for contested seats will be conducted by secret ballot. The candidate receiving the most votes in each pair or group will be elected. Uncontested elections for reappointment may be conducted by voice vote.~~

~~In case of a tie in any Senate vote in the election process, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate(s) by lot.~~

~~The Nominating Committee shall elect its own chair from amongst its members for a one year term of office. The chair is eligible to re-election to that position.~~

Duties and Responsibilities

a. ~~The Nominating Committee shall nominate twice as many faculty candidates for the Faculty Consultative Committee, who are confirmed as willing to serve, as are to be elected each year from the Twin Cities campus and from those faculty from the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections. To achieve balanced representation across the Twin Cities campus, the Nominating Committee may choose to pair candidates. The final slate of candidates shall be announced in the Faculty Senate docket for a spring semester meeting. Additional nominations of eligible faculty, confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities faculty, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. If the nominees are paired, any additional nomination shall specify against which pair the nominee will run. In the event there are additional nominations, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall by vote in order to reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected. The vote shall be taken by secret ballot in a manner determined by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. The clerk of the Senate shall present the final slate the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation for its approval. The slate as approved shall be presented to the faculty for an election, conducted in accordance with Article IV, Section 5(H), of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.~~

b. ~~The Nominating Committee shall each year shall submit to the Faculty Consultative Committee for its approval a proposed slate to be considered for election to the Committee on Committees, composed of as many tenured and tenure track faculty members, confirmed as willing to serve, as there are positions to be filled. The Nominating Committee will strive to include a diverse pool of candidates and, to ensure that the Committee on Committees as a whole will include a balanced representation from across the Twin Cities, the Nominating Committee shall select candidates from appropriate academic units to fill the vacancies. In the event that additional nominations are made by members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee shall vote by secret ballot to determine the slate to be forwarded to the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation, continuing to strive for appropriate balance on the slate.~~

~~The final slate of candidates shall be announced in the Faculty Senate docket for a spring semester meeting. Additional nominations of individuals confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities faculty, provided that the petition~~

~~is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting; or (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. To ensure appropriately balanced representation on the Committee on Committees, any additional nomination shall specify against which candidate the nominee will run. In the event there are additional nominations, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall vote by secret ballot on any contested position(s) and the individuals who receive the most votes will be elected to the positions. For any uncontested positions, the election may be conducted by a voice vote. In case of a tie in any Senate vote in the election process, the clerk shall choose the successful candidate(s) by lot.~~

- ~~c. To oversee the conduct of the elections of the members of the Committee on Committees and the Twin Cities members of the Faculty Consultative Committee.~~
- ~~d. To report to the Faculty Consultative Committee any issues or problems it encounters which require the attention of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation.~~

COMMENT:

There are three related bylaw amendments being proposed. (1) would eliminate the Nominating Committee and replace it with a Nominating Subcommittee of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). (2) would establish the election process for Twin Cities members of the FCC. (3) would charge the Faculty Committee on Committees with replacing its own members.

The idea of having an elected Nominating Committee identifying candidates for the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) (and Faculty Committee on Committees) is a good one in theory but one that has not worked in practice. The current system has been dysfunctional for several years. It has been nearly impossible to arrange meetings of the Nominating Committee where more than three or four members show up (the two meetings of the Nominating Committee for the 2009-10 academic year have had 4 members at one meeting and 3 at the other). Inasmuch as the idea of a nominating committee is to have broad representation, that is far too few people to identify candidates for FCC. FCC members themselves are elected, of course.

FCC and most of the members of the Nominating Committee recommend allowing the current voting members from the Twin Cities campus, the ex officio committee chairs, and the immediate past FCC members, to constitute a Nominating Subcommittee. (It is only "most" of the Nominating Committee members because some have not expressed a view; the majority of the members have and they support the proposal. One question was whether or not there would be sufficient representation on the reconstituted Nominating Subcommittee to identify faculty members from the Academic Health Center, but the current Nominating Committee members noted that were this proposal approved by the Faculty Senate, next year there would be six faculty members from the AHC serving on it.) This is a group of faculty members who understand the role and demands on FCC members, one that is broadly based, and one that is committed to the processes of consultative governance. FCC members would take seriously the need to identify excellent candidates.

One concern that has been expressed is that this will lead to "inbreeding." We do not find that persuasive; FCC members, however nominated, come from a variety of disciplines and colleges, with different attitudes and experiences, with independent minds, and those asked to be

candidates have no obligations to those who have done the asking. FCC members cannot clone themselves in the nomination process, no matter how much they might wish to try (which they don't). FCC members over the years have been among the strong advocates for bringing new faces into governance.

