2010-11 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MARCH 31, 2011

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

The fourth meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2010-11 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, March 31, 2011 at 2:34 p.m., as a joint meeting of the two bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 20 academic professional members, 18 civil service members, 107 faculty/academic professional members, and 20 student members. President Bruininks presided.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS
Information

University Senate

University Senate Constitution Amendment – P&A Senate
Approved by the: University Senate December 2, 2010
Approved by the: Administration January 27, 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents March 10, 2011

University Senate Constitution Amendment – Faculty and Staff Delegation
Approved by the: University Senate December 2, 2010
Approved by the: Administration January 27, 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents March 10, 2011

Faculty Senate

Amendment to the Policy on Grading and Transcripts: Withdrawals and Repeating Courses
Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 30, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Regents Policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 30, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING*
Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING
* President Bruininks is asking Senior Vice President and Provost Sullivan, executive officer responsible for the administration of these particular policies, to share and discuss the proposed amendments with the Board of Regents

Policy on Appointments to Graduate Examining Committees
Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 2, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents - no action required

Amendment to the Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure
Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 2, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING*
Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

* President Bruininks is asking Senior Vice President and Provost Sullivan, executive officer responsible for the administration of these particular policies, to share and discuss the proposed amendments with the Board of Regents

Amendment to the Regents Policy: Code of Conduct
Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 2, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

2. SENATE CONSULTATIVE REPORT
Senate Protocols
Information for the University Senate

The text of the following Senate protocols can be found on the web at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/protocols.html

Mailings and Use of Email Lists
Appointment of Subcommittee of Senate Committees
Protocol on Committee Resolutions
Athletic Tickets for Senate Committee Members
Committee Chairs Pro Tem
Guidelines for Senate Minutes and Senate Committee Minutes
Guidelines for Members and Chairs of Senate Committees
Administration Responses to Senate Actions
FCC Interactions with the Board of Regents
Election and Absence of the Chair and Vice Chair – FCC
Election Protocol for TC members of the FCC
FCC Procedures for Acting on Requests for Temporary Suspension of Faculty under Section 14 of the Tenure Code

COMMENT:

The Faculty and Senate Consultative Committees are reporting these protocols to the Faculty and University Senates for information. They have been adopted over a period of years and have guided the conduct of business for some time. Earlier this year FCC and SCC reviewed all of these protocols, made changes to ensure clarity and consistency, and now report them to the Senates. They are on the Senate website. **Copies will not be provided at the meeting, so please review the protocols on the website if you wish.**

KATHRYN VANDENBOSCH, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

3. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Policy on Hospitality and Special Expenses
Information for the University Senate

Policy on Hospitality and Special Expenses
(new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~).

Policy Statement

Employees who incur or approve expenses for hospitality, alcoholic beverages, entertainment, and other special expenses must exercise prudent judgment to ensure that the expenses are for legitimate University business and comply with the Expense Allowability Grid, regardless of funding source.

If a proposed expenditure is not specifically addressed in the Expense Allowability Grid, it may still be allowable. In those cases, the following principles should guide employee decision-making:

- The expenses must be reasonable, allowable, and allocable under governing laws, regulations, and University policy,
- The purpose for the expenses must directly support the University's mission of teaching, research, and outreach;
- The expenses may not create, maintain, or increase the value of a personal asset, or be personal in nature.

Departments, colleges, coordinate campuses and units may interpret and apply this policy more restrictively where budget, reputation, prior patterns of behavior, or other risk factors are a consideration. However, coordinate campuses, departments and colleges are not allowed to establish their own separate policies in lieu of this University-wide policy.

Employees must provide all requested justification and documentation for hospitality and special expenses.

Exceptions should be infrequent. Departments may request an exception from the University Controller in those situations where special circumstances exist. If an exception is not obtained in advance and the expense is determined to be unallowable, the expense may not be reimbursed, and may be deemed taxable income to the employee, in accordance with guidance published by the Internal Revenue Service regarding "accountable plans".

Applicability of the Policy to Student Groups

Campus Life Program organizations that occasionally raise funds for charitable organizations or activities may continue to do so without being in violation of this policy, so long as the student organizations use the appropriate accounting procedures required for the University's financial systems, and obtain any necessary approvals from the appropriate advisors.

Hospitality Expenses Incurred While Traveling

This policy also applies to employees incurring hospitality expenses while traveling on University business. Due to the higher expense limits for certain hospitality expenses, employees may not use this policy to circumvent travel per diem limits. Employees are assumed to be in "travel" status for purposes of reimbursement unless a clear case for hospitality status can be made. Employees cannot be reimbursed for both a hospitality meal and the per diem for the same meal. (See the University's travel policy at http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Finance/Travel/TRAVEL.html

Expenses for Alcoholic Beverages

Expenses for the purchase, use or consumption of alcoholic beverages are permitted under the following conditions:

- The activity or event for which the expense is incurred must have a legitimate University business purpose (e.g., faculty recruitment or donor relations activities)

- The alcoholic beverages must be paid for with University non-sponsored private funds only, and they must be allowable on the intended source of funds. See University Fund Types.
- The expenditure and the circumstances for the consumption of alcoholic beverages must not jeopardize the University's reputation, or the health and welfare of those involved.

