CONSECUTIVE MEETINGS OF:

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
THE FACULTY SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2015

2:30 - 5:15 P.M.

25 Mondale Hall--Twin Cities Campus
105 Kiehle Hall--Crookston Campus
173 Kirby Plaza--Duluth Campus
7 Humanities and Fine Arts Building--Morris Campus
Room 322--Rochester Campus

This is a consecutive meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate. There are 254 voting members of the University Senate and 164 voting members of the Faculty Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

1. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
2014-15 Committee on Committee Report on Reviewed Committees
Information for the University Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

The Committee on Committees (ConC) charge was amended in February 2011 to include the following provisions:

b. To meet during the fall semester with committee chairs, on a rotating basis determined by the committee, to review with each committee chair the charge to the committee and how well it has been functioning, and pursuant to these discussions, to make recommendations to the Senate Consultative Committee about any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership which it deems appropriate.

c. To review and forward as appropriate to the University Senate any proposed changes to the charge, membership, or ex officio members for committees of the University Senate prior to approval from the University Senate.

The ConC reviewed the following committees in 2013-14:

- Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee
- Academic Health Center Student Consultative Committee
- All-University Honors Committee
- Finance and Planning Committee
- Research Committee
- Student Academic Integrity Committee

OVERALL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ConC has three overall recommendations that came from this year's review process. These apply to all Senate Committees to greater or lesser degree but ConC wanted to be sure to address them all within this report:

1. Increased participation from all system campuses – ConC always considers system campus representatives for service on Senate committees. However, few system campus faculty and academic professionals choose to apply through the annual nomination

process. It would be helpful if the Senate leadership, when talking with leaders from all system campuses, encouraged the support of time being given towards governance work. It is a good reminder that even though some faculty are not eligible to serve, the P&As and civil service members on those campuses are eligible and can bring the voice of those campuses to governance work.

2. Expansion of Google Hangout rooms – As 238A Morrill Hall is the only room equipped with microphones and speakers, it is heavily used by Senate committees to make participating in meetings easier for system campus members. However, as this room is also used extensively by other departments in Morrill Hall, it is not always available. Also, this room can be too large for some smaller groups that would benefit from its technology. Therefore ConC encourages SCC to continue to push for additional rooms in Morrill Hall to be equipped with similar technology to make it easier for system campus members to participate.
3. On-boarding for new members who join at the beginning of the year or during the year – ConC recommends that an orientation be done at the first meeting for new and continuing members. This orientation should focus on the charge to the committee, its representation, and work that it did in the previous year. Members should then be encouraged to suggest topics for upcoming agendas. When a new member starts after the first meeting of the year, the chair is encouraged to speak to the member before or after a meeting, reviewing some of the same information from the fall orientation and serving as a resource for any future questions the new member may have. Chairs should also be cognizant when members are not speaking at meetings and ask if that person has something to contribute to the conversation.

The final recommendation relates solely to the All-University Honors Committee. ConC asks the SCC to encourage increased support at the collegiate and departmental levels for the award processes. Departments and colleges need to make this process a priority so that the number of nominations is increased and there is better recognition of recipients once they have been awarded these honors.

The full report on these committees is available at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/conc/14-15conc_report.pdf

STACY DOEPNER-HOVE, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

2. STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE
Advice from students to instructors on protecting academic integrity
Information for the University Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

To find ways to provide more information on academic integrity to faculty, the Student Academic Integrity Committee reviewed a document from the Pavela Report: Law and Policy in High Education, September 23, 2011, Vol 16:#29 and customized it for system-wide use at the University of Minnesota.

The document includes links to the office at each campus that handles these issues and tips to faculty in the following categories:

- Early in the Course
- Be Personal
- Remind and Reiterate

- Prevention: Cheating
- Prevention: Plagiarism
- Responding to Incidents

The full document is available at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/saic/150408protecting_ai.pdf

Approved by Student Academic Integrity Committee on April 8, 2015

JENNIFER GOODNOUGH, CHAIR
STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE

3. CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Recommendation for the Development of a Learning Space Master Plan as part of the University Strategic Plan Information for the University Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

Recommendation for the Development of a Learning Space Master Plan as part of the University Strategic Plan

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee of the Senate Educational Policy Committee recommends the development of a Learning Space Master Plan (LSMP) as part of the current University Strategic Planning process. A LSMP provides a vision to guide the creation, management, and operational excellence of learning spaces that befit the University of Minnesota. Learning spaces include not only traditional general purpose classrooms, but laboratories, studios, formal and informal study spaces, field research and demonstration space as well as others. The last review of classroom space occurred in 1995, and the 2009 Campus Master Plan included limited guidance for learning spaces. A current and focused LSMP is essential if we are going to achieve our goal of being a world leader in place-based research intensive education, and it will enable us to operate with a new level of focus and planning directed at innovating and operationally maintaining extraordinary learning spaces. A LSMP would include:

- System-wide reclassification of learning spaces using a uniform inventory system to efficiently catalogue existing space and plan for future space needs
- Managing instructional spaces through standardizing policies and procedures based on best practice educational principles, using performance metrics for space utilization, and soliciting funding for space related planning and operations
- Operating instruction and study spaces for optimal learning in day-to-day instruction, safety and security, and emergency preparedness

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee recommends supporting a collaborative advisory or consultative process in the development of the LSMP to ensure input from all stakeholders. The timing is right to align a LSMP with the current University Strategic Planning process. Development of the plan must interface with both educational leadership and capital planning. The Committee recommends a position be created under the Provost in the Center for Educational Innovation to lead the creation of the LSMP. The Office of Classroom Management supports creating the position and offers to fund 50% of new position, with the University funding the remainder to support the system-wide LSMP initiative.

The University of Minnesota is well positioned to be the premier institution of higher learning, demonstrating advanced innovations in best practice pedagogies. This cannot be accomplished

without due attention to the spaces where that learning occurs. The Committee believes the time is now to direct efforts toward a universal LSMP that can guide space decisions for decades to come.

Approved by the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee, May 2014
Approved by the Educational Policy Committee, April 2015

KEVIN SMITH, CHAIR
CLASSROOM ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

SUE WICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE

4. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Thomas Cowette
Associate Professor
Art
1938 - 2015

Robert Hudalla
Principal Engineer
Campus Master Planning
1929 - 2015

Scott Jacobson
Senior Lecturer
Writing Studies
1960 - 2015

Donald Kahn
Professor
Mathematics
1936 - 2015

Gary Leske
Associate Professor
Work, Community, and Family Education
1939 - 2015

William Lewis
Lab Animal Care Technician
Research Animal Resources
1949 - 2015

Michael Marpentier
Digital Equipment Service Specialist
Academic and Distributed Computing Services
1942 - 2015

George Martin Jr.

University Storehouse Manager
Facilities Management
1937 - 2015

Melanie Merz
Nursing Station Technician
Laboratory Medicine and Pathology
1956 - 2015

Josef Mestenhauser
Professor
Educational Policy and Administration
1925 - 2015

Donald Murray, Jr.
Library Assistant
University Libraries
1938 - 2015

Diana Pelayo-Jentoft
Principal Operations/Student Services Specialist
Bookstore - University of Minnesota Duluth
1965 - 2015

Kent Rabehl
Information Technology Professional
Work, Community, and Family Education
1964 - 2014

Mordecai Roshwald
Professor
College of Liberal Arts
1921 - 2015

Wallace Schultz
Vending Services Maintenance Supervisor
Vending Services
1935 – 2015

STUDENTS

Jennifer Houle
Carlson School of Management

5. PRESENTATION OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY SENATE GOVERNANCE AWARD (5 minutes)

The recipients of the 2015 Outstanding Service to University Senate Governance Award, Ms. Stacy Doepner-Hove, Professor Daniel Feeney, and Mr. Joseph Jameson will be presented with their certificates.

6. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
Information for the University Senate

Professor Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), submitted the following written report:

SCC has only had one meeting since the most recent University Senate. At the April 16 SCC meeting, the committee discussed the President's State of the University Address and also invited a member of the Office of Equity and Diversity to listen to a conversation about the priorities that the various members of the SCC believed should be focused on in the upcoming year as they relate to diversity. These priorities included:
1) continuing and increased focus on providing resources for lower-income students;
2) maintaining clear paths for participation at the University for a diverse student body, to include multiple forms of diversity such as religious diversity;
3) expanding faculty diversity because of the contribution of a diverse faculty to mentoring students, enhancing knowledge and the curriculum, and connecting with more communities – SCC wants to underscore, however, that this is not to suggest that faculty from dominant groups cannot serve these roles; indeed, they have a responsibility to ensure that the University has the ability to do so;
4) working toward increased support for faculty and staff who are caregivers;
5) ensuring that mentoring occurs at multiple levels;
6) ensuring adequate funding for the University to do what it wants to do, with support for pre-doctoral faculty programs, bridge funds, and flexible resources that can be used for specific cases.

In closing, she thanks her co-leaders of the SCC this year - Katherine Dowd, chair of the P&A Consultative Committee, and Bill O'Neill, chair of the Civil Service Consultative Committee. She also wants to thank the student, staff, and faculty representatives on the SCC this year. The committee had many important conversations about both the processes and principles that shape everyday life at the University. Each of their voices was important in shaping these conversations.

7. MINUTES FOR APRIL 2, 2015
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/usenate/minutes/150402sen.pdf

BECKY YUST, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE

8. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Current state of the Regents Scholarship Program
Discussion by the University Senate
(15 minutes)

FOR INFORMATION:

Until 2009, the Regents Scholarship provided all University employees the benefit of taking University courses at no cost to the employee. In 2009, the Regents voted to cut this benefit to 75% of tuition, except for employees seeking a first baccalaureate degree. All other employees must pay 25% of tuition to take courses offered by their employer. The purpose of this discussion is to explore the perspectives of various employees regarding this policy.

9. GRADUATE EDUCATION
Information for the University Senate
(10 minutes)

Information on this item will be sent to senators in advance of the meeting.

10. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
(10 minutes)

11. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT
(10 minutes)

Questions to the President should be submitted in writing to the University Senate office no later than Tuesday, April 28, 2015. The President may also choose to take questions from the floor.

12. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

13. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

14. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

THIS CONCLUDES THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BUSINESS.
THE SUBSEQUENT ITEMS ARE FACULTY SENATE BUSINESS ONLY.

MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

15. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS
Information

FACULTY SENATE

2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22 Rochester and Twin Cities Calendars
Approved by the Faculty Senate: April 2, 2015
Administrative Response: April 17, 2015

16. CLERK OF THE SENATE REPORT
Faculty Consultative Committee Election Results
Information for the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill Twin Cities vacancies on the Faculty Consultative Committee, Professors Greta Friedemann-Sanchez, Joseph Konstan, and Marlene Zuk were elected to three-year terms (July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2018).

BECKY YUST, CLERK
FACULTY SENATE

17. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements
Information for the University Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

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

COMMENT:

These data are also available on the web at: http://www.umreports.umn.edu

SUE WICK, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

SCEP Grading Distribution
Fall 2014
Data as of 1/30/2015

	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Campus	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range
UMNCR	3680	2.96	42.61%	1034	2.96	39.94%	3237	3.11	50.70%	491	3.01	44.60%			
UMNDL	19646	2.83	37.30%	7346	2.96	36.32%	11124	3.02	40.10%	4550	3.27	49.41%	678	3.23	49.12%
UMNMO	4007	2.96	36.46%	1427	2.99	37.49%	1726	3.07	41.77%	676	3.41	55.77%			
UMNTC	61369	3.15	44.41%	13865	2.99	34.73%	49738	3.25	48.62%	19256	3.24	47.40%	6233	3.29	50.87%

University of Minnesota, Crookston

	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Academic Group	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range
Acad Aff	3680	2.96	42.61%	1034	2.96	39.94%	3237	3.11	50.70%	491	3.01	44.60%			

University of Minnesota, Duluth

	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Academic Group	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range
Bus/Econ	869	2.75	26.24%	1538	2.93	32.57%	2837	2.75	22.91%	968	2.98	29.86%			
DMED													26	3.05	42.31%
Ed/Hum Srv	2530	3.08	44.27%	1325	2.98	41.51%	2536	3.15	49.49%	1235	3.51	60.73%	72	3.28	52.78%
Fine Arts	2745	3.14	58.14%	582	3.3	56.87%	447	3.39	62.19%	503	3.47	73.16%			
Lib Arts	5783	2.9	31.18%	740	3.09	40.27%	2829	3.14	43.34%	531	3.27	46.89%	158	3.17	41.77%
Pharmacy	40	3.46	70.00%				40	3.28	60.00%						
Sci/Eng	6007	2.56	24.12%	3046	2.84	29.38%	2104	2.91	36.36%	1293	3.23	44.47%	410	3.25	51.46%
UMD-Acad A	1672	3.37	65.97%	115	3.57	80.87%	326	3.76	80.67%	15	3.91	93.33%			

University of Minnesota, Morris

	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Academic Group	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range
Acad Aff	272	3.41	59.19%	26	3.6	73.08%	103	3.66	33.98%						
Div Educ	338	3.75	44.08%	191	3.55	55.50%	79	3.49	49.37%	314	3.72	62.42%			
Humanities	1639	3.11	37.58%	296	3.1	40.88%	402	3.29	54.98%	70	3.65	68.57%			
Sci/Math	1054	2.75	29.89%	565	2.83	29.91%	373	2.89	36.46%	137	3.11	38.69%			
Social Sci	704	2.87	31.25%	349	2.95	34.38%	769	2.99	37.71%	149	3.19	50.34%			

University of Minnesota, Rochester

	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
UMR Chance	1087	2.76	21.90%	500	2.87	22.20%	612	3.43	48.37%	255	3.62	41.57%			

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

	1000Level			2000Level			3000Level			4000Level			5000Level		
Academic Group	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range	Grades	GPA	Pct A-range
AHCS	153	3.25	40.52%				178	3.17	51.69%	213	3.43	15.02%	475	3.09	34.95%
CBS	2593	2.98	25.34%	1564	3.25	28.96%	1900	3.01	35.68%	1484	3.04	35.31%	44	3.34	45.45%
CCE	85	3.4	36.47%	30	3.64	73.33%	686	3.31	50.00%	799	3.32	53.07%	63	3.23	52.38%
CDES	1108	3.12	36.37%	586	3.11	38.23%	1527	3.31	52.06%	898	3.2	37.64%	64	3.5	53.13%
CFANS	2712	3.18	47.57%	1165	3.18	46.18%	2433	3.18	48.95%	1254	3.3	51.99%	137	3.38	53.28%
CLA	25015	3.3	46.60%	415	3.74	75.90%	22987	3.29	52.92%	3759	3.25	51.02%	1707	3.42	64.26%
CSE	17083	2.81	33.48%	6850	2.81	27.88%	4275	2.9	32.75%	4726	3.08	38.85%	1989	3.13	40.67%
CSOM	730	3.22	30.96%	1352	3.02	33.14%	5923	3.18	32.16%	2088	3.41	47.70%	727	3.23	42.64%
Dent				72	3.2	38.89%	118	2.94	26.27%	77	4	3.90%			
EHD	6713	3.38	63.50%	580	3.25	49.31%	4455	3.44	58.70%	1708	3.33	53.16%	778	3.64	71.21%
Health Sci	528	3.76	84.28%	55	3.93	16.36%									
HSPA	182	3.71	81.87%				153	3.52	65.36%	95	3.44	52.63%	24	3.63	75.00%
Law							16	2.78	31.25%						
Med	480	3.28	39.58%	40	3.25	50.00%	1817	3.02	42.21%	310	3.31	45.16%	32	3.33	40.63%
Nursing	145	4	58.62%	153	3.37	58.17%	582	3.58	68.73%	1299	3.57	75.06%	159	4	8.81%
Pharmacy	806	3.64	77.30%				120	3.29	52.50%	111	3.51	70.27%	28	3.85	92.86%
Pub Health	1435	3.39	59.30%				928	3.4	64.76%						
SRVPAA	77	3.5	61.04%	306	3.88	94.12%	838	3.61	70.53%	139	3.73	81.29%			
Ugrd Ed Ad	379	3.85	71.24%	59	3.72	55.93%	171	3.81	80.70%	41	3.89	85.37%			
VMed	58	3.92	87.93%	138	2.96	29.71%	19	3.39	47.37%						

Note: Measures (GPA, Pct A-range and Grades) for subjects with fewer than ten enrolled students are not displayed. Pct A-range includes both A and A- grades.

18. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
(5 minutes)

19. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS UPDATE
(5 minutes)

20. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Approval of Faculty Senate Officers
Action by the Faculty Senate
(2 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following officers for 2015-16 as recommended by the chair of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee:

Clerk – Professor Jennifer Alexander
Parliamentarian – Professor Christopher Roberts
Faculty Senate Vice Chair – Professor Catherine French

REBECCA ROPERS-HUILMAN, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

21. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Slate of Faculty Candidates
Action by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation and UMD Faculty Senators
(2 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following people to serve on the Committee on Committees for a term of 2015-18. A simple majority is required for approval.

BENJAMIN CLARKE: Associate Professor of Biomedical Sciences, Medical School Duluth.

CARSTON WAGNER: Professor of Medicinal Chemistry, College of Pharmacy.

ANN WALTNER: Professor of History, College of Liberal Arts.

MYLES SHAVER: Professor of Strategic Management and Entrepreneurship, Carlson School of Management

FOR INFORMATION:

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

The current membership of the committee is available at:
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/committees/conc.html

STACY DOEPNER-HOVE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

22. RESEARCH COMMITTEE
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Amendments to the Board of Regents Policy on Commercialization of Intellectual Property Rights
Action by the Faculty Senate
(5 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following amendments to the Board of Regents Policy on Commercialization of Intellectual Property Rights (language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~; language to be added is underlined). The full policy is available at: http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/Commercialization_IP.pdf

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY
COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

...

SECTION III. DEFINITIONS.

Subd. 1. Inventor. Inventor shall mean a University employee, student, or postdoctoral or other fellow who invents technology.

Subd. 2. Technology. Technology shall mean the following items and their related intellectual property rights:

- (a) a discovery or invention, patentable or not;
- (b) software owned by the University; and
- (c) trademarks owned by the University that identify University-owned or University-licensed plant varieties or that are commercialized in conjunction with other technology covered by this policy.

Subd. 3. University Official. University official shall mean a person defined as a University official in Board of Regents Policy: Institutional Conflict of Interest and any person covered by administrative policies or procedures implementing that policy.

Subd. 4. Controlling Equity Interest. Controlling equity interest shall mean the University's ownership of equity securities of a licensee sufficient to grant the University the power to direct the licensee's management. The University shall be considered to have a controlling equity interest in a licensee under this policy if:

- (a) the University owns a majority of the voting equity interest in the licensee; or
- (b) the University has the power to appoint a majority of the voting members of the governing body of the licensee.

Subd. 5. Licensee. Licensee shall mean a for-profit, privately held company to which the University licenses or assigns intellectual property rights in University-owned technology.

Subd. 6. Net Income. Net income shall mean the gross monetary payments the University receives in consideration for granting rights in the technology less (a) the University's out-of-pocket expenditures (including legal fees) directly attributable to protecting, developing, and transferring that technology and (b) a fifteen percent administrative fee of the gross monetary payments to help defray the costs associated with operating the Office of Technology Commercialization. Fees, charges, and other monetary payments made to the University to compensate it for administering intellectual property agreements or seeking and maintaining intellectual property protection for technology shall not be considered monetary payments under this policy. Net income includes the net cash proceeds received from the sale of securities acquired under Section V, Subd. 6 of this policy. Net income does not include the net cash proceeds received from the sale of securities acquired under Section VII, Subd. 5 of this policy.

...

SECTION VII. EQUITY, CONTROLLING EQUITY INTERESTS, AND ASSISTANCE WITH COMMERCIALIZATION.

Subd. 1. Disposition of Equity Securities. The University shall sell the equity securities acquired under Section V, Subd. 6 of this policy as soon as prudent and in strict compliance with all applicable federal and state laws. ~~The cash proceeds derived from the sale of equity securities shall be distributed in the same proportions as income derived from technology.~~

Subd. 2. Acquiring a Controlling Equity Interest in the Commercialization of Technology. In acquiring, as part of a transaction to commercialize technology, a majority or other equity interest in a company that grants the University the power to direct the company's management or the power to appoint a majority of the voting members of the governing body of the company, the following prohibitions shall apply:

- (a) Except as permitted under Section VII, Subds. 4 and 5 of this policy or any other applicable Board policies, the University shall not make a cash investment in, lend money to, or guarantee the obligations of the company; and
- (b) University officials shall not purchase or invest, directly or indirectly, in the equity securities of a licensee as long as the licensee is privately held, except that University employees who are not University officials may purchase or invest, directly or indirectly, in such equity securities if permitted under Board of Regents Policy: Individual Business or Financial Conflict of Interest and other applicable Board policies.

Subd. 3. Appointment of Voting Members to Governing Bodies as Part of the Commercialization of Technology. The president or delegate may ~~shall~~ authorize the appointment of voting members to the governing bodies of privately held companies commercializing technology. ~~A University appointed~~ The member shall:

(a) be an individual ~~University employee~~ with demonstrated experience and competence in technology commercialization and in the creation, management, and capitalization of privately held companies; and

(b) be reasonably insured against liability arising from service on the governing bodies of such companies.

~~A University appointed~~ The member:

(a) shall not accept compensation for service as a member of the governing body of the company, but may accept reasonable reimbursement for service-related expenses;

- (b) shall comply with applicable University policies and procedures;

. (c) shall discharge fiduciary and contractual responsibilities to the company, subject to the performance of University duties as provided in Board and other University policy and procedures if the individual is an employee of the University; and
. (d) shall resign as a voting member of the governing body of the company prior to the company's becoming publicly held, unless the president or delegate approves an extension of the appointment.

Subd. 4. Use of Technology Commercialization Income to Assist Commercialization by Non-University Entities. The president or delegate may authorize non-University entities to use income the University earns from technology commercialization to directly encourage, promote, or assist with the commercialization and development of University intellectual property. The commitment of financial support for particular projects shall not exceed $250,000, consistent with Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority.

Subd. 5. Equity Investment to Support Commercialization by Non-University Entities. The president or delegate may authorize an investment in the equity securities (including securities that are convertible to equity securities) of a company formed for the purpose of commercializing and developing University-owned technology. No such investment may exceed $1,050,000, consistent with Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority.

...

MARIA GINI, CHAIR
RESEARCH COMMITTEE

REBECCA ROPERS-HUILMAN, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

23. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Faculty Development Leaves
Discussion by the Faculty Senate
(20 minutes)

FOR INFORMATION:

SCFA Working Proposal on Faculty Development Leaves

Background and Motivation
Faculty development leaves provide at least three key benefits to the University of Minnesota:

- Providing dedicated time primarily for scholarship and also for curriculum and teaching development
- Providing renewal of faculty through learning/scholarship opportunities not possible when taking on normal responsibilities (e.g., immersive experiences in the field; learning new techniques embedded in a different environment)
- Helping compete for faculty with other institutions that offer support for faculty development

The University has an unusual structure of faculty development leaves. Sabbatical leave is at half-pay after six years of service (whether a half-year or full-year leave) with some available supplemental pay. Full-pay single-semester leaves exist, but are at the discretion of colleges, capped by Regents policy, and competitive. Such single-semester leaves are used widely in some colleges, and not at all in others.

As a result, SCFA has found that use of faculty development leaves varies widely, with many faculty responding that they feel they cannot afford to take time for development, in part due to the financial burdens of reduced pay, and in part because of the challenge of planning for time away from a laboratory, students, and clinical responsibilities.

Goal
SCFA charged a committee to develop a plan to encourage greater use of faculty development leaves, with particular focus on those faculty who have felt unable to avail themselves of such leaves.

Main Elements of Proposal
1. Improve current sabbatical options to include the option of a half-year (or single-semester) sabbatical at 100% pay (or close to it), retaining the option of a full-year/two-semester sabbatical at 50% pay (or somewhat more).
2. Replace current single-semester leave with a non-competitive single-semester leave for probationary (tenure-track) faculty.
3. Improve accountability by making completion of a report on the activities, results, and benefits of sabbatical a prerequisite for eligibility for future sabbaticals.

Issues, Challenges, and Current Work
- This sabbatical program will cost colleges more than current program; looking at options to make funds from single-semester leave available for both supplements and back-fill support for units with faculty taking single-semester sabbaticals.
- SCFA strongly preferred 100% pay for single-semester sabbaticals, but recognizes that practical and political considerations may require a small reduction (e.g., 95% pay); at the same time, SCFA would like to encourage increasing full-year sabbatical pay if possible to further support and encourage extended development opportunities.
- Current policies anticipate six full years between the years in which a sabbatical is taken; there is a need to address whether the "sabbatical clock" starts after the semester or full year of a single-semester/half-year sabbatical.
- Details of probationary single-semester leave must be worked out, including timing.
- Nature and timing of required reporting is being revisited; the goal is to provide support for the University benefit of such leaves, not just a report of activities. This may require reporting as part of a faculty member's annual report the year after the leave.
- Division of responsibilities for covering duties during a developmental leave need to be clarified; this is a particular challenge in disciplines with clinical responsibilities, but also applies broadly to issues of who is responsible for finding replacement instructors, for developing plans to accommodate research grants, student advising, etc.

PEH NG, MEMBER
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

24. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
Discussion by the Faculty Senate
(25 minutes)

FOR INFORMATION:

At the May 2007 meeting, the Faculty Senate endorsed undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) as a set of guiding principles for teaching and learning at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus. At that meeting, Vice Provost Carney assured the faculty that by voting in favor of SLOs it was "not endorsing a process for assessment" (Minutes, Faculty Senate, 3 May 2007). In that same meeting, "Professor McCormick reminded senators that they

are only being asked to approve these principles. If senators feel that the outcomes are an adequate representation of what faculty try to do at the University, then senators should vote in favor. There will be time for faculty governance to have a say in future processes." The University has incorporated the SLOs into its formal assessment process as part of its accreditation review. The purpose of this discussion is to gather information and perspectives about the usage of SLOs for assessment in different colleges across the University. Relevant issues concern both procedural matters about shared governance and academic freedom and substantive matters about SLOs and assessment."

NAOMI SCHEMAN, SENATOR

25. UPDATE ON THE WORK OF THE HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Discussion
(30 minutes)

Brian Herman, Vice President for Research, and Brooks Jackson, Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean of the Medical School, will be providing this update.

26. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Resolution on Faculty Oversight of Human Subjects Research
Action by the Faculty Senate
(15 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Faculty Oversight of Human Subjects Research

WHEREAS on December 5, 2013, the Faculty Senate resolved that the administration commission an independent panel "for the purpose of conducting an inquiry examining current policies, practices, and oversight of clinical research on human subjects at the University, in particular clinical research involving adult participants with diminished functional abilities."

WHEREAS the administration commissioned such a report, which was presented and discussed in a Faculty Senate meeting on March 6, 2015.

WHEREAS the report presented numerous recommendations on how to improve oversight of research with human subjects, especially those adults with potentially impaired decision-making capacity.

WHEREAS on March 19, 2015, a Legislative Auditor's Report also examined research practices at the University through its reconsideration of "A Clinical Drug Study at the University of Minnesota Department of Psychiatry: The Dan Markingson Case" and recommended that "The Legislature should enact legislation that requires the University of Minnesota to fully implement the external review panel's recommendations before the University's Institutional Review Board approves additional Department of Psychiatry drug studies."

WHEREAS on March 27, 2015, the Board of Regents passed a resolution on "Improving the Conduct of Human Subjects Research" that refers to the "strong tradition of shared governance and the faculty's unique role in shaping culture and creativity and in upholding the highest

standards of excellence at the University" and commits to involve faculty by "Creating a Task Force comprised primarily of faculty and including external experts to plan implementation of the external review panel recommendations and report an implementation plan and action items to President Kaler and the Board of Regents in 60-days (May 15, 2015)," and "commits to an open and transparent process that solicits input from faculty and others throughout the University community and affirms the University's mission to engage in cutting-edge clinical research of the highest quality."

BE IT RESOLVED that all University committees formed to oversee human subjects research will include at least 40% faculty appointed in consultation with faculty governance leadership.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these committees will report to faculty governance at least quarterly through the Senate Research Committee and bi-annually through the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the FCC will nominate and the Faculty Senate will elect an independent Faculty Liaison for Human Subjects Research who will interact with University Institutional Review Boards, committees, and administrators regulating or overseeing the enrollment and treatment of human subjects in medical research. The Liaison: (1) may meet or communicate with relevant boards, committees, and administrators to express concerns and obtain information that would aid in faculty governance; (2) will have access to documents—including complaints—from individuals inside and outside the University consistent with applicable laws; and (3) will regularly report to the FCC and the Faculty Senate, including about the cooperation of boards, committees, and administrators with the faculty governance process. Liaisons will be appointed for a two-year renewable term. The FCC may if necessary create a second liaison position.

REBECCA ROPERS-HUILMAN, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

27. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

28. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

29. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2015

11:30 A.M. - 1:30 P.M.

25 Mondale Hall--Twin Cities Campus
105 Kiehle Hall--Crookston Campus
173 Kirby Plaza--Duluth Campus
7 Humanities and Fine Arts Building--Morris Campus
Room 322--Rochester Campus

This is a meeting of the Student Senate. There are 57 voting members of the Student Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS
Information

Resolution to "Ban the Box" on Undergraduate Application Forms
Approved by the Student Senate: March 5, 2015
Administrative Response: **PENDING**

Resolution to modify Bereavement in the Administrative Policy on Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences
Approved by the Student Senate: March 5, 2015
Administrative Response: The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) is working with Student Senators and others to address the issues identified in the Resolution. The April 15 SCEP meeting included discussion of three proposed changes to the Administrative Policy on Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences.

Following a substantial discussion in the committee, SCEP members agreed to form a small subcommittee to meet this summer, to continue discussions and to work on drafting language to bring back to SCEP in the fall. Among the areas for discussion are (1) adding language to clarify that faculty members do have the discretion to approve absences and allow for makeup work in addition to those explicitly mentioned in item #1 of the policy as legitimate absences;(2) how best to define bereavement and the relationships for which it would be applicable; (3) consideration of a statement to encourage faculty to take into consideration students' religious practices related to bereavement; (4) further clarification that faculty have the authority to determine when a student cannot meet the objectives of a particular course because of absences, (5) further discussion and consultation.

Resolution Concerning Minimum Sanctions for Sexual Assault
Approved by the Student Senate: March 5, 2015
Administrative Response: The Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity

(OSCAI) would like to acknowledge and commend the resolution put forward by the Student Senate in support of the Title IX Sanctioning Guidelines created by OSCAI which provide transparency in the adjudication of Title IX violations.

Students found responsible for disciplinary offenses under the University of Minnesota Board of Regents Student Conduct Code are subject to sanctions. Many factors are considered when determining appropriate sanctions such as the severity of the offense, the culpability of the student, the impact to the community, and the opportunity for student development. Title IX Sanctioning Guidelines were developed to provide guidance so that community members and impacted parties who are dealing with incidents of sexual violence or harassment are informed about the range of possible sanctions for accused students. The guidelines allow the University to retain the flexibility to respond to every situation on an individual basis.

Input was sought from various stakeholders about these guidelines. However, OSCAI welcomes further discussion and input about the guidelines as the University strives to address all Title IX violations.

Resolution to modify the Administrative Policy on Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences to address student parent concerns

Approved by the Student Senate: April 2, 2015

Administrative Response: See above. Consideration of this issue will be included in further conversations with SCEP.

Resolution to support measures to fund and increase demand for the Department of Chicano & Latino Studies

Approved by the Student Senate: April 2, 2015

Administrative Response: The University administration, particularly in the College of Liberal Arts, was pleased to receive the student senate resolution in support of increased funding for the Department of Chicano and Latino Studies (CLS). We are happy to report a series of developments that move towards addressing your concerns and expanding CLA's active commitment to diversity in all its forms. Soon, CLA will restore the number of full-time tenured faculty housed in CLS to the historical precedent of two. Additionally, we will add a full-time faculty position shared between CLS and Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies whose work will forge connections between these disciplines and other disciplinary areas within CLA.

Amelious Whyte was also recently appointed to be CLA's first director of public engagement. Whyte has held a variety of roles at the University over the past 21 years,

most recently serving as senior associate vice provost for advocacy and support in the Office for Student Affairs. His work will be focused on invigorating and innovating community outreach across the college, including for the benefit of Chicano and Latino Studies.

In the long term, we hope you will find promise in the implementation of the CLA Roadmap, the college's strategic plan for the college that focuses in large part on increased cultivation of diversity and attention to the evolving concerns of CLA's Race, Indigeneity, Gender, and Sexuality (RIGS) departments. The face of this plan and the changes it will represent for the college in coming years are only beginning to emerge, but at its heart is a desire to transform the college into its best self, making CLA a destination college for anyone and everyone.

To that end, we look forward to the Student Senate's continued engagement with this process and value deeply your advocacy and input on behalf of the Department of Chicano and Latino Studies as we plot the course ahead.

2. P&A SENATE UPDATE
(5 minutes)

For Information:

The P&A Senate represents the academic professional and administrators (P&A) class of 5400 non-unionized employees at the University. This class was started in 1980 and the governance body was formed as an advisory committee to the President. P&A have skills between civil service employees and faculty in jobs such as teachers, researchers, advisors, counselors, and extension service workers. Most people stay in this classification or move to a faculty position. P&A employee have some of the same benefits as faculty, but work on annually renewable contracts.

The P&A Senate meets from 9:30-11:30 am the first Friday of most months and meetings are open to the public. The P&A Senate consists of 40 representatives from campus units and colleges and has four subcommittees: Benefits and Compensation, Communications, Outreach, and Professional Development and Recognition.

3. CIVIL SERVICE SENATE UPDATE
(5 minutes)

For Information:

The Civil Service Senate represents the approximately 4300 employees in the civil service category which includes accountants, scientists, executive assistants, and administrators. The classification was started in 1945 with the passage of the civil service rules by the Regents. In 1984 PELRA was passed which allowed for the creation of a bargaining unit separate from civil service employees.

The Civil Service Senate is composed of 50 elected members. The body elects a vice chair each year, with the vice chair becoming next year's chair. The Civil Service Senate meets three times per year.

4. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(5 minutes)

5. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES
(5 minutes)

6. MINUTES FOR APRIL 2, 2015
Action
(2 minutes)

MOTION:

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

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssenate/minutes/150402stu.pdf

BECKY YUST, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE

7. RESOLUTION FOR INCREASED PARATRANSIT SERVICE FLEXIBILITY
Action by Twin Cities Student Delegation
(10 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution:

Resolution for Increased Paratransit Service Flexibility

1. The Twin Cities Student Delegation asks that the Department of Parking and Transportation (PTS) increase the flexibility of the Paratransit Service to allow physically-disabled students to arrange for pick-up and drop-off at residences (or at locations near their residences) that are on or near the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus, at least coextensive with the range of the Gopher Chauffeur.

2. The Twin Cities Student Delegation refers this matter to the Twin Cities members of the Senate Consultative Committee.

COMMENT:

The Paratransit Service purportedly provides "curb-to-curb" transport free of charge to persons with short-term and long-term physical disabilities on the Twin Cities campus. Vans pick up disabled persons Monday through Friday, starting at 7:30 AM and ending at 9:30 PM each week day. Disabled persons schedule pick-up and drop-off via an online website. They can choose from up to 200 locations on the Twin Cities campuses.

Students with physical disabilities have found that the pick-up and drop-off locations on campus are too restrictive, such that some students are unable to take advantage of this valuable service. For example, a student in a wheelchair living near campus (in fact, just across the street) was unable to reach the nearest pick-up and drop-off location on the morning of the first snow of winter this year because the sidewalk leading up to the location was too steep and slippery. Even though Land Care attempted to reduce the slipperiness of this location throughout the winter, there were several times when the student could not get up the incline. Consequently, this student was unable to get to class, and the student felt helpless. After emailing Disability Services and PTS, the Paratransit Service was unwilling to pick up the student at the bottom of the inclined sidewalk and bring the student to the student's classroom destination. If the Paratransit Service had a flexible pick-up and drop-off policy, this student would not have had any difficulties attending class and learning the same information as able-body students did.

Other paratransit programs (such as Metro Mobility) service the University area and can pick up students at their residences and drop them off at specific campus locations, and vice versa. However, these services may not be covered by insurance or charge fees. The Paratransit Service is the only free service available to all students. It is purposed on ensuring that all physically-disabled persons on campus can access all parts of our large University.

The University, through Boynton Health Service, already provides rides to students on weekend nights on or near the University, wherever within this vicinity those students need to go. This service, unlike the Paratransit Service, has flexibility.

Given the low number of physically-disabled persons on campus, the costs of increasing the pick-up and drop-off flexibility of the Paratransit Service should be minimum. With the ubiquity of GPS and smart devices, there should be no technical limitation on the ability for physically-disabled students to be picked-up or dropped-off anywhere on or near the University campus. The fact that Metro Mobility can pick up individuals at most locations suggests that the Paratransit Service has the capability to do so as well.

Increasing the flexibility of the Paratransit Service can accomplish many goals in addition to improving accessibility. For example, the Service can be used to ensure students on the North end of the West Bank can access the East Bank via the Washington Avenue Bridge, without the need for an ADA-compliant ramp near Mondale Hall, something the Student Senate unanimously requested in Fall 2014. In addition, some physically-disabled students have stated that they do not feel their needs are taken seriously by the University or that their wellbeing is often an afterthought. As a result, when asked, these same students said that they would not recommend other physically-disabled students attend our University. Not only students, the increased flexibility of this service could benefit physically-disabled faculty and staff as well. We need to ensure the University is open to all, and increasing the Paratransit Service's flexibility is one way to accomplish this worthy and necessary goal.

Lastly, this Senator has been corresponding with PTS since November 10, 2014. Despite this Senator's requests, PTS has not taken any steps to increase the Paratransit Service's flexibility, and PTS has not taken steps (to this Senator's knowledge) to further investigate whether the Paratransit Service can be expanded in this way. A resolution by the Student Senate would make it clear that providing easy-to-use and accommodating services to physically-disabled students on campus is a priority and ought not to fall by the wayside.

KYLE KROLL, SENATOR

8. RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CREATING

A GRE SUBJECT TEST TESTING FACILITY
Action by Twin Cities Student Delegation
(10 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution.

Resolution in Support of Creating a GRE Subject Test Testing Facility

The Twin Cities Student Senate Delegation requests that administration work together with Education Testing Services (ETS) to bring a paper GRE Subject Test testing site to campus for the September, October, and April testing dates.

COMMENT:

GRE Subject Tests are an important facet of the graduate application for students in many disciplines including Biochemistry, Biology, Chemistry, Literature in English, Mathematics, Physics, and Psychology. Currently, University of Minnesota Twin Cities students have to travel to Mankato or St. Cloud to take a GRE subject test in the spring (April), and to Northfield in the fall (September, October). According to ETS, the Northfield location will be closing next year, and the closest location to students for all test dates will be in St. Cloud.

This will disproportionately harm low-income students and out of state students as those are the two groups least likely to have access to a car. As such, the University should work to establish a testing site on campus or near campus to help all students with their educational goals. This is especially important as 30% of respondents to the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) survey indicated that they plan to attend graduate school. Additionally, Wisconsin has a testing center in Madison, and all other Big Ten schools have GRE Subject test facilities nearby that offer tests three times a year.

VALKYRIE JENSEN, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ZACHARY SHARTIAG, MEMBER
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

9. ELECTION OF 2015-16 STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR
Election by 2015-16 Senators Only
(20 minutes)

10. ELECTION OF TWO 2015-16 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBERS
Election by 2015-16 Senators Only
[One system campus senator and one Twin Cities senator]
(10 minutes)

11. ELECTION OF TWO 2015-16 TWIN CITIES MEMBERS OF THE STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Election by 2015-16 Twin Cities Senators Only
[One Twin Cities undergraduate senator and

one Twin Cities graduate/professional senator]
(10 minutes)

12. ELECTION OF TWO 2015-16 GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS OF THE STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Election by 2015-16 Twin Cities Graduate/Professional Senators Only
(10 minutes)

13. OLD BUSINESS

14. NEW BUSINESS

15. ADJOURNMENT

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus ***Office of the Associate Dean*** *115 Lind Hall*
College of Science and Engineering *207 Church Street S.E.*
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Office: 612-624-5091

April 29, 2015

To: Professor Rebecca Ropers-Huilman
Chair, FCC

From: Undergraduate Associate Deans

Re: Assessment of student learning

Dear Professor Ropers-Huilman:

In light of the conversation that is slated to occur at the Faculty Senate on April 30, the Associate Deans for the undergraduate colleges would like to register their support of the approaches being used to assess and report on undergraduate student learning for the upcoming re-accreditation visit by the Higher Learning Commission.

The Undergraduate Associate Deans were charged with coordinating assessment activities within their colleges, and with preparing reports of those activities that could be used as supporting evidence in the accreditation materials prepared for the Higher Learning Commission's visit in the fall of 2015. As early as the spring of 2013, we began meeting individually with Steven Hawks, the Director of Undergraduate Assessment, to help conceptualize and develop our unit-specific assessment plans.

We attended our first assessment retreat on 6/14/13. At this retreat, each college presented its conceptual plan for assessing undergraduate student learning. Assessment activities and planning continued through the 2013-14 academic year, and a second assessment retreat was held on 1/16/14, during which we provided updates on the process. The third assessment retreat occurred on 6/16/14; each college provided summary results, including what worked and did not work so well in the first cycle of outcomes reporting. Our most recent assessment retreat brought us together on 1/15/15. Provost Hanson has been present at all assessment retreats to listen and to answer any questions.

Throughout this process, it has been clear that collegiate faculty and programs have the expertise and the flexibility to identify what outcomes to assess and in which courses to assess them. While there may be a perception among some faculty that this is an empty process imposed from above, assessment is a requirement of the re-accreditation visit. Most units chose to make use of some or all seven campus-wide undergraduate SLOs as part of their assessment of student learning, and we were also given the flexibility to develop our own learning outcomes. In a number of cases (CBS, CSE) the University's learning outcomes were mapped to more specific program or collegiate learning outcomes. Faculty were also given considerable latitude regarding how they would collect and report on their results, and that has been

evident in the materials shared and the discussions at our assessment retreats. Steven Hawks reports that 93% of all UG programs submitted an assessment report at the conclusion of the 2013-14 academic year and that he expects the percentage will be even higher at the end of this academic year.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Strykowski
Morse Alumni Distinguished Professor
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs, CSE

Jane Glazebrook
Professor of Plant Biology
Associate Dean for Faculty and Academic Affairs, CBS

Christine Mueller
Professor of Nursing
Associate Dean for Academic Programs, Nursing

Gary W. Oehlert
Professor of Statistics
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, CLA

Michael White
Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Faculty Affairs
Morse Alumni Distinguished Professor
College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences (CFANS)

Robert A. Stine
Associate Dean for Academic Programs
College of Continuing Education

signed via email

Ian Maitland
Professor and Associate Dean of the Undergraduate Program
Carlson School of Management

Gail Dubrow
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
College of Design

cc: Renee Dempsey, Office of the President
Becky Hippert, Office of the President

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

Office of the Dean
College of Liberal Arts

215 Johnston Hall
101 Pleasant Street SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Phone: 612-624-2535
Fax: 612-624-6839

April 29, 2015

Subject: Student Learning Outcomes

Dear members of the FCC and the Faculty Senate,

We write to provide a CLA administration perspective on your April 30, 2015 docket item 24 on Student Learning Outcomes.

First and foremost, the administration of CLA supports the assessment of student learning. The Higher Learning Commission will require an assessment of student learning during this accreditation cycle for the University, but beyond this requirement, we believe that such assessment should be part of our standard practice as educators. We further believe that nearly all faculty share that view, and any divergence arises largely from the issue of how to assess learning.

In preparation for accreditation, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education notified each college that it would be required to provide assessments of its students' learning for the accreditation process, and colleges were given broad freedom in how to do the assessment. In CLA, it was the predecessors in our roles who participated in discussions leading to the assessment procedures we describe below, but we believe that we have characterized the process accurately.

The assessment procedures for CLA were developed in consultation with an ad hoc group of five faculty members from across the college representing arts, humanities, and social sciences. Once the framework of the learning assessment procedures was agreed upon, each department nominated a faculty member to facilitate the implementation.

Given the time frame for development, the existence of the undergraduate SLOs for the Twin Cities campus, and the diversity of academic programs across the college, CLA opted to assess learning based on those SLOs. CLA departments, and departments outside of CLA that administer majors in CLA, are asked to assess student learning on Twin Cities campus undergraduate SLOs of their choice in three courses per major, two mid-level required courses of their choice and the senior capstone course, with at least four SLOs assessed per major. The college also assesses student learning on SLOs in the First Year Experience course. The actual form of the assessment was left to departments, and the forms of assessment in use vary widely.

Majors in CLA have used this "study students in three courses" approach during the first two rounds of learning assessment. However, CLA departments have the option of developing their own learning outcomes and their own outcome assessment framework. A few CLA departments are moving in this direction, but none has yet established an alternative to our standard assessment process.

Before closing, we want to reiterate that the College of Liberal Arts deeply values student learning and is dedicated to the best outcomes for its students. In order to know whether we are achieving those best outcomes, we must evaluate the results of what we do, and the assessment of learning via the Student Learning Outcomes is one aspect of that evaluation. Many faculty members from across CLA have worked hard to make assessment of learning a success.

Sincerely,

John Coleman
Dean, CLA

Gary W. Oehlert
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, CLA

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost

234 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis MN 55455-0110

Office: 612-625-0051
Fax: 612-624-3814

April 29, 2015

Dear Members of the FCC and the Faculty Senate,

We write to provide information about the use of SLOs for assessment in different colleges across the Twin Cities campus, and about how reporting on the assessment activities fits into accreditation.

While assessment activities have evolved within the colleges, and within the specific academic programs in those colleges, academic programs have always had responsibility for assessment of student learning. In 2013-14, the Twin Cities colleges were asked to coordinate assessment of learning activities within each college, and to prepare an annual report of such activities. Each college had the flexibility to determine the level at which assessment would occur (collegiate or departmental), what courses or other curricular programs would be assessed, and how they would be assessed. Most units chose to utilize the seven campus-wide undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes as part of their assessment of student learning, but none was required to do so. Units had the opportunity to develop and utilize their own processes for assessment of student learning and their own articulation of learning goals.

We wish to emphasize that it is the faculty responsible for academic programs who identify what outcomes or achievements of goals to assess, which courses to assess, and how to conduct the assessments. Administration has intentionally been hands-off on these matters, because the relevant expertise lies with the faculty and their academic programs. At the conclusion of the 2013-14 academic year, over 90% of all undergraduate programs had submitted an assessment report. At assessment retreats in June of 2013, January of 2014, June of 2014, and January of 2015, representatives of the colleges met to share their assessment plans, their data, and what they have learned. They will meet again in June of 2015, and we anticipate annual assessment meetings thereafter, to share ideas, report on progress, and discuss strategies for the future.

The Twin Cities campus is undergoing its review for re-accreditation in 2015, and the collegiate reports of assessment efforts will be part of the information provided to the Higher Learning Commission to document how "the institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs." These reports will be included as evidence to support the claim that we satisfy Criterion Four, Teaching and Learning:

Evaluation and Improvement, and, more specifically, Core Component 4.B, "The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning." This component of the accreditation requirements includes these key points: "The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals," and "The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs," and "The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

We have met with FCC and SCEP, as well as the CLA faculty and the CLA Assembly for open discussion of these matters. We support assessment of student learning, recognize the importance of documenting such assessments and using assessments to improve student learning. We also recognize the importance of accreditation and note again that assessment is a specific requirement of accreditation. We view assessment as an evolving activity and, after our accreditation in fall of 2015, we envision having a campus-wide discussion on student learning, Student Learning Outcomes, and the best ways to document our processes and learning results. We encourage SCEP to take up these discussions early in the fall.

Sincerely,

Karen Hanson
Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost

Robert B. McMaster
Vice Provost and Dean
of Undergraduate Education

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost

Alternative Structure for Supporting Postbaccalaureate Education

Draft Proposal Submitted by Provost Karen Hanson
to Graduate Faculty and Leaders for Consultation and Feedback

April 28, 2015

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost

234 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110

Office: 612-625-0051
Fax: 612-624-3814

April 23, 2015

Dear Colleagues:

I write to invite your thoughts and comments on a proposed realignment of administrative support for postbaccalaureate education at the University. This realignment is in response to feedback from numerous faculty, staff, and students, and the details of the proposed model are informed by conversations and analyses over the last two years, as well as by the work of the Special Committee on Graduate Education, which was convened in Fall 2013 by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) and me.

At present, there is confusion and wasted energy connected with the unclear distinction between programs that are aligned with the Graduate School and those that are, or want to be, considered separate. I am proposing a model that more clearly aligns postbaccalaureate academic programs with one of two communities: The first includes traditional, graduate education, where a major portion of the degree program involves research or creative activity. The second includes professional degree programs—programs whose graduates most often seek applied professional or practice-based employment, where there is often a requirement of licensure to practice, and where outside accreditation bodies play important roles in determining program requirements. I know that the division isn't entirely crisp—that many professional programs involve some research activity and that many research-based degree programs are paying attention to preparing their students for occupations outside of academia or research settings. Still, there is a general distinction that begins with the difference between the Ph.D. and what used to be called "first professional degrees"—M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M., Pharm. D., etc.—and I think we can work coherently from that distinction to better organize our support for all programs.

I invite you to consider the details of this proposed model outlined on the pages that follow. Two additional points: 1) The schools, colleges, and departments will be the best judges of whether a degree program should be assigned to the graduate or the professional side of this model, and final determinations would be made on the basis of appropriate consultation. 2) This realignment is not expected to increase administrative costs connected with postbaccalaureate education.

I've already discussed this model with many groups on campus, including the collegiate deans and various associate deans, the FCC and other senate committees, the Council of Graduate Students, the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, and others. The aim is to 1) recognize these two broadly distinct educational missions, 2) refocus the Graduate School to serve the research-based, graduate education mission, and 3) provide flexibility, clearer communication, and support for the professional education community.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to review the proposed model and for sending me your candid feedback at provost@umn.edu.

Sincerely,

Karen Hanson
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Alternative Structure for Supporting Postbaccalaureate Education DRAFT - 4/28/2015

	Research-based Graduate Education	Professionally focused Postbaccalaureate Education	
Academic Programs and Students	Research-based Degrees such as the M.S., M.A., M.F.A. in every major	Professional Master's Degrees such as M.P.H, M.Ed., M.N., M.Geo.E., M.Ag., M.Plan.	Academic Programs and Students
	Ph.D. and D.M.A. Degrees in every major	Professional Doctorate Degrees D.D.S., M.D., Pharm.D., J.D., D. V.M., Ed.D., D.P.T., D.N.P.	
	Graduate Minors		
		Postbaccalaureate Certificates	
		Health Education Fellowships and Residencies	
Academic Leadership	Program and Faculty Leadership Directors of Graduate Study / Professional Program Liaisons		Academic Leadership
	Collegiate Deans, Associate/Assistant Deans, and Department Chairs		
	Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (UMD & UMR Chancellors and Vice Chancellors, and Vice President for Health Sciences)		
	Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education *Supported by the Graduate School Staff*	Special Assistant to the Provost for Professional Education *Supported by Provost Office Staff*	
	Board of Regents		
Collegiate and Provostal Administration and Support	Program, Department, Collegiate Responsibilities: • Student education, development, and success • Student advising and mentoring • Student fellowships, funding, and support • College/department/program orientation • Graduation ceremonies • Student recruitment, application, and admission (including diversity priorities)		Collegiate and Provostal Administration and Support
	Graduate School Responsibilities: • Research education leadership • GEC facilitation and program approval • Graduate student orientation • Student programming, workshops, training • Student advising and mentoring support • Fellowship funding support/coordination • Policy oversight	Provost Responsibilities: • Leadership coordination and support • Program review and approval • Policy oversight	
University Administration and Support	Degree Progress and Clearance Led by Academic Support Resources (Registrar)		University Administration and Support
	University Diversity Priorities and Initiatives Led by the Office for Equity and Diversity		
	Academic Program Approval and Review Led by Provost Office with Grad School, AHC, collegiate consultations, support, and recommendations/approvals		
	Academic Policy Postbaccalaureate programs are subject to Univ. policy - exemptions as necessary		
	Recruitment and Admission Academic programs are supported by central admission staff		
	Faculty and Student Governance FCC, COGS, GAPSA, others may wish to align with two communities		
Budget	Postbaccalaureate Education Administrative Costs such as degree progress/clearance and degree approval support (PCAS)		Budget
	Graduate Student Support and Fellowship DDF, IDF, ETC.		
	General Graduate Tuition Rate Guided by one Graduate School Standard	Professional Student Tuition Rates Guided by established Tuition Bands	

Academic Programs and Students

Research-based Graduate Education	Professionally focused Postbaccalaureate Education
Research-based Master's Degrees • Will include all M.S., M.A., and M.F.A. degrees • Characteristics will guide which programs are aligned with research-based community • Characteristics of research-based degree programs include a preponderance of the following: - A major portion of the degree program involves research or creative activity and original scholarship. - Offering a Ph.D. degree option - Offering an M.S., M.A., and/or M.F.A. degree option - Including a master's degree option that requires a thesis comprising original scholarship conducted by the students - Including a master's degree option that requires an examination committee comprising graduate education faculty to assess a student's readiness for degree completion - Including a master's degree option that requires the completion of a research paper or a report of a research project • Program/college and Grad School will determine alignment, Provost will decide if necessary • Alignment will include all plan options, will not subdivide among subplans or programs	**Professional Master's Degrees** • Will include degrees such as M.B.A, M.P.H, M.Ed., M.N., M.Geo.E., M.Ag., M.Plan. • Characteristics will guide which programs are aligned with professionally focused community • Characteristics of professionally focused degree programs include a preponderance of the following: - Attracting students whose primary objective upon completion is to acquire an applied professional or practice-based job outside the typical academic or research environment - Shaped by ethics or principles established by the respective industry or profession - Guided by quality standards enforced by a professional association or accreditation body - Requiring professional licensure or passage of examination to practice • Still subject to University policy (see page 5) • Will not include M.S. or M.A. degrees • Program/college & Provost staff will determine alignment, Provost will decide if necessary • Alignment will include all plan options, will not subdivide among subplans or programs
Research-based Doctoral Degrees • Characteristics (above) will guide alignment • Will include Ph.D. and D.M.A. degrees in every major • Program/college and Grad School will determine alignment, Provost will decide if necessary • Alignment will include all plan options, will not subdivide among subplans or programs	**Professional Doctoral Degrees** • Characteristics (above) will guide alignment • D.D.S., M.D., Pharm.D., J.D., D. V.M., Ed.D., D.P.T., D.N.P. Degrees • Program/college & Provost staff will determine alignment, Provost will decide if necessary • Alignment will include all plan options, will not subdivide among subplans or programs

Graduate Minors

• Will be available to students in programs now aligned in professionally focused community except for students in programs formerly called First Professional (D.D.S., M.D., Pharm.D., D.V.M., J.D., L.L.M.)

• Records administered by ASR

Postbaccalaureate Certificates

• Records administered by ASR

Health Education Fellowships and Residencies

• Continue to be administered by collegiate units with support from AHC Office of Education

	Research-based Graduate Education	Professionally focused Postbaccalaureate Education
Academic Leadership	**Program and Faculty Leadership** • Departments and faculty are the most significant participants in designing and guiding postbaccalaureate experiences	
	Directors of Graduate Study (DGS) (could be the same person as Professional Program Liaison if desired)	**Professional Programs Liaison** (could be the same person as DGS if desired)
	Collegiate Deans, Associate/Assistant Deans, and Department Chairs • Colleges continue to be the degree granting homes • In some exceptions, the Graduate School will continue to be the degree granting home for programs delivered jointly between 2 or more colleges	
	Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (UMD & UMR Vice Chancellors; and Vice President for Health Sciences • The Provost and Vice Chancellors have high-level responsibility or authority for all academic programs • The Vice President for Health Sciences provides coordination and leadership across health-related academic programs	
	Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Education • Supported by the Graduate School Staff • Charged with positioning graduate education for excellence • Charged with providing general policy oversight • Assists Provost with quality oversight responsibilities currently charged to her position	**Special Assistant to the Provost for Professional Education** • Supported by the Provost Office Staff • Charged with coordinating professional program leaders in the identification and addressing of issues • Charged with providing general policy oversight • Assists Provost with quality oversight responsibilities currently charged to her position
	Board of Regents • Broad-level Governance • Academic Program Approval • Tuition Structure and Rates Approval	

	Research-based Graduate Education	Professionally focused Postbaccalaureate Education
Collegiate and Provostal Administration and Support	**Program, Department, Collegiate Responsibilities:** • Student education, development, and success • Student advising and mentoring • Student fellowships, funding, and support • College/department/program orientation • Graduation ceremonies • Student recruitment, application, and admission (including diversity priorities)	
	Graduate School Responsibilities (Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education) • The Vice Provost leads the Graduate School and the University's graduate education strategy • Research education leadership • Graduate Education Council (GEC) facilitation and program approval • Graduate student orientation • Recruitment and application support • Student programming, workshops, training • Student advising and mentoring support • Fellowship funding support/coordination • Policy oversight • Leadership with joint and early admission programs	**Provost Responsibilities (Special Assistant to the Provost)** • Special Assistant aids Provost in addressing responsibilities • Leadership coordination and support • Program review and approval • Policy Oversight • Leadership with joint and early admission programs

	Research-based Graduate Education	Professionally focused Postbaccalaureate Education
University Administration and Support	**Academic Records and Degree Progress and Clearance** • Led by Academic Support Resources (the Registrar)	
	University Diversity Priorities and Initiatives • Led by the Office for Equity and Diversity	
	Academic Program Approval and Review • Academic Program Review is designed to be a holistic evaluation of graduate and professional education as well as undergraduate education, research, resources, etc. • Led by Provost Office with Grad School, AHC, collegiate support and approvals or consultation • Proposals for new, changed, or discontinued programs will be sent by the colleges to the Provost Office, who will engage the Grad School, Spec Assistant, and AHC as appropriate	
	Academic Policy • Postbaccalaureate programs are subject to University Education policy except those granted an exemption: those previously known as 1st professional (D.D.S., M.D., D.V.M., Pharm.D., L.L.M., J.D.) and the M.B.A (TC campus) • Special Assistant to the Provost for Professional Education will facilitate the consideration of other exemptions as needed • Special Assistant to the Provost for Professional Education will lead discussions with exempt programs about ensuring that their policy needs are met, including the possibility of including them under some policies or adjusting wording in policy to meet their needs	
	Recruitment and Admission • Student recruitment remains the responsibility of academic programs with support from central admissions staff • Programs not currently working with the central admissions office may continue to be exempt • Apply Yourself remains a centrally available service, funded primarily by application fees • Central admissions staff continues to provide International transcript evaluation • Ultimate admissions decisions remain with the college/academic program	
	Faculty and Student Governance • Continue to be served by FCC, SCEP, COGS, GAPSA • Faculty and student governance groups may wish to align with Research- and prof-focused distinctions	

	Research-based Graduate Education	Professionally focused Postbaccalaureate Education
Funding Postbaccalaureate Education Programs	**Postbaccalaureate Administration** • Postbaccalaureate administrative costs allocated to existing, campus-wide Support Service-Twin Cities Cost Pool • Includes costs associated with the maintenance of cross service functions such as degree clearance, academic program approval, and Postbaccalaureate Diversity Office (see University Administration and Support on page 5)	
	Graduate Student Support and Fellowship • Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship (DDF) • Interdisciplinary Doctoral Fellows (IDF) • Thesis Research Travel Grant • Quality Assessment Allocation Plan • Diversity of Views and Experiences (DOVE) Fellowship	
	General Graduate Tuition Rate • Programs will follow a common tuition rate and structure (the "Graduate School" rate). • The Board of Regents retains the authority to approve all tuition rates.	**Professional Program Tuition** • Programs may set their own tuition rate and structure • The Board of Regents retains the authority to approve all tuition rates • Future discussions will consider establishing set bands for Professionally focused programs such as same as General Graduate Tuition Rate, a little higher, much higher, a little lower, much lower • Tuition rates outside the band rates would be possible as needed.