The other part of the proposal is to remove from the Nominating Committee responsibility for identifying candidates for the Faculty Committee on Committees and to allow the Committee on Committees to appoint its own replacements, with the stricture that the faculty membership must be roughly proportional to the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty in each of the colleges. FCC members have a sufficient amount of work that to ask them to also find members of the Committee on Committees seemed an undue burden, and one the Committee on Committees members are perfectly able to pick up.

**MARTI HOPE GONZALES, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**JOHN L. SULLIVAN, CHAIR PRO TEM
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Q: Will this change be too much work for the FCC members?

A: There are 17-20 members of FCC who will participate in this process. As they already attend FCC meetings, this will just be added to the end of two meetings.

A senator felt that this was a good proposal and worked well by allowing both committees to identify future members.

Another senator said that this provides more power to FCC so faculty should petition to be on the ballot.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 91 in favor and 2 opposed.

APPROVED

END OF MOTION A

**25. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 5 (B) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (83) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

...

B. ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTER FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

...

Duties and Responsibilities

Steering

- a. To meet at least monthly to discuss matters of concern to the faculty.
- b. To initiate whatever studies it deems necessary and appropriate or to request such studies from the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences or Administrative officers or from the subcommittees.
- c. The chair shall meet each semester with the chair of the AHC Student Consultative Committee to discuss issues of concern to both faculty and students, and the two committees shall meet jointly as deemed necessary by the chairs.
- d e. To advise the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences on procedures for making administrative appointments and to participate in the selection process.
- e d. To create and terminate all subcommittees of the AHC FCC.

...

COMMENT:

The Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee (AHC FCC) reviewed its charge and noted that it did not include a provision that the chairs of the AHC FCC and Academic Health Center Student Consultative Committee (AHC SCC) should meet each semester to discuss issues of concern to both faculty and students, while this provision is in the current charge to the AHC SCC. It was determined that this statement be added to the AHC FCC charge.

BRIAN ISETTS, CHAIR
ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTER FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 90 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

26. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Faculty Senate Vice Chair
Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 5 (a) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (83) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

ARTICLE III. FACULTY SENATE MEMBERSHIP, ELECTIONS, AND OFFICERS
(Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Faculty Senate)

...

5. Officers

a. Chair and vice chair

The President of the University of Minnesota shall chair the Faculty Senate. The vice chair of the Faculty Senate shall preside at Faculty Senate meetings when the President is unable to do so. In the event that neither the President nor the vice chair is available to serve as chair of a Faculty Senate meeting, the vice chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall preside.

A vice chair shall be elected by the Faculty Senate at its last meeting in the spring of the academic year from among ~~its~~ faculty members eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate. A vice chair shall be nominated by the Faculty Consultative Committee; other nominations may be made by ten votes from the floor of the Senate. The vice chair shall serve as chair in the absence of the President and shall serve as a voting member of the Senate Consultative Committee and the Faculty Consultative Committee. The term of office of the vice chair shall be July 1 to June 30, and the person holding the office is eligible for re-election.

...

COMMENT:

The Senate Constitution provides, both in Article III, Section 3 and Article IV, Section 3 that "the vice chair and the clerk shall be faculty members eligible to be elected to the Faculty Senate." The bylaw provision requiring that the vice chair be elected from among the faculty

members of the University/Faculty Senate contradicts the language of the constitution, which requires only that the vice chair is to be elected from faculty members *eligible* to be elected to the Senate.

The Faculty Consultative Committee thus recommends this bylaw amendment to bring the bylaws into conformity with the Senate constitution. FCC notes that in nominating faculty members to serve as Senate vice chair, it has for many years followed the constitutional language and has not restricted its nominations to members of the Senate.

**MARTI HOPE GONZALES, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 87 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

**27. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Sponsored Project Effort on Summer and Part-Time Appointments
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

KEY POLICY ELEMENTS:

1. Decreases institutional risk by clarifying regulatory requirements related to allowable and unallowable activities while paid on sponsored projects during the summer months and on part-time appointments. (NSF is conducting, nationally, a series of 30 audits, and one key area of concern is summer effort. Possible consequences of failures in this area are repayment of funds, extrapolation across all awards, or a significant fine to the institution.)
2. Sets forth a mechanism to document (for auditors or funding agencies) that faculty understand their obligations in the event that they elect to work full-time on sponsored projects rather than take time off (vacation).
3. Describes when it is permissible to create competitive grant proposals on time not paid for by the University.

Sponsored Project Effort on Summer and Part-Time Appointments

POLICY STATEMENT

This policy establishes the requirements for faculty to receive summer salary from sponsored projects and also describes when it is permissible to create competitive grant proposals on time not paid for by the University.

Charging Summer Salary and Certifying Effort on Sponsored Projects

In order to ensure that the University of Minnesota continues to be in compliance with all regulations applicable to federal and non-federal sponsored projects, the following policy defines the charging of faculty summer salary on sponsored projects:

1. All salary charges to sponsored projects must be consistent with the applicable University of Minnesota policies, including the policy on Effort Reporting, which can be found at: http://www.policy.umn.edu/groups/ppd/documents/policy/Effort_Certification.cfm and the limitations described below.
2. All salary charges to sponsored projects must be consistent with sponsor limitations.
3. Salaries charged to sponsored projects during the summer period must only include compensation for the effort expended on those sponsored projects within the same appointment period.
4. Only activities directly related to the sponsored project such as research, writing progress reports, attending project-related conferences and/or holding research meetings (including with participating students) can be charged to a sponsored project. Non-related activities, such as preparing/submitting competitive proposals, other research, vacations, attending department/school faculty meetings, teaching, teaching preparation, administrative work, university service, and attending non-sponsor-related conferences cannot be charged to sponsored projects unless they are de minimus (e.g., an occasional meeting, phone call, or student conference).
5. Unless an alternate location is approved by their unit head, faculty are generally expected to be at the University for the period of summer salary support unless their research requires specific off-campus activities.
6. Any consulting activities conducted during the summer/research quarter are subject to the same University policies in effect during the academic year.

Implementation Requirements and Maximum Effort Levels

1. For B term appointees, up to 2.5 months of summer salary may normally be charged to sponsored projects. Effort certification will be the formal documentation of compliance. Specifically,
 - a. Effort expended during the academic year does not satisfy a commitment related to the receipt of salary during the summer.
 - b. Effort certification covering the summer period only includes the activities for which the faculty member earned summer salary in that period.
2. Any exception exceeding the 2.5 months maximum that can be charged on sponsored projects during the summer period will require an additional statement by the faculty member indicating the full extent of that quarter's effort. Such a request will require the prior approval of the faculty member's unit head (primary appointment department), the Dean, and the Associate Vice President for Research Administration before the request for more than 2.5 months of summer salary will be allowed.

Individuals who hold an appointment less than 100% time may voluntarily write proposals during the percentage of time not paid by the University. The percentage of unpaid time must be

reasonable in relationship to the volume of work performed. Note that questions may arise about when a proposal was written if it appears that there was insufficient time available on non-sponsored or unpaid time to have completed the work

3. Non-sponsored funds may be used to cover salary for any portion of the summer quarter, including the remaining two weeks not allowed on sponsored projects. Other restricted funds (e.g., gifts and endowments) may also be used, subject to the guidelines and restrictions of the sources.
4. If a faculty member has multiple appointments with different contract periods (such as 9 and 12 months), the time available for summer for sponsored research must exclude the time reserved for the 12-month appointment.
5. The rate of pay for one full month of summer salary must be equivalent to the aggregate monthly salary rates from all paid appointments during the academic year quarters. Summer salary paid prior to July 1st will be at the previous (academic) year appointment's salary rate; summer salary paid July 1st or later will be at the forthcoming year's salary rate.

Part-Time Appointees, or B Term Appointees without a Summer Appointment

1. Individuals who hold an appointment less than 100% time may voluntarily write competitive proposals or work on other university functions (e.g., teacher preparation) during the percentage of time not paid by the University. This time is not considered work performed for the University, and must not be reported in the University's effort system.
2. The percentage of unpaid time must be reasonable with respect to the volume of work performed. Note that questions may arise about when a proposal was written if it appears that there is insufficient unpaid time available to have reasonably completed the work.
3. Proposals written on unpaid time are subject to the same standards (for completeness, accuracy, adherence to University and agency policy) as proposals written on paid University time, once they have been formally submitted for review through University review and submission channels.

REASON FOR POLICY

This policy clarifies what activities are allowable while paid on sponsored projects during the summer months, and sets forth a mechanism to document (for auditors or funding agencies) that faculty understand their obligations in the event that they elect to work full-time on sponsored projects rather than taking time off (vacation). The policy also describes when it is permissible to create competitive grant proposals on time not paid for by the University.

**MARTI HOPE GONZALES, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), stated that this policy was a topic of extensive discussion at the February 22 Research Committee meeting and at last week's FCC meeting. This policy reflects the implications for the University due to increased federal funding scrutiny of how faculty spend their summer months and what activities are allowable while faculty are engaging in sponsored efforts. The policy also explains the

mechanisms by which the University can demonstrate faculty understanding and commitment to the policy.

She said that the contents of the policy have shifted in the last few days, so she asked for an update.

Pamela Webb from the Office for Sponsored Projects said that this policy is in its last week of a 30-day public comment period. The policy impacts about 163 B-term faculty, of which 98 are in the Institute of Technology. Good feedback was received and two key changes were made.

The policy does have a maximum of two and one-half months of summer time that can be paid by sponsored projects unless an exception form is filed. Originally the form was to be approved by department chairs and deans but this has been changed to only require the principal investigator signature. This implies that they understand the obligations that are included on the form and reduces administrative processes. This is needed due to broad-cased, national audit findings in this area.

The other change is that there was a work site requirement which needed department head approval if a faculty was going to work off-campus for an extended time. Approval is no longer required but it does explain the issues that need to be thought through and addressed. Faculty also need to understand that if they are being paid for this time, then it is reasonable that the University be able to contact them within a reasonable period of time.

Q: What is the anticipated process once the comment period has concluded?

A: After this period a decision is made by the President, Vice President Mulcahy, and herself to determine if the new policy is ready to go live.

A senator stated that he is impressed with the rapid evolution of this policy. This is a real issue but he thinks that this is a bad response as this is not just a summer issue. If the University wanted to set a policy that there is a maximum amount of sponsored effort that faculty should have when they are full-time and part-time, this would be appropriate. It is a mistake to divide A-term and B-term faculty. There is no policy that restricts A-term faculty to no more than an 84 percent sponsored appointment. If working as a faculty member implies that there is a certain, minimum amount of time that faculty need to be available for the rest of the University's mission besides sponsored research, then this should apply year-round. A physical presence requirement should also apply year-round. This situation was made worse when the change to effort certification was made. The old system did not align with the summer so it allowed for more faculty flexibility and decreased the University's audit risk. He suggested reverting to the old certification system or at least requiring annual or semi-annual certification. At the very least, there needs to be strong direction to unit heads to allow off-cycle shifting of sponsored effort funding which would allow non-sponsored funds to pay for part of a faculty member's summer funding.

Pamela Webb replied that there the reason for dealing with this on a summer basis is to be consistent on a national level. The effort focus has been on three month full-time summer salary.

Auditors realize that during the academic year faculty are doing other types of activities so they tend to focus less on this period than the summer period. The University is trying to limit its response to audits and take a long-term view on this issue.

Professor Gonzales said that the review of this policy has been frustrating at times since its content has been a moving target. Therefore she strongly encouraged additional consultation with FCC and that the policy be brought to the Faculty Senate for discussion if not action in the fall.

Q: Some people are on research appointments paid 100 percent for 12 months on federal grants and spend considerable time writing proposals to retain these grants. This policy seems to prohibit this process for summer faculty. Why would this policy not apply to everyone?

A: This situation is also unallowable under existing policy. Anyone writing new grants cannot be paid at that time from an existing grant. Other institutions are considering a percent of effort restriction. The University is taking a longer-term approach and wants to see whether or not this is needed and whether it needs to be more directive. Writing of a competitive grant proposal is not allowed while paid on an existing grant, however a principal investigator is allowed to be paid by the existing grant while writing an extension for that grant.

A senator said that this policy will harm future research since people who are good at writing grants, but are paid full-time by another grant will no longer be able to assist other principal investigators with their applications.

Pamela Webb said that this is not something that the University is imposing but is a federal mandate that needs to be followed. To allow the University policy to change, the federal regulations must be changed first.

Vice President Mulcahy stated that great comments have already been received on this policy, but consultation will continue. The University is being inappropriately chastised for a federal policy that has a nonsensical standard. The University would like to make changes at the national level but the federal regulations treat everyone who receives grants the same and does not see making a distinction for institutions.

28. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Resolution On Progressivity Of Compensation Reductions
Discussion by the Faculty Senate

Resolution on Progressivity of Compensation Reductions

BACKGROUND:

On March 25, 2010, the Faculty Senate voted to accept the President's proposal of temporary reductions in faculty compensation in FY 2011. The same proposal forms part of a more general plan of temporary reductions in compensation for all employee groups of the University, the purpose of which is to assist in covering a projected deficit in the University's FY 2011 budget.

Following the March 25 meeting, the University Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) asked the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), to consider alternative salary-reduction proposals that had been tabled at the Senate meeting on March 25. While the alternative proposals are no longer applicable to the plan for salary reductions in FY 2011, it was felt that they should be discussed by faculty governance bodies in case further temporary reductions should be deemed necessary in future fiscal years.

At its regular meeting on April 13, 2010, SCFA heard from three representatives of the faculty group that had earlier made the alternative proposals. In essence the alternative proposals call for more progressivity in any future plan of temporary salary reductions that may be considered. After discussion, a small sub-committee of SCFA was appointed to draft a resolution for consideration and possible adoption by the whole committee at its meeting on April 27. What follows is the resolution drafted by the subcommittee.

RESOLUTION:

If temporary reductions in employee compensation, whether by means of furloughs or otherwise, should in the future be deemed necessary in order to balance the University's budget, SCFA recommends that such reductions be calculated on a substantially more progressive scale than that which was adopted for the reductions in FY 2011. The committee feels that lower paid employees should be assessed the least or none at all. Conversely, higher and the highest paid employees should be assessed according to a sliding scale that is more equitably proportional to their level of compensation. Additionally, if temporary reductions in compensation should be considered for adoption in future years, the committee urges that alternative models incorporating greater and lesser degrees of progressivity be discussed with appropriate Senate, Faculty, CAPA, Civil Service, and bargaining unit committees sufficiently early to enable substantive participation in the planning and decisional processes.

COMMENT:

Members of SCFA recognize and applaud that some degree of progressivity was indeed incorporated in the plan of temporary pay reductions that has been adopted for FY 2011: specifically, (1) that the salaries of the highest level administrators are due to be assessed at twice the percentage of the level for all other employees; (2) that the assessments of bargaining unit and Civil Service employees will be more than offset by a concurrent raise of 2 percent; and (3) that the assessments of faculty and P&A employees may be partially offset by merit raises from a pool of 1 percent of the salary pool (i.e., 2 % deferred until January 2012). We also recognize and appreciate that the administration consulted with all employee groups (including Senate committees) in developing its reduction plan for FY 2011. It is in the spirit of these same principles of equity and consultation that we have passed this resolution.

Adopted unanimously April 27, 2010

**KATHRYN HANNA, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A senator stated that the resolution that was presented to the Faculty Senate had a sliding scale with a backwards slope in which only the base salary for practitioners is included. Grants should be charged in any future version.

Another senator said that it is hard to argue against a progressive scale, but upon further observation this proposal could have preserve implications. He has shocked to learn that the best compensated employees are bargaining unit employees since they receive a salary increase and a two-percent step increase each year. Faculty are only eligible for a merit increase while they are intrinsically tied to the mission of the University. The administration must find the most economical way to support this mission. People also need to determine if they believe in a merit system for compensation. Within a unit, if the argument is those who have received the greatest raises and who over time have demonstrated the most merit are now the ones who should take the largest percentage hit, then this undermines the belief in a merit system. This proposal is naïve and ill-advised.

A senator disagreed with the previous comment as bargaining unit employees are not as well-paid as faculty and have families and needs. The University has an obligation to all its employees to not penalize some groups by using a flat rate. Progressivity is the most ethical choice.

Another senator said that this year's proposal was a way to share the sacrifice among all employees however higher paid employees should pay a little more. Staff are hard-working and generally underpaid so this proposal is fair and reasonable.

A senator noted that there is no one single way to address financial stringency that works for everyone. To be fair any proposal must provide flexibility to address the inequities and allow some people to sacrifice more. There are also reasons for inequity in pay among classifications due to the work that each group performs.

Another senator said that the University needs to think about what it wants to be and if it wants to continue to be able to recruit high-level talent.

A senator noted that he is not concerned about losing some faculty or some of his pay as there are other attractions to the University and this is a temporary solution.

Another senator thanked SCFA for looking at this issue. The proposal only asks for discussion of potential models before a final decision be made. This appears to the sentiment expressed by many faculty at the March meeting.

A senator also thanked FCC for considering this proposal and SCFA for writing the resolution as it addresses the issues of excellence versus equity. The issue of financial stringency is being experienced nationally.

A motion was then made and seconded to extend the time for debate by seven minutes. This motion was approved.

A senator reminded senators that anyone at the University can request days of non-salary payment. Anyone who feels strongly about this proposal should pursue this option. It would also be helpful to know how many people actually chose this option.

Another senator said that this resolution is meant to address any future issue, not reformulate the decision from this year. It provides for flexibility, reasonable decisions, and consultation if the issue arises without binding the administration into a certain decision. It might be that progressivity of compensation might not be the correct approach at a future time, but the hope is that there will at least be discussion.

A senator noted that no resolution from this body is binding on a future administration, but simply expresses the faculty sentiment.

29. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

Professor Judith Martin said that the Finance and Planning Committee met with the faculty who proposed an audit. The discussion turned into an audit of the consistency of the University's mission rather than strictly finances. SFCP is still working on a way to address this issue.

30. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

31. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**