Selling or Serving Alcoholic Beverages on University Property
Alcoholic beverages may be sold or served on University property in accordance with the following requirements:

Licensed Facilities (TCF Bank Stadium, Minnesota Landscape Arboretum, and Northrop Memorial Auditorium):
- Events held at the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum and Northrop Memorial Auditorium MUST use University Dining Services (UDS) to sell or serve alcoholic beverages.
- Non-game day events held at TCF Bank Stadium may use UDS, or any other Licensed Caterer With Permit, to sell or serve alcoholic beverages.

All Other University Facilities:
- Events held at any other University property or venue may use any Licensed Caterer With Permit or UDS to sell or serve alcoholic beverages. (note – UDS ~~does not cater~~ contracts with a Licensed Caterer with Permit to serve alcohol at events with alcoholic beverages at ~~any~~ University locations or venues other than Northrop Memorial Auditorium and the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum).

In accordance with state law, no alcoholic beverages may be sold or served at TCF Bank Stadium, Mariucci Arena, or Williams Arena in any of those athletic facilities on game days.

Advance approval is required from Risk Management and Insurance whenever a University organization (college, department, unit, Campus Life Program or Registered Student Organization) or a non-University organization (an external third party or individual) wishes to hold an event where alcoholic beverages will be sold or served by a Licensed Caterer. Approval from Risk Management is NOT required for the sale or service of alcoholic beverages when UDS is the caterer at TCF Bank Stadium, Northrop Memorial Auditorium, or the Minnesota Landscape Arboretum.

Alcoholic beverages may be served (but not sold) without a licensed caterer at private University departmental, private Campus Life Program, and private Registered Student Organization events, under the following conditions:
- The event must meet the definition of a private departmental event (see Definitions);
- Alcoholic beverages may be donated by participants, or must be paid for with private funds;
- Alcoholic beverages may not be sold at the event;
- No admission fee can be charged for the event;
- The event cannot be open to the public.

~~**Applicability to Student Organizations**~~
~~Campus Life student organizations that occasionally raise funds for other charitable organizations or activities may continue to do so without being in violation of this policy, so long as the student organizations use the appropriate accounting procedures required for the University's financial systems, and obtain any necessary approvals from the appropriate advisors.~~

Reason for Policy

To implement Board of Regents Policy*: Alcoholic Beverages on Campus*, to comply with federal and state law, to comply with Internal Revenue Service guidance regarding expense reimbursements made pursuant to "accountable plans", and to satisfy restrictions imposed by funding agencies. As a public institution, the University must demonstrate appropriate use of funds entrusted to it by various constituencies and assure that special expense do not personally benefit University employees.

KATHRYN VANDENBOSCH, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

4. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

John B. Becker
Staff
Kinesiology
1975 – 2011

Martha C. Blake
Staff
Law School
1929 – 2011

David Herin
Staff
Psychiatry
1976 – 2011

Leonard Hertz
Staff
Horticultural Science
1924 – 2011

Craig Johnson
Staff
Veterinary Biomedical Sciences
1963 – 2011

Edith M. Johnson
Staff
Masonic Cancer Center
1923 – 2011

Beverly J. Lewis
Staff
Pediatrics
1925 – 2011

Nancy Jo Peterson
Staff
Office of the Registrar
1954 – 2011

Timothy K. Riley
Staff
Custodial Service – University of Minnesota Duluth
1951 – 2011

Marion E. Ripley
Staff
Physical Plant
1928 – 2011

Vickie Roberts
Staff
Academic Support Resources
1948 – 2011

5. INTRODUCTION
Chancellor Lendley Black, University of Minnesota Duluth

Due to technology issues, this introduction could not take place.

6. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Kathryn VandenBosch, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), reported that SCC met once since the last meeting. Both items it discussed, the Conflict of Interest Policy for Clinical Health Care and a statement on academic civility will be presented to the University Senate later this semester.

7. MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 2, 2010, FEBRUARY 24, 2011, AND MARCH 3, 2011
Action by the University Senate
(2 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate and Faculty Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL.

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/101202sen.html
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsen/110224fac.html
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/110303sen.html

STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

8. EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
Supporting the Efforts of the Work Group Promoting Academic Civility
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Supporting the Efforts of the Work Group Promoting Academic Civility

WHEREAS: Academic incivility is a serious concern on campuses across the country.

WHEREAS: Academic incivility can be defined as hostile, intimidating or offensive behaviors by faculty, staff, or students within the institution, to the extent that it interferes with the ability to work or study, and carries high costs to affected individuals and the institution.

WHEREAS: The Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity (EAD) supports the efforts of the Work Group Promoting Academic Civility (The Work Group).

WHEREAS: The Work Group grew out of the Student Conflict Resolution Center's (SCRC) Graduate Student Experience Survey. The Workgroup is an ad hoc group of interested individuals representing several offices across the campus.

WHEREAS: The Work Group supports the Academic Civility Initiative which envisions a University culture that fosters academic excellence and promotes civil and respectful relationships through effective prevention of, and response to hostile, offensive, or intimidating behavior.

WHEREAS: An effective and respectful student/adviser relationship is a critical factor in the success of graduate students and fosters academic excellence.

WHEREAS: The Workgroup has prepared helpful materials identifying strategies for addressing incivility as well as resources that support effective and respectful advising relationships. These are being distributed to interested departments and units where they are customized to meet their needs.

BE IT RESOLVED: That EAD requests:

1) That units and departments be encouraged to support the Academic Civility Initiative by providing a positive and supportive working and learning environment, and by responding to reported instances of hostile, intimidating, or offensive behavior.

2) That units and departments adapt and utilize materials developed by the Work Group that support best practices of advising and mentoring. That programs consider using the template survey "Graduate Student Adviser Evaluation" (which currently exists on the SCRC website under "Strategies for Improving Advising and Mentoring of Graduate and Professional Students.").

3) That excellent graduate advising be recognized in annual faculty reviews.

4) That a comprehensive review be conducted of the research and surveys, e.g. the 2007 SCRC survey, "Pulse" survey, exit interviews, and institutional research to provide additional analysis of these data and possible direction for further efforts to create a culture of mutual responsibility and respect.

5) That the Work Group be encouraged to conduct a new study to provide some comparisons with the 2007 data.

COMMENT:

The Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee (EAD) and the Social Concerns Committee would encourage further efforts to disseminate the results of the Graduate Student Experience Survey and would like to see more support for the vision and recommendations of the Work Group. We would like to see more substantial changes to support a culture of respect for graduate students by addressing the University Faculty and Staff attitudes and behaviors in a systemic way.

Approved by the Social Concerns Committee October 25, 2010, Student Affairs Committee March 9, 2011, and the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee March 21, 2011.

IRENE DURANCZYK, CHAIR
EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

TIMOTHY SHELDON, CHAIR
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE

SILVIA CANELON, CO-CHAIR
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

JOYCE HOLL, CO-CHAIR
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

TABLED

9. EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Resolution on Equity during Budget Cuts
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Equity during Budget Cuts

Should it be necessary to implement salary reductions for University employees in the future, the University Senate requests that the administration seriously consider a progressive scale based on principles of protecting living wages and social justice.

COMMENT:

The administration asked the Faculty Senate to vote its assent to the temporary reduction of faculty salaries for fiscal year 2010-2011, while also proposing to reduce the compensation of other employees of the University, in accord with Section 4.5 of the Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure. The reduction of faculty salaries was approved by the Faculty Senate (1.15% for the salaries of all faculty and P&A employees, 2.3% for academic and administrative officers, and a three day furlough for staff) and was projected to yield savings of $18.5 million. In a comparable situation of economic duress, in 1932, the Regents of the University of Minnesota imposed a salary cut on a sliding scale, reducing all salaries above certain thresholds and imposing no reduction on salaries below a certain threshold.

The Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee (EAD) appreciated the administration's efforts last year to respond to concerns faculty expressed about equity in dealing with the University's financial troubles. Nevertheless, EAD is concerned that across-the-board percentage pay cuts are inherently regressive in their disproportionate effect on lower-income members of the University community.

Should a similar financial situation arise, the University Senate recommends that the administration seriously consider a progressive and equitable scale so that employees who garner the highest wages at the institution are more proportionally affected for the short term and that the administration protect employees who are the lowest-paid and most vulnerable (for example, employees making less than 200% of the U.S. poverty level) not be asked again to help balance the University budget in difficult economic times.

Approved by the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee, March 21, 2011.

IRENE DURANCZYK, CHAIR
EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Q: How many employees make less than 200 percent of the U.S. poverty level?

A: The committee did not get this information since the number of people was not the issue. As with discrimination, the fact that there would be some employees below this figures makes the case for a fair and equitable progressive scale.

A senator stated that this resolution ties the hands of the Senate without knowing what will happen in the future.

Another senator said that he asked Vice President Carrier for these figures. 200 percent of the U.S. poverty level for family of four is $43,500. 33 percent of University employees are below this level.

A senator said that the resolution just asks for consideration rather than mandates a course of action. Circumstances always influence decisions. The hope is that the Senate and its committees will consult on any future options with appropriate data.

Another senator noted that progress implies a continuous function and not specific marks on a scale.

A senator spoke in favor of the resolution and noted that those who make less are the ones who keep the University running. It is unfair for them to bear the burden if future cuts are needed.

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

APPROVED

10. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Statement on Space Management
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approved the following statement:

The University Senate:

1) Endorses the principles that space should be:
   - **Sustainable**: The University should not have more space than it can afford to operate, maintain, and support.

   - **Aligned**: The University should provide the correct type, quality, and quantity of space required for programs (academic, administrative, and athletic) to function effectively.

   - **Managed**: The University should provide tools and incentives for maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of its space resources.

2) Supports a more disciplined and purposeful decision-making process regarding the University's space inventory by:
   a. Establishing a "No Net New Space without Net New Resources" planning goal.
   b. Prioritizing the renewal of existing buildings over new construction
   c. Conducting comprehensive cost analyses (capital, operations, program) on all new facility projects.
   d. Funding new building operating costs, including Repair and Replacement funds.

3) Encourages the inclusion of additional incentives to reduce space-use in the budget process.

4) Supports the updating and adjustment of the Minnesota Facility Model (MFM) space standards to reflect changes in technology, space sharing, and other best practices applicable in the current academic environment.

5) Urges the communication of best practices and training of units (departments and RRCs) on space management methods and space charging practices.

Approved by the Finance and Planning Committee, November 15, 2010.

RUSSELL LUEPKER, CHAIR
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

11. UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT
Civil Service Senate Rules
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve an amendment to the University Senate Rules which allocates a section for the Civil Service Senate Rules and distributes authority for future revisions to these Rules to the body listed after each article or section. The revisions to the Civil Service Committee sections of the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules were approved by the Civil Service Committee on March 2, 2011, and are available on the web at: http://www1.umn.edu/csc/materials/11-03-02_governing_docs.pdf. As an amendment to the University Senate Rules, the motion requires a simple majority for approval.

KATHRYN VANDENBOSCH, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

12. UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT
Civil Service Senate
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To amend Articles III and of the University Senate Constitution as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~). As an amendment to the University Senate Constitution, the motion requires either a two-thirds majority of all voting members of the University Senate (172) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

...

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

1. Powers

a. The University Senate shall have general legislative authority over administrative matters concerning more than one campus or the University as a whole, but not over the internal affairs of a single campus, institute, college, or school, except where these materially affect the interests of the University as a whole or the interests of other campuses, institutes, colleges, or schools. It may also offer advice to the President on budget, educational policy, and research issues.

b. The University Senate shall have the power to recognize campus assemblies as official campus legislative and policy-making bodies and, upon so doing, such organizations shall have all powers permitted the campus assembly in this Constitution and Bylaws.

c. The University Senate may delegate authority and responsibility to campus assemblies in administrative matters concerning only one campus of the University. Each campus shall determine its own assembly and shall adopt its own constitution and bylaws, consistent with the constitution and bylaws of the University Senate.

d. Nothing in this constitution bars the Senate Consultative Committee, the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Student Consultative Committee, the P&A Consultative Committee, or the Civil Service Consultative Committee from discussing and expressing views on any matter they deem appropriate, without regard to any view expressed by any of the other bodies.

e. In case of disagreement between or among the Senate Consultative Committee, Faculty Consultative Committee, the Student Consultative Committee, the P&A Consultative Committee, or the Civil Service Consultative Committee on a matter, each body may present its own views to the president.

f. Nothing in this constitution bars the University Senate, the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, the P&A Consultative Committee, or the Civil Service Consultative Committee from discussing and expressing views on any matter it deems appropriate, without regard to any view expressed by any of the other bodies.

g. In case of disagreement between or among the University Senate, Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, the P&A Senate, or the Civil Service Senate ~~Committee~~ on a matter, each body may present its own views to the president.

2. Membership

a. The University Senate shall be composed of the following voting members:

(1) the president of the University;

(2) the vice chair of the University Senate;

(3) the 10 elected faculty members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the 10 elected student members of the Student Consultative Committee, the 2 P&A Consultative Committee members of the Senate Consultative Committee, the 2 Civil Service Consultative Committee members of the Senate Consultative Committee, and the past chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, who shall serve as ex officio voting members;

(4) the 155 members of the Faculty Senate;

(5) the 50 members of the Student Senate;

(6) 23 elected academic professional and administrative staff members; and

(7) 23 elected civil service staff members.

Qualified academic staff members elected to the Faculty Senate will not be counted as part of the 23 academic staff to be elected to the University Senate.

b. Each member of the University Senate shall represent the University as a whole. The deans, vice presidents, chancellors, provosts, the University Librarian, and the General Counsel shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members. Student body presidents of the Twin Cities, Duluth, Morris, and Crookston student bodies shall, if not otherwise elected, serve as ex officio nonvoting members.

...

ARTICLE IX. JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS

1. Intercollege Controversies (Changes to this section are subject to vote only by the Faculty Senate)

Controversies arising between institutes, colleges, and/or schools of collegiate rank may be presented, after mutual conference, to a special committee appointed by the president and confirmed by the University Senate. If the special committee is unable to arrange a mutually agreeable solution to the problem in question, the matter shall be placed on the agenda of the next regular or special meeting of the University Senate for decision. The Senate's decision may be appealed to the president.

2. Controversies Between a Senate and Institutes, Colleges, and Schools (Changes to this section are subject to vote only by the Faculty, P&A, Civil Service, and Student Senates)

Controversies arising between the University, Faculty, P&A, Civil Service, or Student Senate or any of their committees and a campus, institute, college, or school government or other division of the University shall be resolved by the president, after conference with representatives of the appropriate Senate and of the units in question.

COMMENT:

Changes to Articles III and IX reflect the change in transition of the Civil Service Committee to a Civil Service Senate.

KATHRYN VANDENBOSCH, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion a vote was taken and the motion was not approved with only 143 votes in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions. An electronic vote will take place.

NOT APPROVED

13. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks said that this has been a challenging legislative session. There are 61 new legislators, a change in the majority in the House and Senate, and a new Governor, as well as a large budget deficit. He is deeply worried about the current trends. State support is currently 20 percent of the University's budget. The House and Senate recommendations would take University funding back to 1998 levels. For every million dollars in state funding that it lost, 15 people lose their jobs or $22 million is needed in endowments.

The Senate cut is 19 percent. In addition to this overall cut to the base budget, there is a tendency to cherry-pick parts of the University budget. The Mayo partnership and University of Minnesota Extension would see 60 percent cuts. During his tenure, he has been tenacious in advocating that if cuts are to be made, the decisions need to be left to the University to decide

how best to protect students, programs, and the academic mission. He believes that these are earmarks and over-regulation.

This is not just an argument about funding. He does not believe that it is good policy to drive down access Minnesota students. He is worried about the tendency to pair deep reductions with excessive regulations that do not allow the University to address the challenges in a highly creative and consultative way.

Another worrisome issue is the tendency to load bills with other riders. This year's rider is anti-cloning legislation. Vice President Friedman has stated that this rider is anti-patient, anti-hope, anti-science, and anti-business. He stated that the University does not do cloning, nor does it have any plans to do it, but the language envelopes stem cell research as well and makes them criminal actions. The good news is that it is unlikely that this rider will be approved, but citizens should still be alarmed.

President Bruininks appreciated the report on capital investments from the Finance and Planning Committee. The University is moving towards decommissioning eight structures this year and decrease University space by one million square feet over the next few years. This will save $10 million in annual expenses, which does not include ongoing maintenance expenses. The University has tripled the amount of emphasis in the capital request in the last nine years on Higher Education Asset Preservation and Replacement (HEAPR) funding. This requires no matching University funding and is designed to restore buildings. The actual budget appropriations in this period have been four times the amount received in the previous 15 years.

All budget resources will be reviewed to drive down costs while minimizing job losses in today's economic climate. The Retirement Incentive Option is also being used again to help people plan for transitions. Everyone has been encouraged to think of new strategies, such as adding over 12,000 students in the last five years. Blue Ribbon Committee reports have also sparked new interest in entrepreneurial strategies and commitments.

The University will continue to reduce investments where it can and thoughtfully manage any potential cuts. He expects that 80-100 percent of any cuts will be made in the first year of the biennium.

There are important dates to watch. The legislature is legally scheduled to adjourn on May 23. He is hoping that this deadline will be met, but if not, a special session would need to be called after the leaders arrive at an agreement. June 30 is the end of the University's fiscal year and it is possible that the next budget year could start without state funding. This amounts to $50 million per month in missing revenue from the state. However the University needs to keep going due to summer session, research, and ongoing commitments.

He believes that senators needs to educate citizens that these cuts are not easy to take and that in the last two years, $110 million was removed from the University's budget. This is not a one-time issue but would be the third time in nine years that the state to cut the University's budget in excess of $100 million. The Governor's budget recommendation is for six percent and would keep tuition increases at 1.5-2.0 percent. The House or Senate budgets would have a much higher tuition increase or require 1500 layoffs to keep tuition increases low.

14. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

A senator commented that when speaking with legislators and citizens, they need to be reminded that next year's salary freeze will be the fifth one in 20 years.

Q: What would be the University's position in the case that a request were made under Minnesota's open record law to search faculty and staff email records for evidence of political advocacy? Do employees need to avoid speaking as citizens?

A: This trend is disturbing and they should be resisted. The University should stand for academic freedom and free speech, but needs to avoid attacking the beliefs of others through a University branded website or email address as there are other forms that can be used. There are Regents policies on this topic that first need to be understood, along with state law, before the University could take a position.

Professor Kathryn VandenBosch stated that the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee will be taking up this topic tomorrow and will be joined by representatives from the Office of Information Technology and the Office of the General Counsel.

Q: Most faculty live in districts with legislators who are sympathetic to the University. How can the University reach people living in other districts?

A: There are faculty, staff, and students who live in almost every district. The Alumni Association also has a legislative network to help the University. University professors are widely respected and trusted so he encouraged them to write to any state outlet to make the case for the University.

Q: Steve Sviggum is being asked to choose between his two positions at the University-Regent and Professor-due to a potential conflict of interest. For many years there has been a labor Regent. Is this Regent not also a conflict of interest? Will this lead to a change in Board policy?

A: There is no labor Regents right now. Previous labor Regents were not employees of the University but would recuse themselves during discussions and votes on some issues. This recusal is customary. This situation does not signal a change in Board policy.

Q: Through the Regents, the state has almost total control over University governance. In return, the state contributes less than 20 percent to the University's budget. As the Regents have not made any public remarks, how can the University make sure that the Regents advocate on behalf of the University and any proposed cuts?

A: The Regents have expressed concern and angst over the funding trend. They take an oath at swearing in to advocate for the University. While they may differ philosophically on some issues, they are deeply dedicated to the future of the University. The issue is how to get the state support that is deserved.

A senator suggested that senators read the March 27 Star Tribune editorial from Professor Giancarlo Casale and forward it to their colleagues. It articulates the University's dilemma in an effective way.

Q: Do you support graduate assistant union organizing?

A: No since it is not productive to the organization, but students have the right to do it. He would prefer to work collaboratively on solutions instead of working through a union.

15. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

16. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

17. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:39 p.m.

18. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Kathryn VandenBosch, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that recent FCC guests have included Associate Vice President Meredith McQuaid, to provide an update on the University's Office of Global Programs and Strategic Alliance, and Senior Vice President Robert Jones to discuss the coordinate campuses. FCC has also discussed academic professional eligibility for teaching awards and high school preparation standards for freshmen.

At today's meeting, FCC had a series of interesting discussions with the Provost and Vice Provost regarding the scale, scope, and mission of the University along with an update on Twin Cities enrollment management. Dean Schroeder also provided an update on ongoing work on look at mechanisms for financing graduate assistantships and tuition structures. Provost Sullivan also reported on Blue Ribbon Committee reports. He will come back to discuss the compact process.

Retirement and health benefit changes will be presented to FCC on April 7, and the leadership from the Civil Service Committee and the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators have been invited to attend. These issues will then be discussion items at the April 14 Senate meeting. FCC's April 7 discussion will be circulated to senators prior to the meeting.

19. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS UPDATE

Professor Elizabeth Boyle, one of the Faculty Legislative Liaison along with Professor Caroline Hayes, distributed a handout showing the University's economic impact and the state budget status. Contact information was also included for key legislators, including the Governor. She noted that while most faculty live in districts with sympathetic legislators, letters to them can be helpful as well.

President Bruininks said that when looking at the history of state support for the University, there has been heavy support from greater Minnesota representatives. While there are many local campuses in the MnSCU system, there is a great deal of respect for the University. He urged senators to use their contacts to stress that there is no single investment that the state makes which creates as many jobs as the University. The total of direct and indirect state jobs is approximately 80,000, which makes the University the second largest employer in the state.

Professor Caroline Hayes noted that legislators state that they receive very few hand-written letters so these can make a greater impact.

20. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Election Of Faculty Senate Officers

Action by the Faculty Senate

The chair of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee recommend the following officers for 2011-12:

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

KATHRYN VANDENBOSCH, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

21. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
2015-16 Crookston and Duluth Calendars
Information for the Faculty Senate

Crookston 2015-16

Fall Semester 2015 (75 class days)

August 25	Tuesday	Classes begin
September 7	Monday	Labor Day holiday
October 9	Friday	In-service (no classes)
November 26-27	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 11	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 14-17	Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
December 17	Thursday	End of the term

Spring Semester 2016 (73 class days)

January 11	Monday	Classes begin
January 18	Monday	MLK holiday
February 15	Monday	In-service (no classes)
March 14-18	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
March 25	Friday	Floating holiday (no classes)
May 2	Monday	Last day of instruction
May 3-6	Tues.-Fri.	Final examinations
May 6	Friday	End of the term
May 7	Saturday	Commencement

May Session 2016 (15 class days)

May 9	Monday	May session begins
May 27	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2016 (39 class days)

June 6	Monday	Classes begin
July 4	Monday	Independence Day holiday
July 29	Friday	8-wk summer session ends

Duluth 2015-16

Fall Semester 2015 (71 class days)

September 7	Monday	Labor Day holiday
September 8	Tuesday	Classes begin
November 26-27	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 17	Thursday	Last day of instruction
December 18-19, 21-23	Fri.-Sat., Mon.-Wed.	Final examinations
December 23	Wednesday	End of the term

Spring Semester 2016 (74 class days)

January 18	Monday	MLK holiday
January 19	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 14-18	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 6	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 9-13	Mon.-Fri.	Final examinations
May 12	Thursday	Grad Commencement
May 13	Friday	End of the term
May 14	Saturday	Undergrad Commencement

May Session 2016 (13 class days)

May 16	Monday	May session begins
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 3	Friday	Final examinations; End of May session

Summer Session 2016 (38 class days)

June 6	Monday	Classes begin
July 4	Monday	Independence Day holiday
July 29	Friday	Final examinations; End of Summer Session

THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

22. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
2015-16 Morris, Rochester, and Twin Cities Calendars
Action by the Faculty Senate

Morris 2015-16

Fall Semester 2015 (73 class days)

August 26	Wednesday	Classes begin
September 7	Monday	Labor Day holiday
October 19-20	Mon.-Tues.	Fall Break (no classes)
November 26-27	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 11	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 12	Saturday	Study day
December 14-17	Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations

Spring Semester 2016 (74 class days)

January 18	Monday	MLK holiday

January 19	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 14-18	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 6	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 7	Saturday	Study day
May 9-12	Mon.-Thurs.	Final examinations
May 14	Saturday	Commencement

May Session 2016 (14 class days)

May 23	Monday	May session begins
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 10	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2016

May 23-June 24	Summer session I (24 class days)	
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 27-July 29	Summer session II (24 class days)	
July 4	Monday	Independence Day holiday

Twin Cities and Rochester 2015-16

Fall Semester 2015 (70 class days)

September 7	Monday	Labor Day holiday
September 8	Tuesday	Classes begin
November 26-27	Thurs.-Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 16	Wednesday	Last day of instruction
December 17-19, 21-23	Thurs.-Sat., Mon.-Wed.	Final examinations
December 20	Sunday	Study day
December 23	Wednesday	End of the term

Spring Semester 2016 (74 class days)

January 18	Monday	MLK holiday
January 19	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 14-18	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 6	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 7-8	Sat.-Sun.	Study days
May 9-14	Mon.-Sat.	Final examinations
May 14	Saturday	End of the term

May Session 2016 (14 class days)

May 23	Monday	May session begins
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 10	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2016 (39 class days)

June 13	Monday	Classes begin
July 4	Monday	Independence Day holiday
August 5	Friday	8-wk summer session ends

THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

23. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on Credits for Nationally-Recognized Exams for Undergraduate Students
Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To approve the new Policy on Credits for Nationally-Recognized Exams for Undergraduate Students:

Credit for Nationally-Recognized Exams for Undergraduate Students: Twin Cities, Duluth, Crookston, Morris, and Rochester

POLICY STATEMENT

Students will be awarded credits based on nationally-recognized examinations (Advanced Placement (AP) program, the International Baccalaureate (IB) program, and the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)) when they meet the minimum standards for awarding credit. Academic unit authorities on each campus establish the minimum standards for awarding credits. Academic units are not required to offer credits for nationally-recognized examinations.

Academic unit authorities may award credits for a particular course if they determine that the material in the test is substantially similar to that of an existing course. If the material is judged to be of college level but not substantially similar to an existing course, the academic unit may assign general departmental credits.

COMMENT:

When the educational policies were all reviewed and revised two years ago, one policy was not included because it needed additional background work: Policy on Examinations for Credit and Proficiency. The Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education recommended to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) that the policy be split into two, one dealing with nationally-recognized exams and the other with departmental exams for credit.

This policy does not represent any change in institutional practice.

THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

24. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on Departmental Exams for Proficiency or Credit for Undergraduate Students
Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To approve the new Policy on Departmental Exams for Proficiency or Credit for Undergraduate Students:

Departmental Exams for Proficiency or Credit for Undergraduate Students: Twin Cities, Duluth, Crookston, Morris, and Rochester

POLICY STATEMENT

Academic departments have the discretion to offer any currently-enrolled undergraduate degree-seeking student an exam to either demonstrate proficiency or earn course credit. Departments may establish eligibility criteria for an exam for proficiency or credit. The format of these exams is at the department's discretion (e.g., final examination, oral tests, written papers or projects). A student may not take an exam for credit for a course he or she has already completed for any grade basis (i.e., A-F, S-N, or AUD status). No department is required to offer exams for proficiency or credit.

1. Exam to demonstrate proficiency
A departmental exam for proficiency may be used to fulfill prerequisites for advanced courses or satisfy other requirements. An exam for proficiency does not yield any course credit or grade. The academic department giving the examination will determine the minimum standards for successful completion of an exam for proficiency.

2. Exam to earn course credit
A departmental exam for credit may be used to earn credit for a course. Credit(s) earned by departmental exam have no bearing on an undergraduate student's campus-specific credit requirements. Credit(s) earned by departmental exam do not earn GPA points and are reflected only within the student's cumulative credit totals on the transcript (not within the term in which the student completed the exam). The academic department giving the examination will determine the minimum standards for successful completion of an exam for credit.

Students may be required to pay the credit by special examination fee for exams to earn course credit.

Special situations

On the Morris campus, the Scholastic Committee serves in the role of the academic department and has all related responsibilities.

REASON FOR POLICY

Departments may wish to have a means of allowing students to demonstrate existing proficiency in a subject without requiring the student to complete coursework.

COMMENT:

When the educational policies were all reviewed and revised two years ago, one policy was not included because it needed additional background work: Policy on Examinations for Credit and Proficiency. The Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education recommended to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) that the policy be split into two, one dealing with nationally-recognized exams and the other with departmental exams for credit.

The Faculty Senate just approved the policy on Credit for Nationally-Recognized Exams for Undergraduate Students: Twin Cities, Duluth, Crookston, Morris, and Rochester. This is the second of the two policies that were prepared.

SCEP raised questions about this policy and received answers that satisfied it, and approved it unanimously.

This policy does not represent any change in institutional practice.

THOMAS BROTHEN, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

25. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Report of the Ad Hoc Summer Semester Committee
Discussion by the Faculty Senate

Report of the Ad Hoc Summer Semester Committee January 2011

Overview

The Ad Hoc Summer Semester Committee was established and charged by the University of Minnesota Faculty Consultative Committee to assess whether or not serious consideration of a full, regular third (summer) semester added to the University's Twin Cities Campus calendar is warranted (see Appendix A for charge and Appendix B for committee membership). The committee met four times during fall semester 2010 and solicited information from a number of individuals including academic units representing almost all of the undergraduate, graduate, and professional student programs on the Twin Cities Campus (see Appendix C).

This report is not a detailed analysis of how a full summer semester would be implemented; we did not consider that to be our role. Nor do we address the potential for a full summer semester at the coordinate campuses. However, the report does raise the many issues, concerns, and opportunities that a full summer semester would present. Opinions varied within and among the academic units. Barriers to implementing a full summer semester primarily were perceived by the academic units as conflicts with current summer programs, limited demand, faculty desirability, and staffing limitations. Advantages expressed by academic units were expanded utilization of facilities, facilitation of graduation especially for transfer students, and options for faculty appointments. University support units (e.g., Academic Resources, Housing and Residential Life) indicated that they could accommodate a full third semester.

In sum, there is interest on the part of some academic units to investigate a full summer semester. However, two questions remain: (1) if only some units support a full summer semester, should it be implemented campus wide; and (2) is it possible for only some units to implement a full summer semester and not others? Additional exploration is warranted to more deeply analyze how this option would be implemented.

The full report can be found on the web at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fcc/1101_summer_session_report.pdf

COMMENT:

The Faculty Consultative Committee asked a small ad hoc committee to consider whether the Twin Cities campus should give serious consideration to adding a full, regular semester during the summer. The ad hoc committee prepared a report. FCC is considering what to recommend to the administration with respect to a summer semester and would like to hear the views of the members of the Faculty Senate.

KATHRYN VANDENBOSCH, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Kathryn VandenBosch, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that an idea arose in the Finance and Planning Committee that if the University had more summer offerings, there would be more efficient use of facilities. FCC constituted an ad hoc committee to determine if there should be a full study of implementing a summer semester at the Twin Cities Campus. The report outlines advantages, obstacles, and additional questions that would need further study. The ad hoc committee was chaired by Professor Becky Yust from the College of Design.

The executive summary was the in the printed agenda. Some of the advantages were the expanded utilization of facilities; possible facilitation of graduation, especially for transfer students; great flexibility and options for faculty appointments and student attendance; and support units reported that they could handle greater utilization. Some identified obstacles include possible conflicts with existing summer programs, limits on financial aid, and uncertainty about student demand.

The ad hoc committee identified two remaining questions-if only some units support a full summer semester, should it be implemented campus-wide, and is it possible for some other colleges to implement a full summer semester. FCC will need to make a recommendation to the administration about further action and is seeking input from senators, including questions that merit further investigation

A senator stated that since most faculty in his college are on 'B' appointments, there are two categories of decisions that need the involvement of the entire faculty-curricular changes and promotion decisions. If appointments were split over three semesters, when would these decisions take place? The issue of 100 percent faculty participation is not addressed in the report.

Professor Yust noted that the full report includes curricular issues from each of the colleges that responded. Even within colleges, these changes would have an impact on certain degree programs and not others. In terms of faculty appointments, it would not require that all faculty be available at all times as there are currently ways to involve faculty in these decisions when they are on leave. Unit governance is also particular to the unit and college. Many units were interested in pursuing this option further.

Another senator asked about the impact on class enrollment. Currently his college only offers summer courses for the most highly-enrolled courses and he is not sure that the college would support courses that enroll 15 students or less. Maybe enrollments would even out between semesters after five years, but the problem in the first few years will be to sustain enrollment and justify these costs. He also questioned how teaching assistant support would be handled if they were assigned to summer semester courses that were then cut. Graduate student support in his

college was already reduced by two-thirds so there one means of support is teaching assistantships. They cannot do anything that would jeopardize these positions.

Professor Yust said that one of issues with summer enrollment by undergraduates is the rules regarding financial aid. Until this past year, Pell Grants could only be used for two semesters per year. She is not sure if more education on costs could get students to take more summer courses, thereby graduating sooner and paying less overall. Graduate student support was also discussed. The committee also learned from Academic Support Resources (ASR) that one of the issues with the current summer session is that payment can not be made incrementally, as with the other semesters, but it due all at once. ASR noted that clearance for admittance and graduation is also handled differently in the summer, but these procedures could be changed.

A senator stated that many faculty are prohibited from overtime teaching. This restriction would need to be reconsidered if there was a full summer semester.

Another senator said that graduate student tuition benefits are being looked at by the Vice Provost for Graduate Education.

A senator stated that this report provides a very broad analysis of a complex management problem. One of the conclusions is that economic models have not been run sufficiently well at this point. Upfront costs and support would be needed to launch this kind of program and that subsidies would be needed for several issues.

Professor Russell Luepker, Chair of the Finance and Planning Committee (SCFP), agreed that this type of change would be hard due to the individual characteristics of schools and units. What started this report was two issues. First is that there are facilities which are not heavily used in the summer but still take funds to operate. Second is that some students want to get their degrees finished sooner. He agrees that there will be big challenges, requiring subsidies, but this model is being used in other places for the same reasons just mentioned.

A senator agreed with part of the previous statement in that more students graduating early or on-time has a huge personal value. He also expressed amazement at the lack of entrepreneurial spirit on the teaching side of the University. He also believes that full summer offerings would appeal to a broader range of students, those who have missed some experience or class or that only have summer available to take additional courses. He believes that there are many good aspects to this issue and that it requires more thought.

Another senator said that current dual-degree programs highly utilize May and summer session courses and therefore she would advocate for allowing liberties to programs to make decisions.

President Bruininks said that he would encourage faculty to push for a more robust summer session as was once the case when it was centralized. Since decentralization took place, there is no advocate for summer offerings or enrollment. With a creative approach, the University could capitalize on this opportunity. There could be huge advantages for undergraduates, since by taking summer semester courses, they would have time during a different semester to participate in an internship or study abroad. It would also increase the course offerings in the summer, particularly for liberal education requirements. This will be an important long-term issue for the University. He encouraged the coordinate campuses to have the same discussions.

Professor Yust said that there have been a huge increase in online course offerings in the summer. This is a growth area that faculty might not have the time to focus on during the rest of the academic year.

Another senator said that under the quarter system, her department had an arrangement in which faculty were appointed for any three out of four quarters. This was not a problem for the curriculum and it allowed for more summer offerings. She felt that it was a broad benefit to faculty and students.

Professor VandenBosch said that FCC has time to assimilate any other viewpoints and she would appreciate receiving further questions and comments from senators and their colleagues. FCC will have a report to the administration by the end of May.

26. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

27. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

28. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor