

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, November 2, 2004
2:30 – 4:15
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Morris Kleiner (chair), F. R. P. Akehurst, Bruce Brorson, Carol Carrier, Dann Chapman, Janet Ericksen, John Fossum, Richard Goldstein, Elizabeth Hjelman, Robert Jones, Theodor Litman, Steven McLoon, Kelly Risbey, Kathleen Sellew, Oriol Valls, Timothy Wiedmann
- Absent: Matthew Bribitzer-Stull, A. Saari Csallany, Jesse Daniels, Patricia Frazier, Darwin Hendel, Wade Savage, Larry Wallace, Aks Zaheer
- Guests: Jackie Singer (Director of Retirement Benefits); Professor Will Durfee (ad hoc subcommittee on the evaluation of instruction)

[In these minutes: (1) number of faculty and P&A instructional appointments; (2) faculty retirement plan waiting period; (3) evaluation of instruction]

1. Number of Faculty and P&A Appointments

Professor Kleiner convened the meeting at 2:30 and began by welcoming the new student members. He then turned to Vice President Carrier to lead a discussion about the number of faculty and P&A academic appointments.

Dr. Carrier began by recalling that an administrative policy was passed a few years ago provide a better way to define how to use the academic appointment classification system at the University; the policy came out of a joint faculty-administration effort and was approved by the Senate. The policy covers people who are carrying out teaching duties. It addressed problems across the University (that occur around the country) because there were units that tended to use a significant number of non-tenure-track faculty appointments, largely but not exclusively in the Academic Health Center. The document identified existing appointment categories and created a new category of term faculty—contract faculty (who might be at the University for the duration of their career or perhaps only for a few years). Since the appointment of temporary faculty (a subcategory of term faculty) had become undisciplined, the policy tightened up the rules, governing term appointments, created the subcategory of term faculty—contract faculty—and required that colleges and departments be more accountable in their use. The policy also clarified the use of the adjunct title, both for people inside the University who might be appointed in another department as well as for those outside the University who are given adjunct titles.

The policy also better defined the role of instructional staff with P&A titles. Before the policy was adopted, those people had positions without benefits; now they have retirement and other benefits.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

The policy covers all instructional appointments at the University. After it was adopted, the administration asked all colleges and campuses to provide a plan on how they intended to use this appointment system. The administration received the plans and provided them to the Tenure Committee for review; most are now operational; there are three plans that are still being negotiated. The administration agreed to provide an annual report on the use of the various titles under each category as well as the numbers of appointments under each category—and did not want to see unbridled use of appointments that are not tenured/tenure-track faculty to teach. As part of the college personnel plan, units must have an approved supplemental plan if the number of instructional staff with titles other than tenured/tenure-track faculty will exceed 25% of the total. They have received a number of supplemental plans for colleges or individual departments, and some seem to be appropriate (e.g., CLA language departments, where the demand for instruction significantly exceeds the appropriate size of the regular faculty). The administration monitors the degree to which colleges/departments are complying with the policy and their plans.

Dr. Carrier introduced Nan Wilhelmson from her office, who runs and reviews the data. Dr. Wilhelmson referred to the handout that had been distributed and noted that in each plan, the college must indicate which category of teaching appointments it will use in order to monitor the use of various titles. They will track use over time; if it appears, in a particular unit, that there is a high percentage of non-regular appointments, they will ask for an explanation of why this is happening. A variation could happen for one semester for a variety of reasons, but if there is a pattern, they will inquire.

One of the problems the new system was meant to address, Dr. Carrier told the Committee, was that of faculty appointed as temporary who spent many years at the University but who had no notice period rights. That did not seem right.

Professor McLoon asked for a definition of research associate. Dr. Carrier said that it is a P&A position, not faculty, and in the majority of cases the individual is in a lab on a sponsored account doing research-related work. The individual might do some teaching. Professor McLoon asked if Dr. Carrier knew what mechanism is used to give research associates faculty titles. Many have an assistant professor title, he said. Each college had to determine if it would give courtesy professorial titles to research associates, Dr. Carrier told him; some do, primarily to help in recruiting, while others do not. These courtesy titles are also used to designate some teaching effort on the part of the individual.

Professor Ericksen asked if there is University-wide policy covering termination of contract faculty. Dr. Carrier said that it is but that such individuals may be renewed, and affirmed that they may be renewed year after year.

Professor Goldstein said he has been seeing, in the list of titles used by some colleges, titles that he has never seen before, such as research assistant professor. Should there be more uniformity in these titles, he asked? Those titles are in the policy, Ms. Wilhelmson said, and may be used as determined by each college. Is there a list of titles on the web, Professor Goldstein asked? There is; it is at <http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/ohrpolicy/Hiring/acadtitles.pdf>. A college may not make up its own titles, Dr. Carrier added.

Are there any University criteria on giving the assistant or associate professor title to research associates, Professor Kleiner inquired? Is there policy that sets out criteria or tasks one must perform in order to be considered for the professorial title? There is no single set of criteria, Dr. Carrier said. They

wanted to be able to track all who deliver instruction at the University, so now anyone with teaching responsibilities must have a title to so indicate. Individuals may, as a result, have two titles: official University appointment title and a courtesy title. Units are permitted to quality professorial titles (e.g., teaching assistant professor), and some do so.

Professor Valls said he was surprised to learn that research associates could teach, because they are being paid to do research. Dr. Carrier said that is true but some do teach.

Professor McLoon said that the research associate category remains a big hole in the system and it is abused. He said he knows of people who are hired as research associates, given the assistant professor title, and then emphasize the latter. In some cases they do not understand their appointment. So there is too much sliding into responsibilities of a regular faculty appointment, Dr. Carrier commented. The position is viewed as more faculty than it is, Professor McLoon said, and it is more tenuous than many of them understand.

Professor Kleiner asked where positions such as research fellow fit. Salaries come and go but titles stay forever, he observed; he said he was surprised at the number of titles that exist across the institution. If someone is assigned instructional work, Dr. Carrier said, they should have an instructional title so they can be counted in the workforce; if someone is teaching, the University wants to be able to count them. No one says how much they should teach. The senior fellow title is P&A; if the person is teaching, he or she should have one of the instructional titles.

Is "research assistant professor" a standard title, Professor Goldstein asked? It would need to be a courtesy title for a research associate, Ms. Wilhelmson said. The official appointment would still be research associate, Dr. Carrier added. A contract faculty member could also hold this title as their official University title. One reason to give the title is so the individual can be more competitive in writing grants to support themselves, Professor Wiedmann observed. The path in some cases is Ph.D. to postdoc to research assistant professor to a search for a tenured/tenure-track position. There can be abuse, and if the research associate/research assistant professor does not obtain funding, he or she is washed out of the system. An individual could be at the University a long time as a research associate, Dr. Carrier said, and some colleges allow them to be PIs on grants. Is it possible to look at the trend in titles that are used, Ms. Risbey asked? They will start to do so when they have the data, Dr. Carrier said; most units are just starting to use the system.

Professor McLoon said he had no idea what his agreement with the University is. Is there a place that defines categories and the agreements with the University for these people? The policy here is one piece, Dr. Carrier said. For the individual, it includes the notice of appointment, which provides the title and the particulars of the appointment. Does the University make an effort to make clear to everyone what their standing is, Professor McLoon asked? With respect to research associates, what effort is made to make clear their position and how vulnerable they are? There are extensive guidelines for P&A appointments and everyone who is hired is told about them as well as the policies that apply to them; they are all on the web, Dr. Carrier replied.

Professor Goldstein said that his concern about courtesy titles is that when there are a large number of them, they cheapen the professorial title. Can the Committee be informed about the number of research professors, clinical professors, and so on? Dr. Carrier said they will be able to obtain those data. There has been a tension in the policy: many do not want widespread use of the professorial title unless

an individual is tenured or tenure-track, but many others argue they can use the courtesy titles to recruit or the titles are needed when the individual seeks grant funding. It would also be helpful to know the source of funds for each position, Professor Kleiner said—federal funds, private funds, state funds, etc. Dr. Carrier said they would look into how to develop such information.

Professor Fossum said he had two questions. One, with respect to academic teaching appointments and the table of data for each college, he noted there are FTEs indicated in each column. Do they have any idea of the proportion of teaching done by regular faculty versus the other categories of instructors? He said he suspected the numbers understate the proportion of teaching being done by non-regular faculty (e.g., P&A appointees are more likely to do more teaching than regular faculty; in the Carlson School, for example, P&A instructors teach 24 hours per year, which is twice the number expected of regular faculty). Right now they cannot tell, Dr. Carrier said, because they cannot match appointment to the number of credits taught each semester. She agreed, however, that Professor Fossum was generally correct, that P&A instructors do more instruction than regular faculty. One complexity is that teaching loads across colleges vary considerably, even for regular faculty. There are also courses offered by some departments that are rarely taught by regular faculty because the faculty do not do research in the field, Professor Fossum said.

Professor Fossum's second question was about the employment security of non-regular instructors. What is the current notice period for P&A faculty, he asked? It depends on their years of service, Dr. Carrier reported; it ranges from one to twelve months. So departments have inherited some liability to P&A instructors that they did not have before, Professor Fossum commented. Dr. Carrier agreed.

Dr. Carrier said she would keep in touch with the Committee about the data. Other Big Ten schools are interested in what the University is doing in this regard. Is there a clear statement of the duties and tasks for assistant/associate/full professors, Professor Kleiner asked? There is a clearer definition for regular faculty, with the 7.12 statements and the tenure regulations, than there is for non-regular faculty, Dr. Carrier said.

Professor Kleiner thanked Dr. Carrier and Ms. Wilhelmson for their report.

2. Faculty Retirement Plan Waiting Period

Professor Kleiner next welcomed Jackie Singer to the table to discuss data concerning new faculty who are and are not faced with a two-year waiting period before joining the Faculty Retirement Plan.

Ms. Singer reviewed for the Committee the eligibility requirements for the Faculty Retirement Plan. For faculty, full professors are immediately eligible, assistant professors have a two-year waiting period, and instructors have a three-year waiting period. For P&A staff, eligibility is based on salary; over \$54,135, one is immediately eligible, \$45,863 to \$54,135, there is a two-year waiting period, and under \$45,800 there is a three-year waiting period. There has been considerable sentiment on the part of this Committee and the Senate to get rid of the waiting period, but that has not been possible in the current budget climate. It would cost about \$5 million to bring everyone into the plan and about \$2 million per year to provide immediate eligibility to everyone hired who qualifies for the plan.

There were concerns that the two-year waiting period was creating a problem in recruiting people who had been in retirement plans at other institutions, so as a stopgap measure the University approved a waiver program. Each college can elect to waive the waiting period, which means that anyone hired in certain job categories can file a form and participate immediately in the Faculty Retirement Plan.

For 2003-04, of the 83 new assistant professor hires (tenure-track and multiple-year-contract), 10 were granted waivers. For 2004-05 thus far, there have been 66 such hires, of whom 6 have been granted waivers. Of the colleges last year that elected to grant waivers, none dropped the option and four more decided to grant waivers. Only three units now do not grant waivers: College of Biological Sciences, College of Liberal Arts, and UMD.

The waiver is only approved if one was in a retirement plan before coming to the University as an assistant professor, Professor Valls asked? That is correct, Ms. Singer said. That is the group they were told that colleges were having the biggest problems with, she said.

This Committee has a long history with this issue, Professor Goldstein recalled, and pushed hard to eliminate the waiting period altogether. The central administration did not have a problem with doing so, and then the colleges realized they had the money for these employees and did not want to give it up. The Committee needs to push again, he said; the money contributed during the first two years of employment equal in value, over time, the contributions made during the last five years of employment, given reasonable assumptions about rates of return. Professor Fossum said he agreed entirely. He expressed appreciation to Ms. Singer for the data and noted that the three colleges that do not grant waivers account for just under 50% of the new assistant professor hires.

Professor Valls said that it is misleading to say there is a cost. When they hire, they offer a compensation package, and if they cannot offer the Faculty Retirement Plan, they offer a higher salary. The real cost of eliminating the waiting period would be less than projected. Professor Kleiner asked Ms. Singer if she has heard from colleges that they must compensate faculty in other ways because they are not allowed to contribute to the Faculty Retirement Plan. Ms. Singer said she has not. They have compared the University's plan with others in the Big Ten and the plans vary widely; in some of them there are vesting periods. Or there are different contribution levels, Vice President Carrier observed; Ohio State contributes 14%, Northwestern 13%, the others are around 10%. But Ohio State does not pay Social Security, Professor Goldstein noted.

There is no question the University has an excellent plan, Professor Goldstein said. But in a study of the Big Ten schools the Committee commissioned, it was shown that only Minnesota has a waiting period. Even with a vesting period, faculty can get the money later; with a waiting period, they never get it. This is a good plan, however, once one is in it, but there should be no waiting period, he repeated.

Professor Kleiner asked if the administration had any objection to eliminating the waiting period other than the expense. It is largely a matter of money, Dr. Carrier said. There has been talk about this for a long time and this Committee has been solidly in favor of eliminating it. The Provost brought the proposal to the deans' group and the result is the option by college.

Professor McLoon said he did not care about the issue. It is a generous retirement plan no matter when one is hired. He said he would not favor eliminating the waiting period if doing so would mean

cutting benefits. Over the long term, it is a nice plan, although he would not design it with a waiting period if he were creating it from scratch. Professor Goldstein took exception to Professor McLoon's position and said the math is simple: one is better off without the last seven years of contributions than the first two years. The money is in the system, he pointed out; the deans have it.

In response to a question from Professor Wiedmann, Ms. Singer said she does not hear much about the plan not being competitive; they do get some complaints about it being a mandatory program. People may not be making as much money as they want and are irritated when they are forced to put 2.5% of salary into the retirement plan—even when they are informed that the University puts in 13%. Professor Valls joked that anyone who turns down a 13% match should be fired.

Professor McLoon asked if there had been models of the University's plan compared with that of other Big Ten schools, after 20 years of participation. Are University of Minnesota faculty better off? Ms. Singer said they have been working on such a comparison, by calculating a percentage of final salary paid out by the plan, assuming someone participates in a plan for 35 years and starts at \$50,000 per year. The Minnesota plan pays out about 60% of final salary, Indiana pays about 39%; most Big Ten schools are about 58% (because of the difference between the typical 15% total contribution versus 15.5% at Minnesota). Ohio State is far ahead of the rest of the schools. Some of the schools have defined benefit plans, so contribution levels are not as important. And some of those other plans have health care benefits for retirees so are actually much better than Minnesota, Professor Goldstein said. And it must also be pointed out that the Ohio State plan, Professor Fossum added, does not include Social Security. It also includes post-retirement health care, Ms. Singer reported.

Ms. Risbey asked if colleges are encouraged to provide information to new assistant professors, or if the onus is the individuals to find the information. Ms. Singer said that departments provide the information when new faculty are hired.

Vice President Carrier said that the completed report should be on the Committee's agenda in the future. The question is not only the huge amount of money the faculty are not receiving but also the impact on the University's competitive position, Professor Kleiner summarized. He thanked Ms. Singer for her report.

3. Evaluation of Instruction

Professor Kleiner next welcomed Professor Will Durfee to the meeting. Professor Durfee chaired the Educational Policy-Faculty Affairs joint ad hoc subcommittee on the evaluation of instruction. The subcommittee recommendations and comments being considered by this Committee are these (groupings are from the subcommittee report):

1. Recommendation: Department heads and tenure and promotion review committees should be provided with comprehensive information on the interpretation and use of student rating data in making personnel decisions, and information on practices of peer evaluation of instruction. A working group should be appointed to create this information which should be available to the entire University community through a web site.
2. Recommendation: All student rating forms should have spaces for two open-ended comments, and with the comments being course rather than instructor directed. The labels for the

comments should be, “Describe things about the course that you found helpful”, and “What suggestions do you have for improving the course?”

Comment: By directing comments towards the course, students should be less likely to make inappropriate or personal comments about the instructor.

Comment: Faculty and departments should be free to add additional open-ended questions to the required form, but these should be in addition to rather than replace the required comments.

Comment: Because the practice of using student comments for personnel decisions varies across the University, the Committee feels each department or school should develop its own practice as to how comment data is used, but the practice should be communicated to faculty.

3. Recommendation: Only results from those questions that will be used to evaluate faculty performance should be made available to department heads. Data from questions that are to be used only for improving teaching should not be released to department heads. Data from questions that are to be used for program improvements may be released to department heads and curriculum committees. Each department or school should be free to set local standards for access to data from student rating forms.

Comment: Departments or schools can decide whether open-ended student comments will be used for evaluating instructors. If so, those comments can be made available to department heads.

Comment: This recommendation means that data flow from student rating forms will vary from department to department

4. Recommendation: Departments should develop and make available to their instructors a written policy that defines which data from student rating forms will be used for personnel decisions and which data will be made available to department heads and committees charged with reviewing instructor performance and which data will be made available to curriculum committees for improving courses and programs.

5. Recommendation: Faculty should always be allowed to respond to student rating results when those results are used for performance evaluation.

6. Recommendation: The current set of 10 student release questions should be modified. First, the category title should be changed from “student release” to “Questions to help students make informed course selections” or some such term that makes the intent of the questions clear. Second, the set of questions should be reviewed and possibly modified to fit the specific purpose of course selection. Whenever possible, questions should refer to the course rather than to the instructor.

Comment: Developing new questions should be done in collaboration with the Academics and Services Committee of the Minnesota Student Association.

Comment: When questions are directed towards the course, more instructors are likely to permit their release.

7. Recommendation: Student release questions should never be used by the department for personnel decisions.
8. Recommendation: The SET instructions should state that harassing comments or comments on irrelevant factors are not helpful for evaluation of instruction. These instructions should be worded in a manner that does not turn students away from the rating process.
9. Recommendation: Faculty should be provided with guidelines on how to process and interpret open-ended student comments, particularly those that are inappropriate.
10. Recommendation: Inappropriate comments should never be used by the department as data for evaluating an instructor.
11. Recommendation: OCM be provided with resources to conduct a research study using the database of comments.
12. Recommendation: In rewriting the policy, the following protocols for administering student rating forms should be made clear:
 1. The course must be evaluated during the last two weeks of instruction.
 2. The evaluation must occur at the beginning of the class period.
 3. The instructor may give instructions and hand out the forms, but must not be present while the forms are being completed and collected. The instructor must never touch or see completed forms.
 4. The forms should be collected by a student, placed in a sealed envelope, and delivered either to the data processing center (OMS on the Twin Cities campus) or to a collection point in the department. If the latter, the department should deliver the envelopes to the data processing center without opening the envelopes.

Comment: Some departments capture the forms before they are sent to OMS to copy the comments. The Committee felt that a more appropriate path would be for all data to go to OMS first and not be viewed by either the instructor or the department until after final grades have been posted.

Comment: The logistics for data flow are considerably simplified for web-based systems.

Comment: Protocols must be modified for web-based rating forms and for courses that are delivered on-line.

Comment: Protocols must accommodate courses with multiple instructors. For example, when an instructor finishes his or her two week block, there should be an option available where students can evaluate that instructor, and two weeks later, the next instructor. At the end of the course, students could evaluate the course as a whole.

Comment: The Director of OMS has considerable insight and experience with the protocols for student rating forms and should participate in discussions on policy changes.

13. Recommendation: Students should not be required to fill in a student rating form for any course. There should be no incentives, for example course points, given for filling in a student rating form. Instructors should never know who filled in a form and who didn't.

Comment: If filling in the form is tied in any way to course performance, the data could be biased. While it would be desirable to receive feedback from every student, in reality there is no practical way to make that happen.

Professor Durfee said that evaluation of instruction serves three purposes, one of which is to provide information for review of faculty members, and it is that purpose in which this Committee is interested. In terms of the recommendations, for #4, departments vary a lot in what they do and the subcommittee recommends they be clear about their practices. The subcommittee did not believe there should be a central mandate about what they should do because the system seems to be working.

For #1, they felt there should be more information available to department heads/chairs and others about how to interpret evaluation data—what it means and how it can be used for personnel decisions. There is a large volume of information on how to do so. Professor Wiedmann asked if there had been any thought given to an explicit statement that data from student evaluation forms should never be used in isolation in evaluating faculty? Departments often use only the numerical data, but there are policies that say departments are also supposed to use peer review information and so on. That question came up at the last meeting, Professor Kleiner recalled, and there was no answer: Is there any correlation between the amount of student learning and how the instructor is evaluated? Is there anything in the literature on this point?

Professor Durfee said he did not know. He said he was impressed, in reading the literature, on how good evaluations are. If questions are asked properly (and the University's generally are), the results are well-correlated with other measurements. Those who study evaluation say that student evaluations are not a bad measure but that they should not be used in isolation. There are about 2,000 studies; opponents of student evaluation cite the 3 or 4 outliers. The body of the literature says student evaluation is not bad, but he said he did not know if it looked at learning.

Professor McLoon said he had a lot of concerns about student evaluation. He said that evaluation should be tied to the faculty role in the course (e.g., when he gives one lecture in one course and ten lectures in another). He agreed that if asked questions multiple ways, students can be good at evaluating what they learn. He said he saw a form from one company that gets at student learning; it is all subjective, but the form appeared to be more than just "what do you think of this guy?" One of the most popular faculty in the Medical School was a terrible teacher who gave non-substantive lectures. What students learn should define "my number," he said.

Professor Durfee agreed. The current policy does not handle multiple-instructor courses such as those offered in the Medical School and Veterinary Medicine. Another of their recommendations is that the University should stipulate the four questions currently in use (minus the facilities question), but colleges and departments should be able to create their own, drawing from a question bank. There are a lot of very good questions that could be used.

Professor McLoon asked where things stand—is this the beginning of a long process? The subcommittee report comes to this Committee and Educational Policy, which will jointly draft a single new Senate policy, which then would need to be approved by the administration. So once the Committee is done with student evaluations, the issue is done, Professor Wiedmann asked? They will not touch on other important issues, such as adequate peer evaluations, visits by department heads, and self-evaluation? He said he would like to see an explicit statement that these are also required. Professor Durfee acknowledged that there is a failure to follow the existing Senate policy in full, which also requires peer evaluation. He said he did not know if there is an enforcement mechanism, but departments could be made more aware of the policy. One problem is that student evaluations have numbers; the other forms of evaluation are murkier. This is only one component of evaluation of instruction, Professor Durfee commented; evaluation of instruction is a multi-faceted effort. The subcommittee was asked to look also at peer evaluation but declined because it was simply more than it could handle.

There are a number of reasons for student evaluations, Professor Goldstein said. One is for personnel purposes; another is to help the instructor improve. Did they look at the latter? They did, Professor Durfee said. That is where the question bank is important; there can be mass customization of forms and the instructor can ask additional questions. Not all can do that, Professor Goldstein replied; some need guidance on what could be asked. It would help to have guidance for the instructor on what he or she could do to improve a course.

If one is being evaluated by the department head for tenure, one will be guarded, Professor Wiedmann said. But if one goes to the Center for Teaching and Learning Services (CTLTS), which is only interested in improving teaching, one can be open and not worry about the long-term function. Does this serve a different purpose? That is why the department and college need to be upfront about how they will use data, Professor Durfee said.

Vice President Carrier said that CTLTS still exists and serves many faculty every year. One comment she heard from the director of CTLTS about peer evaluation is that faculty say they do not know how to do it and fear that if they say the wrong thing, they could harm people. If that is true, the University must help people learn to do evaluations. Professor Goldstein said he thought that would be a good idea.

Professor Akehurst noted that there was mention in the subcommittee report that the instructor could make a response to student evaluations. He said he would favor that option. Faculty can respond to everything else in their personnel file, so they should be able to respond to the student evaluations as well. And to student comments. All faculty have seen outliers; if someone says a faculty member is abysmal, the faculty member should have the opportunity to respond.

That question also came up with respect to inappropriate comments that have nothing to do with the course or the instruction, Professor Durfee said. Since the University cannot prevent or screen such comments, faculty should be allowed to comment on them. The practice now varies by department. He said he believed this point should be Senate policy.

Professor McLoon said he worried the Committee could be spinning its wheels. He said that adopting a 37-page report would not be useful and this is not a useful process. Professor Fossum said he wished to speak on behalf of the previous committees that have worked on this issue. As they know,

there is a policy in place, but its implementation led this Committee and Educational Policy to be concerned about the way course and teaching evaluations took place. They asked the subcommittee to look at the issue in depth, and it focused on student evaluations. The subcommittee did an excellent job. Everyone may quibble with parts of the report, based on their own experiences, and no one believes the report is the be-all and end-all of the issue. But the recommendations are reasonable and a well-thought foundation for rewriting the Senate policy. The policy will only be as good as the faculty and department heads who implement it, and they will be helped if they are educated about evaluation. If the recommendations are implemented, they will help improve teaching. As Professor Wiedmann said, there is much more that can be done; this report is part of the process. Professor Fossum moved that the Committee adopt the recommendations so that the two Committees can start to work on developing a revised Senate policy. The result will go to the Senate for a vote, Professor Kleiner said; Professor Fossum said that there should be also be discussion: if it is a valuable policy, it should be discussed by the Senate, as should implementation.

The Committee voted 10-0 with one abstention in favor of Professor Fossum's motion.

Professor McLoon expressed a worry that a new Senate policy would not change anything in his department. He said he would like to see something practical go out, something that takes the recommendations and incorporates them in something usable about designing the evaluation of courses. No one cares about student evaluations until it comes time for a pay increase in the spring. It would help if departments were provided something that is user-friendly and help make the process work. Dr. Carrier said she would work with CTLS to think about how to do that.

Professor Kleiner thanked Professor Durfee for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 4:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota