

2009-10 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MARCH 4, 2010

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2 STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 3

The second meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2009-10 was convened in Coffman Theatre on Thursday, March 4, 2010, at 2:31 p.m., as a joint meeting of the two bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 25 academic professional members, 21 civil service members, 133 faculty/academic professional members, and 33 student members. President Bruininks presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

Faculty Senate

2013-14 Morris Calendar

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: 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 PENDING (President's Policy Committee Review March 3, 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 PENDING (President's Policy Committee Review March 3, 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 PENDING (President's Policy Committee Review March 3, 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 PENDING (President's Policy Committee Review March 3, 2010)
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Interpretation to the Policy on Grading and Transcripts:
Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester
Information for the Faculty Senate

The Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) has issued the following interpretation to the Policy on Grading and Transcripts: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester to provide clarity (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

Grading and Transcripts: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester

...

B. Permanent Grades for Academic Work for Credit

1. The list below identifies the possible permanent grades and associated grade points that can be given for any course for which credit is to be awarded. These grades will be entered on a student's official transcript and, for an A, B, C, or D with permitted pluses and minuses, carry the indicated grade points. (Except for the Law School, the University does not award A+ grades, nor are D- grades permitted). The S grade will not carry grade points but the credits will count toward the student's degree program if allowed by the college, campus, or program.
 - A 4.000 - Represents achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements
 - A- 3.667
 - B+ 3.333
 - B 3.000 - Represents achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements
 - B- 2.667
 - C+ 2.333
 - C 2.000 - Represents achievement that meets the course requirements in every respect
 - C- 1.667
 - D+ 1.333
 - D 1.000 - Represents achievement that is worthy of credit even though it fails to meet fully the course requirements
 - S Represents achievement that is satisfactory, which is equivalent to a C- or better.
2. These definitions apply to grades awarded to students who are not enrolled in graduate, post-baccalaureate, and professional programs, but the grade points are the same no matter the level or course of enrollment.
3. Instructors are permitted to hold graduate and undergraduate students who are in the same class to different standards of academic performance and accomplishment. The syllabus must make clear what the different standards will be for the different groups of students who may be enrolled in the class
4. These are the general University standards. In connection with all symbols of achievement instructors will define for a class, at one of its earliest meetings and as explicitly as possible, the performance that will be necessary to earn each.

C. Permanent Grades for Academic Work for which No Credit is Given

1. There are two permanent grades given for a course for which no credit is to be awarded. These grades will be entered on a student's official transcript.

F “0” Represents failure and signifies that the work was either (1) completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit or (2) was not completed and there was no agreement between the instructor and the student that the student would be awarded an I (see Section D). The F carries 0 grade points and the credits for the course do not count toward any academic degree program. The credit hours for the course will count in the grade point average.

N Represents no credit and signifies that the work was either (1) completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit or (2) was not completed and there was no agreement between the instructor and the student that the student would be awarded an I (see Section C). The N carries no grade points and the credits for the course do not count toward any academic degree program. The credit hours for the course do not count in the grade point average.

...

COMMENT:

It has been observed by a number of people that the "0" preceding the narrative about the F grade is confusing. The Educational Policy Committee has made clerical changes so the policy is clearer.

**CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

**3. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE
Statement on the Teacher-Education Program Proposal
College of Education and Human Development
Information for the Faculty Senate**

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) has taken note of recent events involving the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) response to College of Education and Human Development's (CEHD) faculty members' work in developing a proposal for the Bush Foundation to redesign the teacher-education curriculum.

The Committee takes no position on the merits of the ideas expressed in the task force notes that have been the focus of the events, but it vigorously reaffirms the right of faculty and staff to speak freely on matters related to their professional responsibilities and to the governance of the University. Academic freedom protects faculty and staff who express their best professional views; it is the essence of the creative process.

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

**KAREN MIKSCH, CO-CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

**4. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE
Statement on Faculty and the Budget**

Information for the Faculty Senate

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) met with Vice Provost Arlene Carney on Friday, February 5, to discuss matters related to tenured and probationary faculty appointments and the budget decisions that will need to be made in the near future. Three sections of the tenure code bear directly on the discussions. Vice Provost Carney was emphatic in telling the Committee that the University would follow the requirements of the tenure code, which are transparent and ironclad. (The tenure code can be found at <http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/humanresources/FacultyTenure.pdf>)

1. Section 4.5 of the code governs salary reductions:

4.5 Reduction Or Postponement Of Compensation. If the University or a collegiate unit is faced with financial stringency that does not amount to a fiscal emergency, the president may propose a temporary reduction or postponement in compensation to be allocated to faculty in accordance with a mathematical formula or similar device. If approved by the Faculty Senate or the appropriate collegiate assembly, respectively, and the Board of Regents, the recurring salary of all faculty members in the University or in the designated collegiate units shall be reduced temporarily in accordance with the formula or device. The reduction may not continue for longer than two years, unless renewed by the same procedure. [Emphasis added.]

Vice Provost Carney pointed out that discussions or implementations of furloughs are covered by Section 4.5. Any institution-wide faculty furloughs (for faculty not in a bargaining unit) will need approval by the Faculty Senate. Both Professor Miksch and Vice Provost Carney noted that Vice President Carrier promised that any furlough proposal would be brought to the Committee on Faculty Affairs for discussion as well.

2. Vice Provost Carney reminded the Committee that the University cannot terminate or lay off tenured or probationary faculty without invoking the fiscal-emergency language of Section 11. The University is nowhere near invoking Section 11 and no one is discussing implementation of a "fiscal emergency."
3. Section 7a of the tenure code deals with post-tenure review. It should be clearly understood that neither the Provost nor any other central officer has anything to do with initiating post-tenure review. It must be initiated in a department: A department chair/head and an elected faculty committee must look at a faculty member's record and agree that the performance falls below the department's goals and expectations. If the chair/head and the elected committee agree, a letter goes to the faculty member setting out a plan and allowing at least a year to complete it. After that, if the department chair and elected faculty committee agree the person did not meet the goals and expectations, they may jointly ask the dean for special peer review, which requires appointment of a special 5-member faculty committee, one selected by the faculty member and four by the unit. This process has no involvement of the Provost or central administrators (unless the initial unit is also a college, such as the Law School, and the dean's special review is done by the Provost).

Any claim that the central or collegiate administrations are going to begin using post-tenure review more often or in summary fashion to remove tenured faculty is false, as that is not permitted by the tenure code. The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee has been reassured that the intent of requiring units to spell out the standards for post-tenure review is an attempt to protect faculty members from vague standards, to make the

standards more transparent, and to comply with the due-process provisions of Section 7a of the tenure code.

Anyone who has questions about these provisions of the tenure code should feel free to contact either of the co-chairs of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, Professors Barbara Elliott (belliottd@umn.edu) or Karen Miksch (miksc001@umn.edu).

Adopted unanimously February 8, 2010. This statement has been endorsed by Professors Marti Hope Gonzales and Michael Oakes, chair and vice chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee.

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

**KAREN MIKSCH, CO-CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

**5. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE
Regents Policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
Information for the Faculty Senate**

Dear Provost Sullivan,

The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) has a question for your consideration regarding the Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy adopted by the Board of Regents.

Professor Tom Clayton (with Professor Carol Chomsky's assistance) has recognized that there is a phrase in the statement that needs to be moved within the statement, in order to clearly state the intent of the policy. At the February 5, 2010 meeting, AF&T unanimously endorsed the change.

The current wording is:

"Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the University."

Professor Clayton has pointed out that as written, the phrase "without institutional discipline or restraint" syntactically applies only to "to speak or write." What inadvertently happened was that the text was disambiguated in the wrong direction. After some exchange between Professor Clayton and Chomsky, they are recommending to this Committee the following language:

"Academic freedom is the freedom without institutional discipline or restraint to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the University."

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

**KAREN MIKSCH, CO-CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

6. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Memorandum on FY2011 Budget Framework
Information for the Faculty Senate

February 8, 2010

MEMORANDUM

To: President Robert Bruininks

From: Russell V. Luepker for the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning

Re: FY 2011 Framework Budget Discussion

We recently met with Vice President Pfitzenreuter to discuss the budget proposals for FY11. The expected next round of State budget cuts deserves serious attention from all in the University community. The Committee offers a number of observations on information and data that it has been provided.

First, there are overarching themes, including:

1. It is apparent that we are in a severe and worsening fiscal crisis. Something has to be done. We are not sure everyone believes this yet or understands the likely impact.
2. The proposals are based on additional "across the board" cuts and is for only one year, FY 11. This is the usual response to a fiscal crisis. A bold, transparent strategic plan, which provides a vision and informs decisions, is not apparent. Such a plan will be essential if we are to face the FY 12 crisis and future cutbacks. The long-range problem was well described in the Financing the Future report. A strategic plan needs articulation and must be initiated soon.
3. Major elements in the draft budget proposal move many budget decisions from the schools and colleges back to central administration. This reverses the goals of the budget model over the last several years and takes responsibility away from the schools and colleges, once again encouraging dependency on central administration.
4. The draft plan that was discussed needs a summary table of the costs and revenues to assess the whole picture. It is not possible to ascertain this from the handout.

With regard to specific items:

1. Pay raises: A 2% raise in pay is more symbolic than economically substantive. Employees will appreciate the symbolism. However, the public and political perception of this may be that the University has enough money to absorb State cuts and still give pay raises.
2. Twenty-seven pay periods: This calendar artifact should be handled directly with 27 payments where applicable: all should be treated equitably, but calculating paychecks may differ between hourly-wage and salaried employees. This issue needs to be factored into future budgets. Few people understand the calendar problem other than knowing a solution wasn't planned. It shouldn't happen again.

3. Tuition increase: It is clear that the burden will increasingly fall on individual students and their families. It also appears the added money will be controlled by central administration rather than the schools and colleges. The increases will have to be used to offset state budget cuts and therefore will not be available for instructional purposes.
4. Initiatives pool: It is not apparent how we can create any new initiatives in the coming period. Some of this money appears targeted to fill holes that undoubtedly will occur but the criteria for these subsidies are not apparent. It sounds like discretionary money for central administration. A wise use of this money might be to invest in one-time projects that will produce financial benefits or to distribute part of the pool to colleges to invest in local priorities.
5. Furloughs: This is the most controversial topic for employees. In essence, two unpaid weeks is a 3.8% pay cut. Making it work will be problematic, especially given the diversity of funding sources and appointment terms for faculty, staff, and student employees. The Committee needs more details and further consultation, but the details must be worked out quickly because employees are already raising concerns due to the vagueness of the idea and lack of communication.
6. Overall givebacks of 2.75%: How will those decisions on the distribution of cuts among the various units be made and will the criteria be transparent? The term "supporting the institutional framework" is obscure. The bottom line of this is that staff will lose jobs.
7. Financial aid: In recent years, as state financial support has waned and tuition increases have been necessary to cover the resulting revenue loss, the University has significantly expanded its commitment to need-based financial aid to lower- and middle-income students. The cost of this aid is a substantial part of the undergraduate cost pool and reduces the efficacy of these tuition increases as corresponding increases in aid are needed. It also reduces discretionary revenue from tuition increases. Given the likelihood of sustained and significant reductions in state support, the Committee feels that it is important for the University community to discuss the nature and level of the University's financial aid commitment and how that commitment relates to the mission of the University.
8. Cost pools: A variety of comments were made about cost pools. It is apparent that some will increase, as will the overall total. It is apparent that the cost pools exceed the State subsidy for a growing number of schools and colleges. Cost-pool increases are an additional budget cut to the units, on top of the 2.75%. The Committee needs greater clarity about the relationship of the cost pools to the academic mission.

The Faculty Consultative Committee voted unanimously to endorse this memo.

cc: Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan
Senior Vice President Frank Cerra
Senior Vice President Robert Jones
Vice President Kathryn Brown
The Faculty Consultative Committee

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

7. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Lucille P. Caldecott
Staff
Food Science and Nutrition
1923 – 2009

Norma Campbell
Staff
Student Support Services– University of Minnesota Duluth
1934 – 2009

Betty Callahan
Staff
Addressing and Mailing
1925 – 2009

Joan E. Cardwell
Staff
University Bookstore
1940 – 2010

James A. Carruthers
Professor
Electrical Engineering
1921 – 2009

Sharon Desborough
Professor
Horticultural Sciences
1935 – 2010

John D. Donker
Professor
Animal Science
1920 – 2010

Ellen C. Egan
Professor
Nursing
1935 – 2009

Caesar Farah
Professor
History
1929 – 2009

David L. Ghere
Professor
Postsecondary Teaching and Learning
1950 – 2010

Griselda F. Hanlon

Professor
Veterinary Teaching Hospital
1922 – 2010

Clarence M. Hull
Staff
Maintenance and Locksmith Shop
1932 – 2009

Robert D. James
Staff
Purchasing and Materials Management
1934 – 2010

Cynthia S. Kisse
Staff
Diagnostic/Biological Sciences
1952 – 2009

Everett L. Kropp
Staff
Plant Service – University of Minnesota Crookston
1929 – 2009

Elaine C. Larson
Staff
Food Services
1927 – 2009

Warren S. Loud
Professor
Mathematics
1921 – 2010

Jill Mullaney
Staff
Office of Information Technology
1971 – 2010

Ardis H. Nier
Staff
Educational Administration
1921 – 2009

Charles M. Nolte
Professor
Theatre Arts and Dance
1923 – 2010

Petra Ostrom
Staff
Human Resources
1935 – 2010

Mabel M. Perling
Staff
Mineral Resource Research Center
1922 – 2010

William Ranz
Professor
Chemical Engineering
1922 – 2009

Theresa S. Roesler
Staff
University of Minnesota Waseca
1930 – 2009

Alan G. Rose
Professor
Lab Medicine and Pathology
1940 – 2009

Shirley Ruedebusch
Staff
University of Minnesota Extension
1933 – 2010

Norman L. Schulz
Professor
Extension Natural Resources
1918 – 2010

Gordon W. Sund
Staff
Parking Maintenance
1936 – 2009

William R. Wilebski
Staff
Facilities Management
1954 – 2010

STUDENTS

Kevin J. Buchman
College of Education and Human Development

Peter Fredin
Carlson School of Management

Lowell Lutter
College of Continuing Education

Nick Owens
Institute of Technology

8. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that the committee has met twice since her last report. Discussions have focused on current and future fiscal challenges and ways to increase efficiencies and reduce the cost of doing business. For example, a lengthy discussion focused on the need to use physical space more efficiently. Among the options provided by the Finance and Planning Committee and discussed by SCC were making more efficient use of existing classrooms by expanding their use beyond the peak hours of 10 am to 3 pm and providing incentives to use classrooms at other times, decommissioning or tearing down buildings that have outlived their usefulness, and saving energy costs by turning out non-essential lights, reducing heating and air conditioning, and planning for energy-efficiency in new buildings.

These changes demonstrate careful stewardship of scarce environmental resources. The SCC, along with other Senate committees, is eager to work with the Vice President for University Services to remove some impediments to these changes, such as making it easier to schedule classrooms, and develop principles to guide future energy usage.

SCC has also discussed general budgetary concerns and specific strategies for managing the fiscal challenges immediately ahead. What struck her most during these discussions was the willingness of faculty, staff, and students to share in the pain. For example, many student members of SCC seemed resigned to next year's tuition increase, although such increases cannot occur in perpetuity. The concern from the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) was finding ways to protect staff positions, including foregoing payment of the 27th pay period. Civil Service members were also committed to preserving as many jobs as possible. Given that some positions will be consolidated in the years ahead, it is essential to address issues of seniority and to ensure that bargaining-unit records related to length of service are well-maintained and consulted.

The biggest challenge is chronic uncertainty. In the coming weeks SCC hopes to work with administrators to minimize this uncertainty as communication is made to the University community as soon as possible.

9. MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 3, 2009 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/091203sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**10. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Amendment to the Procedure on Hiring Senior Administrators:
Senate Committee Involvement (Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester)
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following amendment to the Procedure on Hiring Senior Administrators: Senate Committee Involvement (Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester):

PROCEDURE

**HIRING SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS: SENATE COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT
(TWIN CITIES, MORRIS, ROCHESTER)**

Related Policy: Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and Academic Professional and Administrative Employees

When hiring senior administrators, the appointing authority will involve Senate committees in forming search committees and in interviewing finalists.*

Administrative Positions Covered and Associated Senate Committees

A. The following list specifies the positions to which this process applies and the Senate committees that are to be involved in the search process.

President**	Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC)
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost	FCC, SSCC, Educational Policy
Senior Vice President for the Academic Health Center	FCC, SSCC
Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration	FCC, SSCC
Vice President for Research	FCC, Research
Vice President and Chief Financial Officer	FCC, SSCC, Finance and Planning
Vice President for University Relations	FCC, SSCC
Vice President and Chief of Staff	FCC, SSCC
Vice President and Chief Information Officer	FCC, SSCC, Information Technologies, Library
Vice President for Human Resources	FCC, Faculty Affairs
Vice President for Equity and Diversity	FCC, SSCC, Equity, Access, and Diversity
Vice President for University Services	FCC, SSCC, Finance and Planning
Chancellor (not Crookston or Duluth)	FCC, SSCC
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education	FCC, GAPSA, Educational Policy, Research
Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education	FCC, SSCC, Educational Policy
Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs	FCC, Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom and Tenure
Vice Provost for Student Affairs	Student Affairs
Assistant/Associate Vice President,	Research

Sponsored Projects Administration	
Associate Vice President Audits	Finance and Planning
General Counsel	FCC, SSCC, Judicial
University Librarian	Library
Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action	FCC, SSCC, Equity, Access, and Diversity
President and CEO, University of Minnesota Foundation	FCC, Finance and Planning
Director, Intercollegiate Athletics (Twin Cities campus)	FCC, SSCC, Advisory Committee on Athletics, Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics

B. For any other senior administrator positions for which a search committee will be established, the appointing authority should inform the chairs of FCC and SSCC of the pending search and provide opportunity for the committees to participate as described if they choose to do so.

Senate Committee Participation in the Appointment of Search Committees

Members and chairs of search committees for the specified positions will be chosen by the appointing authority after consultation with appropriate Senate committees as described in this section.

- A. The appointing authority will ask the chairs of the specified committees to submit, by a specified date, nominations of faculty members or students, as appropriate, to serve on the search committee. Nominees need not be members of the specified committee. The number of individuals nominated should be greater than the number of faculty members or students expected to serve on the search committee (perhaps twice as many), in order to provide the appointing authority flexibility in the choices. The appointing authority will select the student and faculty members of the search committee from among those nominated or will explain any deviation to the Senate committee. The relevant Senate committee(s) may nominate additional individuals (who are not faculty or students) for the appointing authority to consider for search committee membership.
- B. The Senate committee(s) will ordinarily be given at least two weeks notice of the need for nominees to the search committee.
- C. If the Senate committees are unable to provide nominations by the date specified, the appointment authority may appoint the search committee without Senate committee consultation.

Senate Committee Participation in Interviews of Finalists

Members of the specified Senate committees will be given an opportunity to attend an interview with each finalist. Interviews with committees will be scheduled irrespective of the scope of the search (full, limited, or non-competitive appointment); in the case of non-competitive appointments, the committee will be given the opportunity to interview the finalist before the position is offered to the finalist.

Interviews may be arranged for committee members alone or in conjunction with others, but will be separate from any public presentation by the finalist. When more than one committee is appropriately involved in finalist interviews, a joint session may be scheduled.

The Senate committee will be supplied, in advance of the interview, copies of the position description and the curriculum vita of each finalist.

The Senate committee will provide its comments as quickly as possible to the appointing authority. The committee's views will be submitted as a single document, prepared by the chair or his or her designee, and may include minority views. Committee members may also submit individual comments.

It is understood that committee interviews, especially during the summer or when scheduled on short notice, may involve less than a majority of committee members and there may not be consistent representation for all the finalists for the position. The hiring process should not be slowed or hindered by the possible unavailability of committee members.

If the FCC or SSCC determines that Senate Committees should participate in interviews with finalists, FCC or SSCC may delegate responsibility for participating in interviews to other committees of the Senate. FCC may invite other faculty members, including past members of FCC, to participate in the interview process. SSCC may designate student representatives other than SSCC members to participate in the interview process. FCC and SSCC may also designate additional committees to participate in any interviews.

*In the parlance of the categorization of administrative appointees at the time this protocol is written, it covers class numbers 9301-9305, 9314, 9316, 9321-9328, and a few of the individuals in class 9330.

**The selection of the University President is the legal responsibility of the Board of Regents and the search committee for this office is drawn from the members of the Board. This committee has customarily involved the Senate Consultative Committee in the search, either relying on SCC to act as a search advisory committee or asking SCC to appoint such an advisory committee. It is presumed that this practice will continue.

ORIGINAL PROTOCOL:

Protocol for Senate Committee Involvement in Central Administrator Searches

I. Formation of Search Committees

Search committees are typically established to fill major University central administrative positions. The positions to which this section of the protocol is addressed include the following:*

- President**
- Executive Vice President and Provost
- Senior Vice President
- Vice President
- Associate/Assistant Vice President
- Chancellor
- Provost
- Associate/Assistant Provost
- Vice Provost
- Associate/Assistant Vice Provost
- Dean of the Graduate School
- General Counsel
- University Librarian
- Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action
- Director, Intercollegiate Athletics (Twin Cities campus)

Members of search committees for these positions, and their chairs, shall be chosen by the appointing authority after consultation with appropriate Senate committees, as follows.

The appointing authority shall ask the Faculty Consultative Committee and Student Senate Consultative Committee, or other appropriate committee (as set out in Section III of this protocol) to submit, by a specified date, names of the faculty and students who should serve on the search committee. The number of individuals nominated should be greater than the number who will serve on the search committee (perhaps twice as large), in order to allow for those who decline to serve and to provide the appointing authority some flexibility in the choices. The appointing authority will select the search committee from among those individuals or will explain to the Senate committee why the search committee membership deviated from the list of individuals nominated. The Faculty and Student Senate Consultative Committees may also identify the names of other individuals (who are not faculty or students) who the appointing authority may wish to consider selecting for search committee membership.

If the Senate committees are unable to provide names to the appointing authority by the date specified, he or she may proceed to appoint the search committee without Senate committee consultation. It is assumed the Senate committee would be given at least two weeks notice of the need for nominees to the search committee.

The Faculty Consultative Committee and the President or other administrator may agree that identification of faculty members for other administrator search committees is appropriate; this protocol should also be followed in such instances. The same is true for the Student Senate Consultative Committee.

II. Committee Responsibility for Interviews

The following Senate committees will be given the opportunity to participate in nomination of search committee members and in interviews of candidates for the positions noted, in accord with the provisions of Section III of this protocol. Interviews with committees will be scheduled irrespective of the scope of the search (full, limited, or non-competitive appointment); in the case of non-competitive appointments, the committee will be given the opportunity to interview the candidate before the position has been offered to the candidate.

Faculty Consultative:	President; all vice presidencies (executive, senior, and those without preceding adjective); Provost; Dean of the Graduate School; Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; the General Counsel; Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action; Chancellors; Directors of Athletics [Twin Cities campus]; others as the President may request
Student Senate Consultative:	President; all vice presidencies (executive, senior, and those without preceding adjective); Provost; Dean of the Graduate School; Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; the General Counsel; Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action; Chancellors; Directors of Athletics [Twin Cities campus]; others as the President may request
Information Technologies:	Chief Information Officer; University Librarian
Educational Policy:	Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; Dean of the Graduate School
Faculty Affairs:	Vice president for human resources

Finance and Planning:	Vice President for Finance; associate/assistant vice presidents in Budget and Finance; Controller
Advisory Committee on Athletics:	Director of Athletics [Twin Cities campus]
Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics:	Director of Athletics [Twin Cities campus]
Judicial Committee:	General Counsel
Library:	University Librarian; Chief Information Officer
Research:	Vice President for Research; Dean of the Graduate School; Assistant/associate vice president, Sponsored Projects Administration
Student Affairs:	Vice Provost for Student Affairs

Note: The Faculty Consultative Committee may draw on former FCC members to participate in the interviewing process. The Student Senate Consultative Committee may designate student representatives (other than members of the SSCC) to participate in the interview process.

III. Interviewing Protocol, Candidates for Administrative Positions with Senate Committees

It is understood that committee interviews, especially during the summer or when scheduled on short notice, may not involve a majority of committee members or consistent representation for several candidates. It is not the intent of this protocol that the hiring process be slowed or hindered by the possible unavailability of committee members. The committee interviews are scheduled to give committee members the opportunity [*underlined in original*] to participate in the search process; if they are unavailable or do not attend, the hiring process should nonetheless go forward.

1. The committee will be supplied, in advance of the interview, copies of the position description and the curriculum vitae of each candidate.
2. The committee will assemble and discuss, in advance of the arrival of the candidate, how it wishes to conduct the interview.
3. The candidate will meet with the committee.
4. The candidate will depart; the committee will then meet in closed session to discuss the candidate(s) and to decide upon its comments or recommendation to the appointing authority.
5. These comments or recommendation, including any minority or dissenting views, will be submitted as quickly as possible to the appointing authority. The committee's views (with minority or dissenting views) will be submitted as a single document, prepared by the chair or his or her designee, rather than as individual responses to the appointing authority.
6. The Faculty Consultative Committee and the President or other administrators may determine that faculty participation in interviews with candidates for other positions is desirable; FCC may delegate responsibility for participating in such interviews to other committees of the Senate or the Assembly. FCC may also designate additional committees or individual faculty members to participate in any interviews. The same is true for the Student Senate Consultative Committee.
7. When more than one committee is appropriately involved in candidate interviews, the committees may schedule a joint session.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The protocol was adopted by the Senate on February 18, 1993, as part of a consent package, without debate, and approved by the administration on April 26, 1993.

Revised Fall, 1998, to reflect changes in the University's administrative organization and titles of senior officers.

*In the parlance of the categorization of administrative appointees at the time this protocol is written, it covers class numbers 9301-9305, 9314, 9316, 9321-9328, and a few of the individuals in class 9330.

**The selection of the University President is the legal responsibility of the Board of Regents and the search committee for this office is drawn from the members of the Board. This committee has customarily involved the Senate Consultative Committee in the search, either relying on SCC to act as a search advisory committee or asking SCC to appoint such an advisory committee. It is presumed that this practice would continue.

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

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**11. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Budget Discussion**

President Bruininks said that issues of the University's budget are first and foremost and occupying time for all administrators of state-funded agencies in light of the economic recession. Currently the University is dealing with the cumulative impact of three separate decisions – the first budget reduction, a \$50 million unallotment, and another \$36 million unallotment – which amount to a \$226 million state budget challenge in the next fiscal year. This is in addition to stagnant allocations to the University for the last 30 years once they are adjusted for inflation. This is the second time in this decade that the University has taken significant cuts. This is not business as usual but it is referred to as the "new normal." It is something that will be difficult to cope with and address in the next few years.

He reminded senators of core principles in light of various options. First, the University needs to keep advancing its quality and competitiveness through targeted and timely reductions and investments in mission-critical academic and capital priorities. The University is a human-capital-intensive organization that depends on talented people every day for its survival. A second core principle is to retain the talented workforce of the University through compensation, support, and retention. Continued financial access and affordability for students is another core principle that has been supported by the Regents. In the last several years the University has gone from the bottom of student financial support among peers to a much more respectable level by doubling scholarships. Internal reallocation of internal finances must continue as well. Next, the University needs to continue to grow and stabilize revenues. The University cannot give up on state support, because it requires \$22 in private funds to replace every \$1 of state support. The University needs to better leverage its assets and grow revenue from new sources, such as educational programming. Emphasis has also been placed on reducing and controlling costs while taking advantage of one-time funding from the federal stimulus package.

It is quite clear that there will not be much help from the state in the near term and the outlook for the next biennium does not appear much brighter. The state has a problem of almost \$5

billion and there are no solutions being proposed. Every unit of the University is being asked to undertake a searching examination of what can be strengthened, maintained, reduced, consolidated, or terminated. This is a long-term conversation.

President Bruininks said that he is often asked what the plan is and what the solution is. When the cuts are this pervasive, there is no single plan or solution. There will continue to be communication on these issues. These same issues are also being faced by other institutions in the Big Ten.

Human capital is the largest cost driver at the University. Cost savings measures in this arena have included a freeze on compensation, restructuring of benefits to push more costs to employees, restructuring health-care plans to slow their growth, reducing the workforce in planned ways through a voluntary retirement program, freezing new hires (including 150 faculty positions), reducing offices, consolidating financial offices in Morrill Hall and senior officers in the Academic Health Center, and consolidating the extension offices.

Facilities are a second large part of the University's budget. Instead of new buildings, remodeling and restoration have been priorities, including saving \$60 million in costs by keeping projects on budget and on schedule. The University is also requesting additional HEAPR funding from the state because the University does not pay debt on these funds. Energy savings through small changes have also saved \$2 million in the last year and will continue next year.

The third cost-driver is technology. A six-year capital plan is being developed for this area and 50 units will be clustered in the system to save on server, software, and support costs.

Additional ways to save or raise revenue include a purchasing and procurement initiative, increased enrollment, e-learning, and new research grants and contracts.

The main part of today's conversation is the proposed compensation plan. In addition to deep budget cuts for next year, federal regulations require fringe benefit rates be readjusted every three years, which will be increasing by \$10 million, there is a two percent compensation increase, and every 11 years there is a 27th pay period as part of biweekly payroll, which amounts to \$41 million. The University thought that it might not have to pay this amount, but the legal opinion is that it is a grievable matter that the University would likely lose. There was also a salary freeze this year and the outlook for FY12-13 will also have challenges when addressing compensation.

The budget challenge is about \$132 million - \$32 million for compensation increases, \$27 million for financial aid and need-based financial aid for students, \$41 million is tied to the 27 pay period, and \$32 million stems from the unallotment.

President Bruininks said that his proposal was released earlier this week. The compensation plan includes a two percent pay increase in July 2010, with a deferred increase to faculty and academic professionals until January 2011, a three-day unpaid furlough for all employees between Christmas and New Years in December 2010, three additional unpaid furlough days for administrators, and up to a total of 10 unpaid, voluntary furlough days for all employees. This plan is a modest shared sacrifice for everyone while preserving the workforce.

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that the committee has decided to convene the Faculty Senate on March 25 to take a vote on reductions in faculty compensation, as required by the tenure vote. All senators will be welcome but only faculty senators will vote. She apologized for the late notice of this special meeting, but noted that the April 1 meeting is reserved for the President's State of the University Address.

A senator said that he appreciates the amount of communication and the timeline for this proposal. In talking with colleagues, he reported, they express a willingness for shared sacrifice, but there is an issue of inequity between 9-month and 12-month faculty. It is being interpreted that a 9-month faculty member will have a 1.5 percent decrease in pay for the next year while 12-month faculty will see a 1.2 percent decrease and a 3.8 percent increase for a net increase of 2.6 percent. This is not shared sacrifice. When looking at other institutions, there is a split on what has been done for people with annual appointments. While there is general consensus that hourly employees should be paid, employees on annual appointments should be paid the annual amount and not create an artificial financial crisis.

Another senator stated that the University would not exist without its faculty and students. The administration is bloated and not essential. The University has adopted a corporation model. When looking at 2008-09 salaries for University and state employees for anyone with a title including president, the total compensation was over \$9 million, which is an average of over \$221,000 per employee. In French institutions, the president and dean are elected by the faculty and served fixed four-year terms while continuing to teach. It is necessary for the University to open its books to an independent auditor prior to seeking additional sacrifices from faculty, staff, and students.

A senator was astonished to find that in this year's DFL resolution package there was no resolution in support of the University. The public perception is weak and the state does not understand the contribution that the University makes to the prosperity of the region. His college is now flirting with the idea of closing entire departments, some of which are unique to the state and region or the only PhD degree-granting program in many areas. While the University must be frugal, it must reach out to the members of the public and let them know that the University is also suffering, which will continue to affect the state.

Another senator said that he will not be here on March 25, but if he were he would happily vote for the proposal and share in the sacrifice. There are two themes that are being discussed – increased efficiency and productivity by faculty and the centrality of programs. There are three camps of faculty at the University – those who know that the financial problem is not going away, those who think it is a ploy by the administration to cut things they do not like, and those who have their heads in the sand. The first group is correct, it is not going away, but he has yet to see clear, well-defined criteria for what it means to be central to the mission and what it means for faculty to be productive. Is the uniqueness of a department a criterion? More direction and difficult conversations will be needed to define priorities, otherwise everyone will make a case for his or her own department.

A senator said that in small departments, there will be pressure on employees to take additional voluntary furlough days to retain a position in the department.

Another senator questioned why profit-generating hourly employees are included in this proposal and will they be required to take the mandatory furlough days.

Q: Can employees designate where savings go when taking voluntary furlough days?

Q: The rationale for the two percent compensation increase is that without an increase there would be demoralization. How broadly have people been consulted on this issue, as many faculty seem willing to forego this increase? What are the implications for how this compensation increase is viewed by the state? Have faculty been asked to make this sacrifice?

A senator said that faculty will be asked to permit the declaration of financial stringency in this instance to permit a furlough. However, faculty will not have enough information to make this

decision. The budget is not transparent and one cannot tell how the University spends most of its resources. Faculty also do not know what else such consent will authorize the administration to do within the next two years. She asked for an audit of University finances and that all budget information be made publicly available in a transparent fashion. Then a decision can be made on financial stringency. A sliding scale for pay reductions should also be proposed.

Q: Mandatory furlough days will affect employee paychecks. Has it been decided if this decrease will be in one paycheck or spread throughout the year?

A senator said that a mandatory furlough will not affect faculty productivity as most faculty will continue to work during this period. The furlough then amounts to a tax on faculty.

Another senator said that he was troubled by the lack of information, transparency in the budget, and knowledge of how the University works and funds are spent. If faculty are to provide their consent, they need information to make an informed decision. The one slide provided by the administration does not help faculty understand where money is being spent and allow helpful input. The March 25 meeting appears to be hastily called, as this type of information will not be available by this date or allow for review to determine a wise decision. There is concern that there is not meaningful faculty participation and consultation with faculty, but instead a model of consideration and consent. How can there be meaningful faculty participation so that ideas are generated and the administration is charged with their implementation?

A senator asked for costs of alternate strategies that were considered and discarded by the administration.

Another senator said that as a member of the Finance and Planning Committee, these issues have been discussed by the committee for years in tremendous detail. He cannot explain the entire budget structure in today's meeting, but the simple answer is that state funds are allocated to the colleges. When there are cuts from the state, there is less funding to pay salaries. He strongly encouraged senators to read the minutes of the committee and learn that the initial proposals have evolved and are not the ones being presented today. He asked the senators to trust the work of the committees.

A senator asked for a show of hands from senators who know someone who has been laid off. These proposals are a way to have fewer hands raised in the future. When the proposal was presented to her civil service colleagues, there was an agreement that it was reasonable.

Another senator said that the University is focusing more on research and discovery and spending less time reaching out to potential students. Minnesota high school graduates should not question where they want to attend college. She is also willing to give up three days of pay.

A senator asked that employees be asked to announce voluntary furlough days in advance of any budget decisions affecting personnel.

Another senator said that just because a Senate committee discussed this issue with the administration, that does not suffice to provide the faculty at large, much less the public, with the necessary information or participation in these decisions. With regard to where the money goes, only a transparent, independent audit can guarantee this information. The administration should be held accountable as it spends public dollars.

A senator said that he appreciates the give and take from administrators with members of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA). Some of his colleagues face December 31 deadlines which would make these furlough days tricky, but responses to him appreciate the information and feel that this is a fair solution.

Q: What does it mean to close campus during the furlough days? Will there be access to labs, offices, and email?

Q: Is the March 25 proposal just being presented to vote in favor or opposed or will amendments be allowed?

Q: Nationally, corporations are foregoing compensation increases for their executives. Has this approach been considered?

Another senator said that it is hard to ask faculty and staff to make a sacrifice when answers to fundamental questions will not be provided for another few weeks. A deadline for this information would be courteous.

Vice President Carol Carrier said that Human Resources has compiled a large set of questions and answers, including a large set from Sponsored Projects Administration, on the implications of furloughs and closing on grant activity. These responses have been carefully researched and included contact with funding agencies and other institutions. This document will be provided online shortly and will continue to be updated.

A senator said that she shares the concern for governance and transparency, however, she has a problem of conscience, as the University is competing for funding with agencies that work with homeless children. Many faculty and staff in her college may not be comfortable with any compensation increases for faculty. The furlough seems like a reasonable proposition, but she does not agree with the 27th pay period for annual appointments.

Another senator said that he is willing to give back three days of pay, but on March 25 will faculty be asked to vote for financial exigency rather than stringency and carry other contractual issues.

A senator reminded senators that the President characterized the 27th pay period as payment instead of a 10 day furlough. It is not extra pay.

Another senator said that students will face a 7.5 percent tuition increase next year. She finds it heartening that faculty are willing to forego a two percent compensation increase to keep tuition increases at this rate.

A senator said that some businesses are allowing staff to take a reduced appointment rather than cut staff and that she would like to see this discussed for the University.

Vice Chair Chomsky said that answers will be provided to these questions prior to the vote on March 25. The process in the tenure code allows the Faculty Senate to approve or reject the administration's proposal.

12. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks said that more information will be made available and alternatives will continue to be explored. Transparency will be addressed in future communications. For the students, he said that last year's budget plan included a likely 7.5 percent tuition increase. At that time it was also indicated that the University has an agreement with the legislature to buy down tuition for Minnesota residents so they will only have a 4.4 percent increase. With the Promise Scholarship, many students saw a decrease in costs this year and next. With tuition a larger part of the University's budget, a strategy has been developed to keep the University

accessible and affordable. In the last nine years, the net yearly increase was three percent due to need-based scholarships and other state and federal support.

He thanked senators for the great conversation today and looked forward to the discussion on March 25. Today's comments will be taken into consideration when determining a plan that moves the University forward while being fair and equitable to all employees. With regard to the voluntary furlough days, these savings will stay in the department. A vote by the Faculty Senate on March 25 does not declare financial exigency or affect the contractual arrangement between the University and its faculty. It will simply ask for a one-time reduction in base salary. Any future reductions would need to come back to the Faculty Senate for another vote.

In closing he thanked the University community for their thoughtful comments, cards, and well wishes.

13. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

NONE

14. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

15. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

16. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 4:08 pm.

17. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that this committee has met weekly and that she and the Vice Chair, Professor J. Michael Oakes, have continued to meet regularly with administrators to discuss faculty concerns and effective responses.

The first concern is the implications of the immediate fiscal challenges and the ways to address them for this year and the next biennium. With recent communications from the President and FCC minutes, options have been described. Faculty and staff are becoming increasingly aware of the magnitude of the sacrifices that lie ahead. The conversations with administrators have been both constructive and candid as members of the FCC have shared their opinions on the prospect of furloughs, the 27th pay period, and the two percent compensation increase.

As the shape of higher education continues to evolve, and the University contemplates the scope of its mission as a land-grant institution, a number of Senate committees have repeatedly expressed concerns that attention to the immediate fiscal concerns not preclude attention to the very difficult and complex decisions inherent to long-range planning. Questions on the scope of

the mission are being asked and the FCC will remain an active participant in this deliberative process.

Big changes and sacrifices do lie ahead. A moving target at the legislature makes it extremely difficult to provide the University with decisions that are both timely and accurate. Still, FCC remains committed to working with administrators to provide timely and accurate information designed to reduce the chronic uncertainty that remains a source of stress and distraction for everyone. After today's discussion, FCC will work with administrators to gather the questions, find answers, and post them on the web.

Representatives from FCC have also met with Board of Regents Chair Allen and Regent Simmons to discuss the search for the next President. FCC indicated that it hopes for and expects meaningful faculty representation on the search-advisory committee. A list of attributes and characteristics in the next president was also shared. FCC is working on a statement articulating the desirable attributes being sought.

Professor Gonzales then apologized for the slip in communication regarding the special March 25 Faculty Senate meeting. She then turned to the complexities of that meeting. The tenure code and the Faculty Senate Constitution are not in alignment. Section 4.5 of the tenure code provides for a vote of the Faculty Senate to endorse proposals for compensation changes for term and regular faculty. While the tenure code does not address faculty-like academic professionals, there are members of this class who are members of the Faculty Senate who would have a vote. Since there is not time to align the tenure code with the Faculty Senate Constitution, what is being proposed is two separate votes on March 25 – one from regular faculty and another vote with regular faculty and faculty-like academic professionals.

18. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE

Professor Martin Sampson, one of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons, said that there are two issues from the legislature, the bonding bill and the FY11 budget. There has been discussion that the state's bonding bill cannot exceed three percent of the state's expenditures, but this limit is gone this year. The Governor's Office revised the criteria, which allow the maximum to be close to \$1.5 billion, more than is being proposed by anyone. The Governor has insisted that the maximum bill be \$750 million. The legislature passed a \$1-billion bill and then withheld it to avoid a veto while discussions are held with the Governor. All of the University's items are in the bonding bill, although there is a reduced amount for HEAPR funds, \$55 million instead of \$100 million, and the Physics and Nanotechnology building only received planning funds instead of the full request. The discussion so far is that the Governor is unhappy with the amount allocated to MnSCU but is firm on some support for the University.

In regard to FY11, which begins in July, a projected state budget shortfall of \$1.2 billion is now closer to \$1 billion. The legislature is working on a proposal and the Governor has already announced his proposal, which would cut \$36 million from the University. This is the maximum amount permitted under the federal stimulus legislation. At a hearing last week the President made a moving presentation on the realities that the state is much different without the contributions of the University. The Chair of the House Higher Education Committee said that he refuses to move forward on a bill that would cut the University by \$36 million, but the reality is that it will likely take place.

19. NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE TWIN CITIES MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Slate of Candidates

Action by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation and UMD Faculty Senators

MOTION:

To approve the following six names to stand for election to the Faculty Consultative Committee, from which one of each pair are to be elected by the Twin Cities and non-represented UMD faculty for a term of 2011-14. First pair: Professors Paul Olin and Cheryl Robertson; Second Pair: Professors Terry Roe and 1 to be named; Third Pair: 2 to be named. A simple majority is required for approval.

FIRST PAIR

PAUL OLIN: 1984*, Associate Professor of Restorative Sciences, School of Dentistry. University Senate member: None. Committee participation (past and present): AHC Faculty Consultative, 2006-11; AHC Finance and Planning, 2006-12 (Chair: 2007-10); Finance and Planning,.

CHERYL ROBERTSON: 2000*, Associate Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing. University Senate member: None. Committee participation (past and present): AHC Faculty Consultative, 2007-12.

SECOND PAIR

TERRY ROE: 1971*, Professor of Applied Economics, College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences. University Senate member: 1995-96. Committee participation (past and present): Faculty Consultative, 1995-96; Finance and Planning, 1997-2005, 2006-11.

1 TO BE NAMED:

THIRD PAIR

1 TO BE NAMED:

1 TO BE NAMED:

*Date of initial appointment at the University.

FOR INFORMATION:

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

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

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

Christopher Cramer, Institute of Technology
Shawn Curley, Carlson School of Management
Michael Hancher, College of Liberal Arts

Jan McCulloch, College of Education and Human Development
J. Michael Oakes, School of Public Health
Kathryn VandenBosch, College of Agricultural, Food, and Natural Resource Sciences

The terms of Marti Hope Gonzales (College of Liberal Arts), Jeffrey Kahn (Medical School), and Becky Yust (College of Design) expire at the end of the academic year. However, the current chair, Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, will remain on the committee for one more year in a voting ex officio position as the past chair.

**JOHN SULLIVAN, CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

TABLED

**20. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Amendment to the Faculty Compensation Policy
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Faculty Compensation Policy as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

Faculty Compensation Policy

Faculty are compensated for their contributions to teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service to the institution and the state/region/nation/other nations, as well as their professions. Total compensation includes annual base salary plus fringe benefits, including retirement, health and dental coverage, and life and disability insurance. In some instances, annual base salary is augmented through internal sources, such as overload teaching, or from external sources in the case of approved external consulting.

Initial annual base salary is negotiated at the time of hire, with floors established for the instructor and assistant professor ranks only. Increases to annual base salary for faculty occur in the following ways: through annually determined merit increases; through acceptance of a retention offer that includes an increase; in conjunction with a promotion in rank and/or the awarding of indefinite tenure; through an augmentation attached to an administrative title or a set of administrative duties; or in conjunction with an honorary or endowed title. For many faculty, annual base salary is supplemented with summer school or other internal summer employment, such as grant research. Annual base salary may also be supplemented internally during one's contract period through means such as extension teaching. Normally, new salaries go into effect for A base faculty on July 1 and for B base faculty on September 16 of each year.

The salary determination process must provide an objective unbiased evaluation of each faculty member following a thorough review of his/her work. The process must encourage continued good or improved performance, which in turn, should be rewarded by the compensation system.

CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL SALARY INCREASES AND PROMOTION

Any salary determination process at the University of Minnesota must be nondiscriminatory. Initial salary offers, periodic increases, and retention offers may not be based on considerations related to the race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, sexual preference, marital status, public assistance status, veteran status, or age of the person being considered.

The criteria for determining salary increases must be similar to those used for promotion and tenure. The tenure and promotion regulations of the University provide the following instructions which form the framework within which salary decisions must be made: (See Board of Regents policy: Faculty Tenure, sections 7.11, 7.12, 9.2, and 5.5, and administrative Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty)

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

Faculty participation in the discussions surrounding criteria and procedures for salary increase determination is essential to maintaining an equitable and collegial environment. (For the purposes of salary discussion and determination, the relevant academic unit is the departmental or budgetary unit, whichever is smaller.) With the administrator of each unit, the faculty must have the opportunity to develop the criteria for, and the format of, the process through which annual salary increases are determined, including for those faculty who hold endowed chairs. The process determined through consultation may include faculty participation in the judgments regarding compensation changes as a committee of the whole or through a salary committee consisting in whole or in part of elected members. The documents that describe these criteria, formats, and processes shall be shared with the college dean, the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, as appropriate, and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. This process must include the provision that the unit head meet with each faculty member individually, at least once per year, to review his or her performance. The sessions shall review the past year's performance and offer suggestions for enhancing productivity, where appropriate. Units may choose to conduct more in depth evaluations on a periodic basis (e.g. 4 or 5 years) that would include outside evaluations.

ALLOCATION FORMAT

Each year the annual salary increase pool for meritorious performance received by the unit will be distributed based on the criteria specified in the Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure and appropriate departmental faculty evaluation documents.

Unsatisfactory performance, which shall be documented and communicated to the individual involved, shall serve as justification for withholding an individual's increase.

This policy does not apply to any across-the-board component of salary increases.

PROMOTION INCREASES

Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and from associate professor to professor will be accompanied by an extraordinary recurring increase in base salary. These amounts are *in addition* to the annual increase given for meritorious performance. The amounts will be adjusted annually to reflect inflation using the Higher Education Price Index. It will be the responsibility of the Provost to identify the amounts each year and to communicate those amounts to the deans (or equivalent unit heads). The Provost's office will, after calculating the increases, round the results to the nearest \$50 or \$100, and no particular ratio between the two promotion increments need be maintained. The deans will set aside funding for promotional increases separate from funding normally set aside for merit and retention purposes. Deans may

institute higher minima but are required to use consistent and equitable procedures when granting these increases.

OTHER PROVISIONS

1. A standing administrative and faculty compensation committee (including representatives of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee) will examine and make recommendations on policies such as salary levels in the University as a whole, salary disparity among units, minimum salary levels for associate and full professors, and salary compression.

~~2. Goals and expectations for endowed chairs and professorships must be established in each unit, in consultation with the dean, and must be used as the basis for review of the performance of individuals who hold endowed chairs and professorships.~~

2. Goals and expectations for endowed chairs and professorships must be established in each college or campus by the dean or chancellor and a committee of faculty from the unit. These goals and expectations must be used as the basis for review of the performance of individuals who hold endowed chairs and professorships.

3. The Provost will receive an annual report from each college on reviews of endowed chairs and will provide a summary report to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

APPENDIX

STATEMENT ON EVALUATING LECTURESHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS, PROFESSORSHIPS, AND CHAIRS

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

(Adapted from an ad hoc subcommittee report, September, 2006)

There are more than 700 Endowed Chairs at the University of Minnesota. The expenditure of dollars to those holding endowed chairs and professorships exceeded \$30 million in fiscal year 2003. The number and dollar expenditures are expected to grow due to shrinkage of historical means/levels of support coupled with expansion of charitable campaigns.

Currently, there is no policy that requires faculty oversight or involvement in the development or implementation of review processes for faculty holding these positions. In fact, there is no requirement of a review. The faculty compensation policy does not recognize the existence of this form of compensation and the tenure code makes no mention of these factors. Therefore, it behooves the Faculty Senate to provide clarification to the tenure code and post-tenure review process as well as to develop a policy to require review of those faculty that receive awards, honors, and recognition and the inclusion of faculty from the appropriate academic unit in the review process.

Section 7a.1 of the Board of Regents policy: Faculty Tenure requires that

faculty of each academic unit must establish goals and expectations for all faculty members, including goals and expectations regarding teaching, scholarly productivity, and contributions to the service and outreach functions of the unit. The factors to be considered will parallel those used by the unit in the granting of tenure, but will take into account the different stages of professional development of faculty.

According to the RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW, the implementation of Section 7a of the tenure code requires the following:

The faculty of each academic unit should adopt two policy statements. One is a statement of goals and expectations for all faculty members in that unit (Section 7a.1). The other is a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews (Sections 7a.2, 7a.3). Many Academic Units already have these (or similar) policies in place for compensation review purposes. If so, the faculty need only make any modifications it feels necessary and identify them as the policies applicable to post-tenure review pursuant to Section 7a.

The two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. If existing policies are being designated for this purpose, there should be a vote of the faculty designating them as such. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every Academic Unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean may approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

The Subcommittee of SCFA asserts these policies must be applied to those that receive special awards, honors and recognition. This would include lectureships, fellowships, professorships, or chairs (referred to more generally as endowed chairs to distinguish the appointment from administrators) as defined in the Board of Regents policy: Awards, Honors, and Recognition. The special recognition, honor or compensation bestowed upon the faculty must be considered in establishing the goals and expectations for that faculty in a manner analogous to taking into account the different stages of professional development of faculty.

Pursuant to the Tenure code (Section 7a.1), each unit must have a statement addressing the goals and expectations for all faculty including those that receive special recognition, honor, or compensation. Each unit must also have a statement of procedures for annual and special reviews of all faculty, including those specially recognized faculty. In keeping with the RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL AND SPECIAL POST-TENURE REVIEW, the two policy statements must be adopted by vote of the faculty of the unit. The documents must be submitted for review to the dean, who is responsible for ensuring that every academic unit has adopted a policy that meets the standards of the University and of the collegiate unit. The dean may approve the policy statements or return them to the faculty with requests for change.

For the recognition, honor, or compensation that is awarded by an entity other than the academic unit (for example, the college, university, or outside entity), rules and procedures for timely review must be developed by the awarding entity. These procedures must have a component involving the review conducted by the academic unit of the faculty.

COMMENT:

The Faculty Senate approved revisions to this policy in April, 2009, that incorporated the provisions governing endowed chairs. The administration asked that one additional change be made, as indicated with the strike-out and new language. The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the additional change.

The reason for the change is due to the funding structure of many of endowed chairs and professorships. The gift often explicitly names the dean as the person who administers the endowed chair. The language recommended in the Senate version adopted last spring makes the dean secondary to the faculty's recommendations. This language puts the dean first but says he or she must work with a faculty committee to determine the goals and expectations.

**KATHRYN HANNA, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**21. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Amendment to the Policy on Expected Student Academic
Work per Credit: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Policy on Expected Student Academic Work per Credit: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

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

...

A. Undergraduate Students

1. Student workload expectations per undergraduate credit. The Faculty Senate affirms the standard (first adopted by the Senate on February 16, 1922) that, for fall and spring semester, one credit represents, for the average University of Minnesota undergraduate student, three hours of academic work per week (including lectures, laboratories, recitations, discussion groups, field work, study, and so on), averaged over the semester, in order to complete the work of the course to achieve an average grade. One credit equals 42-45 hours of work over the course of the semester (1 credit x 3 hours of work per week x 14/15 weeks in a semester = 42-45 hours of academic work). Thus, enrollment for 15 credits in a semester represents approximately 45 hours of work per week, on average, over the course of the semester. All online courses and all short courses (whether offered during fall or spring semester, the May session, January, summer session, or any other time) must have the same expectation of academic work per credit, 42-45 hours.

2. Exceptions to undergraduate workload standard. Professional norms and the nature of the academic work may necessitate spending more than three hours of work per week on average. For example, clinical experiences, some laboratory work, and some studio activities may require more than an average three hours per week. Demands on the student in excess of the average of three hours per credit per week are permissible with college approval and with appropriate notification to the student of the amount of work expected for the course or educational experience (e.g., in class schedules, bulletins, or syllabi).

3. Student workload statement required for undergraduate courses. All proposals for undergraduate courses must include a student workload statement demonstrating how the course conforms to the student workload expectations in sections (A1a) and (A2b). College and campus curriculum committees and other approving bodies (e.g., the Council on Liberal Education) must consider the student workload statement in reaching a decision on whether to approve a proposed course.

...

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) was asked whether the expectation of academic work per credit established for semesters also applied to summer and other short courses. In SCEP's view, a credit is a credit is a credit and every credit should carry approximately the same expectation of academic work. These amendments make clear that view of what credit for a course means.

**CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**22. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Graduate School Work Group Reports
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that fora were held and useful comments were received on the reports. She would like to present senators the opportunity to provide their input as well.

A senator said that she was puzzled by some of the responses to issues in the report, such as the centralization of fellowships. The report assumes that resources will be available to expand the fellowship program by the closing of the Graduate School, but there is no acknowledgement that costs are just being shifted to the colleges without any additional funding.

Another senator said while his comments do not relate directly to the Graduate School report, they do focus on graduate-student education. Many departments have master's programs in which the students pay tuition instead of being supported through teaching assistant positions. The Graduate School is telling departments to limit admission to these programs because it costs the college more to have the students even though they are paying tuition. This makes no sense, as this is an obvious revenue stream. Students in some disciplines spend time away from campus doing field research. When they return they have completed their coursework, but they still owe money for dissertation credits, so they must remain as active students and need teaching assistant positions. Would it be possible to allow dissertation credit to be earned for field work? This would reduce the time to degree and would cost the University less as departments would not be paying for dissertation credits through the teaching assistant positions.

23. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

24. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

25. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor

2009-10 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MARCH 4, 2010

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 3

The third meeting of the Student Senate for 2009-10 was convened in Coffman Theatre on Thursday, March 4, 2010, at 11:31 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 40 student members. Chair Kathy Julik-Heine presided.

**1. STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING SUBCOMMITTEE
Approval of Appointed Senators
Action**

MOTION:

That the Student Senate approve the appointment of the following Twin Cities student senators:

Alexander Abrams – College of Liberal Arts
Sepeedeh Araghiniknam – College of Biological Sciences
Paula Bachinski – College of Liberal Arts
Tracy Dalluge – College of Design
Peter Reese – Carlson School of Management

**ANDREW HEAIRET, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING SUBCOMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

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

Resolution on Email to Faculty Encouraging Release of Course Evaluations

Approved by the: Student Senate December 3, 2009
Approved by the: Administration – no action required
Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

Resolution on Student Senate Input to the Advancing Excellence Steering Committee

Approved by the: Student Senate December 3, 2009
Approved by the: Administration – no action required
Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

3. COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS UPDATE

For Information:

Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) represents the professional class of 5200 non-unionized employees at the University. This class was started in 1980 and CAPA was formed as an advisory committee to the President. Academic professionals (P&A) have skills between civil service employees and faculty in jobs such as teachers, researchers, advisors, counselors, and extension service workers. Most people stay in this classification or move to a faculty position. P&A employees have some of the same benefits as faculty, but work on annually renewable contracts.

CAPA meets from 9:00-11:00 am the third Friday of each month in 101 Walter Library and meetings are open to the public. CAPA consists of 40 representatives from campus units and colleges and has four committees: Benefits and Compensation, Representation and Governance, Professional Development and Recognition, and Communications.

Discussion:

Will Craig, Vice Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that CAPA is starting to explore a move to a Senate. The Civil Service Committee is also discussing this option. The University's budget situation is being discussed by CAPA. There is an extreme shortfall due to a cut from the state and a 27 pay period issue. The administration has proposed a three-day furlough for all employees with another seven optional furlough days.

In April CAPA will be awarding an Outstanding Unit Award to a department or area of campus that excels in providing governance and leadership opportunities to its academic professionals. CAPA has also been reviewing access to other University awards. CAPA received a report that academic professionals receive a fair share of these other awards, except for teaching awards.

Lastly, CAPA has been doing a leadership mining program at its meetings this year. With the change in administrators, valuable leadership experience will be lost. CAPA has therefore invited administrators to meetings to discuss their leadership philosophy. These presentations are recorded and available from the CAPA website.

4. CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE UPDATE

For Information:

The Civil Service Committee (CSC) represents the approximately 5000 employees in this category which includes accountants, scientists, executive assistants, and administrators. The classification was started in 1945 with the passage of the civil service rules by the Regents. In 1984 PELRA was passed which allowed for the creation of a bargaining unit separate from civil service employees.

CSC is composed of fifteen members and several alternates. The committee elects a chair, vice chair, and treasurer each year, with the vice chair becoming next year's chair. Members are selected by a committee and appointed by the President to three-year terms. CSC meets the fourth Thursday of each month from 9:00 am-12:00 pm.

Discussion:

There was no report.

5. DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT BRUININKS

President Bruininks started by thanking students for their well wishes as he recovered from his surgery. He was touched by the cards that he received.

When he speaks with students he likes to talk about good news stories. Despite the depth of the economic recession, progress is being made in support of students and the University's educational mission. This is his eighth year as President and his 42nd year at the University.. In this eight year period he had had the dubious distinction of presiding over the two largest cuts in state funding, both the results of severe depressions. Additionally the state has not stepped up to its responsibilities in the modern economy. Citizens are looking for solutions from legislators but instead see political gridlock.

He hopes that students get engaged in campus life and take their spirit of civic engagement into the fall election season by asking candidates hard questions on their commitment to education and the University.

This year there have been three basic reductions in the University's budget from the state. These reductions amount to a \$230 million reduction in this biennium. Last year every unit reduced its budget by 5.5 percent. Instructions to units stated that student funding must be protected. This included graduate assistant positions, research opportunities, and scholarships. Administrative units were cut at a higher rate than academic units and do not have a revenue stream from tuition. All departments will face another 3 percent reduction for next year.

When faced with these major challenges, the University must take time to determine what is really important. He starts this process by framing core principles and values that will help make wise decisions. These principles will continue to be revised. First is the idea that despite adversity, the University must look toward the future and look to expanding and advancing the University's quality and competitiveness. Students should look back with pride that their degree was awarded here.

A second core principle is compensation, support, and retention of a talented workforce, which is hard to do in these times. This is what makes this place function well for students. Third, which he cares deeply about, is keeping the University affordable and accessible for future students.

Fourth is the need to reduce costs, reduce investments, reinvest current resources, and grow revenue to balance reductions instead of increasing tuition. The University needs to continue to work with the state while creatively leveraging its assets and being competitive with new grants and contracts. The fifth principle is using one-time federal stimulus funds creatively to help in this transitional period.

The University has more than doubled the number of scholarships and amount per scholarship while making many need-based instead of merit-based. The University puts more funds into student support than the combined federal and state governments. Last year a middle income scholarship program was introduced and titled the University Promise Scholarship. This year there are 13,000 students receiving funds through this program and they have seen a decrease in their tuition. He is worried about FY12-13 since federal stimulus funding will have run out but there will still be economic pressures. Tuition increases should continue to stay in the single digits. In the last nine years tuition has doubled at the University, but the net cost increase has only been 27 percent due to additional University funding.

Q: MSA runs a volunteer tax assistance program that costs \$1100 but has already realized \$1500 in savings for students with a projection of \$5000 in savings. Using this as an example, how has the University's revenue been grown using this entrepreneurial spirit?

A: MSA should talk with the Law School's free tax clinic regarding their program. The University is always interested in conversations on returns in investments. When given the opportunity to apply for new federal grants, the University applied for 700 new proposal to secure an additional \$200 million in support. The University needs to be more conscience and use its resources well. UMore Park was an 8000 acre parcel that was used mainly for natural resource and agricultural research. This site was underused and poorly planned. 2800 acres were provided to the Department of Natural Resources in the stadium agreement and it created almost a 6000 acre nature preserve in the area. The remaining 5000 contain one of the largest aggregate gravel deposits in the state. By not traveling to other states for gravel, the state will save over \$300 million in construction costs and provide a slow revenue stream for the University. He would like to see net revenues from UMore Park used for matching contributions for private gifts. Another area for investment includes e-learning. An entrepreneurial culture will be needed to grow resources within a set of priorities.

A senator talked about the restructuring with the Graduate School. Graduate students have been the most involved in this process. She asked that the President emphasize to deans that when budget cuts are being discussed, undergraduate, graduate, and professional students should be involved in this process. Students can provide feedback on services that they value and areas that need improvements or additional resources. Students do care and are willing to put forth the time and effort to be involved.

President Bruininks said that he assumes that this is being done to the level expected, but he will make sure to convey to deans that students be involved. Graduate and professional students are 40 percent of the total enrollment and there are a distinctive aspect of the University's profile.

A senator thanked the President for his experiences at the University and for the support of veterans. He appreciated the comments on being cost-conscious and entrepreneurial. He asked that the President influence his successor in these traditions.

President Bruininks said that he cares deeply about the University and that is why he would like the next president to be better.

Q: The University continues to offer an increasing amount of on-line courses to be compliant with the a request from the Governor. Currently there are five campuses, each with their own on-line offerings. Has the University considered streamlining its on-line offerings to make them easier to access for students?

A: The University's system-wide task force is looking to reset its own strategies and develop a state-wide versus campus-based system. Research shows that there are greater benefits to students with blended courses which incorporate on-line and in-person interactions. The University must find a better way to leverage its options and make it easier for students to transfer between campuses within the system.

Q: In the University's two-thirds, one-third funding strategy, what does the one-third entail for students?

A: When solving budgetary shortfalls, the University's approach is to have two-thirds of this amount come from reductions, deferred investments, and reallocations. The remaining one-third is from an increase in revenue, of which the largest source is tuition. In the future the University will continue to grow scholarships, particularly need-based, and fellowships. The hope would be to grow this support so that the net costs remains at reasonable levels. A set of metrics will be used to focus on affordability while maintaining quality. The most difficult decision for the University will be abandoning things that have value.

Q: Can you remind students how the University plans on protecting undergraduate research?

A: The University's Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP) has been a long-term priority. It is one of the most important and distinguishing characteristics of the University and a huge comparative advantage for students by learning through close interactions with the people doing the work. The University will cut many items before this program is touched.

Q: As an IT student she thanked the President for protecting UROP and his commitment to excellent students, faculty, and staff. What influence will there be on the new president and what will the transition process be?

A: He was asked by the Regents to extend his contract and he agreed to a three-year extension while stating that June 30, 2011 would be his last day as President. This amount of notice is very unusual. The reason he did it was because he wanted this transition to be orderly. He got the idea by talking to leaders in businesses and industries that he admired who said that they start planning for a transition the moment that they take a position. His goal is to work with the Board on the issues that he wishes to finish and helping with transitions for other University leaders. He will be less involved in who will replace him unless he is asked for input. Even with the challenges, he feels that the University is a better place than it was 10 years ago. This is an area that students can get engaged. When finalists are on campus for interviews, students should show up and make a difference in this process.

Q: What is the current status of the Physics and Nanotechnology Building?

A: The Governor has threatened to veto the bonding bill so there are now negotiations happening with the legislature. There is planning money in the current budget that he hopes will be protected. The challenge with this building is that this is its first time in the bonding bill process and is the largest cost in the budget. If planning money is awarded this year, it will be more feasible to receive the remaining funding in two years and construction will be ready to start at that time. This building has strong support within and outside the University.

A senator said that the University was creative and innovative when it instituted paperless billing. In the face of budget cuts she would like to see more innovations that have a sustainability focus.

President Bruininks stated that Chancellor Johnson and Vice President O'Brien are co-chairs of the University's Sustainability Committee and they are driving this strategy across the state. Last year the University started an initiative to save energy which has already saved \$2 million in one year. The University is taking a systematic approach to many areas and are good news stories that need to be shared.

6. STUDENT SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT **Addition of Rochester Student Senate Representation** **Action**

MOTION:

To amend Article V, Section 2(b)(1) of the Student Senate Bylaws as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~). As an amendment to the Student Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Student Senate (29) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Student Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

**ARTICLE V. STUDENT SENATE MEMBERSHIP, ELECTIONS, AND OFFICERS
(Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Student Senate)**

1. Membership

For the purpose of electing representatives and alternate representatives, if any, to the Student Senate, qualified students shall vote within each of the following units of the University:

TWIN CITIES: Biological Sciences; Continuing Education; Dentistry; Design; Education and Human Development; Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences; Graduate School; Law; Liberal Arts; Management; Medical School; Nursing; Pharmacy; Public Health; Technology; Veterinary Medicine

CROOKSTON

DULUTH: Business and Economics; Education and Human Service Professions; Fine Arts; Liberal Arts; Science and Engineering;

MORRIS

ROCHESTER

The elected members of the Student Senate shall be members of the University Senate.

2. Election of Members

...

b. Elections

1. Coordinate Campuses

a. Between February 1 and April 30 of each year, Crookston, Duluth, ~~and~~ Morris, and Rochester as listed in Section 1 of this Article shall conduct an election for Student Senate members and alternate members, if any. Each unit shall establish its own procedures, in accordance with the constitution, for conducting its elections. The results of the elections shall be mailed to the Clerk of the Senate not later than May 5.

b. Eligible students elect from their ranks 50 Student Senate members, who shall be distributed among the colleges and campuses in proportion to the number of students in those units. Each college shall be guaranteed one student senator. Morris and Crookston will be guaranteed a minimum of two student senators.

...

COMMENT:

With the enrollment of students at the Rochester campus, the Student Senate Consultative Committee believes that representation from this campus should be added to the Student Senate. By approving the amendment now, it will allow Rochester to elect a senator this spring, who will start serving July 1, 2010.

KATHY JULIK-HEINE, CHAIR

STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 35 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

7. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Kathy Julik-Heine, Chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), said that there have been three SSCC meetings since the last Student Senate meeting and she would like to share information from those meetings. In December the committee spoke with Kris Wright from the Office of Student Financial Aid. She talked about the University having a high tuition-high aid model but guaranteeing that students are able to pay for their education.

January's meeting had a discussion with Vice Provost McMaster on the topic of textbooks and bookstore initiatives. In February President Bruininks spoke with the committee and then Tom Dohm from the Office of Measurement Services discussed the results from the student evaluations. The Student Senate sent an email to Twin Cities faculty encouraging the release of the student release questions and there was a large response from the faculty. She encouraged senators to continue to speak with their faculty. The next priority for the Student Senate is updating information on the One-Stop website.

In closing she reminded senators that there would be a budget discussion at this afternoon's University Senate meeting and she invited students to express their opinions.

8. ADVANCING EXCELLENCE STEERING COMMITTEE UPDATE

Kathy Julik-Heine, Chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), said that as a member of the Advancing Excellence Steering Committee (AESC) said that she is not impressed with the operation of the group so far. She joined expecting that it would be a potential platform for engagement and change. The first few meetings were spent reviewing the charge and December's meeting focused on a budget report and workplan. The next meeting is March 30 and she will continue to represent the student opinions and bring ideas back to the Student Senate for consultation.

9. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – Greg Summers stated that each Thursday from 12-2 pm there are no classes but instead a mini, convocation-style event titled Thursday Commons Events. There has been a lack of student attendance so CSA is looking at ways to reach students. Yesterday Chancellor Casey spoke about budget information for the campus. Today is spring convocation which honors dean's list students and spring sport athletes.

Duluth – Jonathan Lundberg reported that the Duluth taxi program has run out of funding for the year due to use by 30-40 percent of students each month. UMDSA is working with faculty on updating the course guide.

Morris – Mark Privratsky said that MCSA is working on technology fee allocations.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly – No report.

Minnesota Student Association - Mark Lewandowski said that MSA has discussed the social host ordinance, started the Volunteer Tax Assistance Program again this year, funded 33 events through diversity fund grants, and rallied students for Support the U Day in February. Upcoming projects include an update to the renter's survey, the Lend a Hand, Hear the Band concert, and elections. He reminded senators who want to continue to complete an application to run in this spring's election.

**10. MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 3, 2009
Action**

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/091203stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**11. STUDENT SENATE STIPENDS
Action**

FOR INFORMATION:

The Student Consultative Committee, less its stipend-receiving members, shall review the performance of duties of all stipend-receiving members and vote on the approval, reduction, or withholding of the portion of their stipends allocated for spring semester. A two-thirds affirmative vote by the Student Consultative Committee is required for modification of stipend disbursement.

The Student Consultative Committee recommendation shall be presented to the Student Senate for approval at or before the Student Senate's last regular meeting of spring semester. Stipend receiving persons have a right to answer questions about or speak regarding the Student Consultative Committee's findings at this meeting if they so chose. A two-thirds vote of the Student Senate is required to modify the Student Consultative Committee recommendation.

MOTION:

The Student Senate Stipend Review Committee has reviewed the performance of the following stipend-receiving students: Kathy Julik-Heine, SSCC/Student Senate Chair; and, Andrew Heairet, SSCC/Student Senate Vice Chair. The recommendation from the committee is that:

- Kathy Julik-Heine receive \$500.00 of the \$500.00 spring semester portion of her stipend
- Andrew Heairet receive \$125.00 of the \$125.00 spring semester portion of his stipend

COMMENT:

The Review Committee felt that both students fulfilled the duties associated with their positions and therefore should receive the full spring semester portion of their respective stipends.

**ANDREW SMITH, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE STIPEND REVIEW COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**12. LEGITIMATE ABSENCES FROM CLASSES
Discussion**

Based on the following policy, the Student Senate Consultative Committee would like to have a discussion about other instances that might be included in the list of legitimate absences.

POLICY ON MAKEUP WORK FOR LEGITIMATE ABSENCES

1. Students will not be penalized for absence during the semester due to unavoidable or legitimate circumstances. Such circumstances include verified illness, participation in intercollegiate athletic events, subpoenas, jury duty, military service, bereavement, and religious observances. Such circumstances also include activities sponsored by the University if identified by the senior academic officer for the campus or his or her designee as the basis for excused absences. Such circumstances do not include voting in local, state, or national elections.
2. It is the responsibility of students to plan their schedules to avoid excessive conflict with course requirements.
3. A student must notify instructors of circumstances identified in (1) as soon as possible and provide documentation to the instructor to verify the reason for the absence. In the event that the University declares a pandemic emergency (e.g., flu), the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost or designee may waive the requirement that students are required to have documentation from a physician for illness.
4. If a student is absent due to circumstances identified in (1) and has complied with the notification requirement, the instructor may not penalize the student and must provide reasonable and timely accommodation or opportunity to make up exams or other course requirements that have an impact on the course grade.
5. The authority to determine what constitutes an excusable bereavement absence and religious observance rests with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

6. Instructors are encouraged to accommodate students who wish to participate in party caucuses, pursuant to Board of Regents resolution [See <http://www1.umn.edu/regents/minutes/2005/december/board.pdf>, p. 147]
7. This policy does not apply to final examinations.
8. Colleges and academic units may establish specific criteria for notice and completion of work to implement this policy.

This policy is not applicable to the Duluth campus.

DISCUSSION:

Kris Schwebler, a member of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), said that he brought this to SSCC due to the fact that interviews for graduate and professional schools are not included in the list of legitimate absences. This led him to consider what else might be included in the list.

A senator said that there is a resolution being considered to expand the list of legitimate absences to include student-parents whose children are ill without requiring documentation from a doctor's office. 22 percent of graduate students are also parents and they are beginning to discuss this with administrators.

Another senator said that many times parents cannot attend class because their daycare will not accept their sick child. However student-parents cannot afford to take their child to a doctor every time there is a fever or cough. This is why a note from a daycare provider as well as a doctor is a key to any proposal. He suggested that work be done with the Student Parent Help Center.

A senator said that the current policy also does not protect senators.

Another senator said that UMDSA is discussing this issue with their faculty. If the policy is expanded to allow additional legitimate absences, faculty could take other actions against students. Their faculty suggested finding a more amicable solution that does not involve a policy change.

A senator said that an proposal should be focused on unexpected absences, such as illnesses, rather than scheduling conflicts.

Another senator suggested that any changes be brought as separate proposals for approval.

A senator then said that there are state statutes that cover parents which should be reviewed before any language is proposed.

13. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

14. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

15. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:56 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor