

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
NOVEMBER 5, 1998**

The second meeting of the University Senate for 1998-99 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 5, 1998, at 2:28 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 115 voting faculty/academic professional members, 26 voting student members, 2 ex officio member, and 2 nonmembers. President Mark Yudof presided.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE TO SENATE ACTIONS

- A. Amendment of the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy
 Approved by the: University Senate - April 16, 1998
 Administration - June 5, 1998
 Board of Regents – no action required
- Implemented by the: Administration – Fall 1999

**II. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Guidelines for the Development of Applied Partnership Degree Programs
Information**

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
University of Minnesota

The University of Minnesota and the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) signed on January 15, 1998, the *Partnership Agreement for Public Higher Education*. The agreement provides an opportunity for the University of Minnesota to reflect on its experiences with applied partnership degree programs with community colleges in the Twin Cities, which evolved from the 1993 statement on partnerships, and to develop a general set of guidelines for new applied partnership degree programs. The January 1998 *Partnership Agreement* expands upon the earlier agreement, and recognizes the need for additional creative and strategic collaborations between the two public systems.

In 1993, the Twin Cities Higher Education Partnership recognized that the educational needs of students and employers locally, regionally, nationally, and globally were changing very rapidly. It further recognized that public higher education institutions in Minnesota had entered a period of tight fiscal constraints in which improved collaboration and responsiveness were more critical than ever in making the best use of available state resources. Subsequently, the Board of Regents approved the four applied degree programs on the dates noted below:

Bachelor of Information Networking	June 1993
Bachelor of Applied Business	July 1993
Bachelor of Emergency Health Services	January 1996
Bachelor of Construction Management	January 1996

This document frames a set of values and principles to guide thinking about applied partnership degree programs, articulates a set of criteria to be used in evaluating extant and proposed partnership degree programs, and suggests a strategy for identifying future collaborative efforts. Although the guidelines were developed vis-à-vis the applied partnership degree programs offered through University College in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, the same considerations apply for collaborative efforts between the University of Minnesota and MnSCU elsewhere in Minnesota.

Partnership degrees are innovative, career-oriented, baccalaureate degree programs, offered by a baccalaureate degree granting public institution in Minnesota, and are best delivered by collaboration between partner institutions. The four-fold rationale is based on the premise that a new type of applied baccalaureate degree program is essential to keep Minnesota citizens competitive in a global economy, and that continuing education and lifelong learning are essential in a knowledge-based society,

First, the partnership degree programs recognize and respond to the growing need for a new type of applied, career-oriented baccalaureate degree program. They blend appropriate levels of the “how” and the “why” of knowledge, and are developed with all of the necessary educational, structural and procedural integrity common to University of Minnesota degree programs.

Second, the partnership degree programs are a direct response to workforce needs and issues being discussed by businesses and industries. Businesses and industries of the 21st century will require an increasingly skilled and knowledgeable workforce.

Third, all partnership degree programs address the need to identify creative institutional strategies to use limited state resources in an effective and efficient manner.

Fourth, the University of Minnesota is uniquely equipped to provide specialized course work that is the foundation for certain leading edge career fields consistent with the land-grant mission of the University.

As a Research I, land-grant institution in a major urban center, the University of Minnesota–Twin Cities has an appropriately broader set of degree programs than institutions having only one of the above defining characteristics. Fundamental to the land-grant concept is access by Minnesota citizens to degree programs that contribute to the evolving needs of the state’s businesses and industries. Location in a large metropolitan area that includes numerous highly sophisticated and technical businesses and industries adds yet another dimension in determining the range and nature of the degree programs offered by the University of Minnesota–Twin Cities. One of the strengths of the institution is the range and quality of its course offerings and degree programs.

Principles to Guide Thinking about Degree Programs

Fundamental to any degree program offered by the University of Minnesota is a core group of University faculty committed to working together to offer a high quality degree program. In an era in which educational needs cannot always be met within the boundaries of traditional academic disciplines or even single campuses, some of the models successfully used in interdisciplinary graduate education can be applied in designing applied baccalaureate degree programs. In considering a new partnership degree program, the University of Minnesota must first consider whether the opportunities realized by offering the degree (e.g., attracting new students and additional income sources) outweigh the possible negative consequences (e.g., reducing time available for other undergraduate and graduate programs, faculty research, and outreach activities) of redirection of faculty effort in the collegiate units involved.

A set of assumptions about University College serves as the basis for discussions about partnership degree programs. The first is that University College is a University-wide vehicle for offering partnership degree programs. A second assumption is that degree-granting delivery of University of Minnesota degrees via University College is limited to partnership degree programs and the degrees offered through the Program in Individualized Learning and the Inter-College Program. The third assumption is that discussions about central funding for partnership degree programs occur as part of the annual planning and budget discussions between the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and University College. The fourth assumption is that some of the partnership degree programs to be offered in the metropolitan area and greater Minnesota may be awarded by MnSCU institutions, even though much of the coursework may be delivered by current University of Minnesota collegiate units. The following set of principles is suggested as the foundation for discussions about partnership degree programs:

The degree program must be consistent with institutional values, contribute to the accomplishment of the University's mission, and reflect strategic directions for its academic programs.

The degree program balances liberal education outcomes with the provision of specific technical skills.

The degree program is an appropriate baccalaureate-level degree program and does not imply a level of preparation more appropriate for post-baccalaureate professional education.

Criteria for formal admission to a partnership degree program are consistent with quality standards used for admission to other degree programs in the collegiate unit(s) involved.

The degree program cannot be delivered entirely by one of the colleges on the Twin Cities campus of the University.

The degree program is more effectively and efficiently delivered by a partnership between Minnesota's two public higher education systems, and provides enrolled students with a better educational experience because of the partnership between the institutions.

Naming of the degree programs balances generality versus specificity, so that titles convey a broad focus appropriate for a baccalaureate degree, are not too time-bound in their meaning, and yet clearly convey the core knowledge domain studied by students.

Program-specific courses are designed in response to needs identified by business and industry representatives who participate in the curriculum design process.

Offering the degree program through the University of Minnesota employs its unique resources consistent with appropriate mission differentiation vis-à-vis the state universities, the community colleges, and the technical colleges.

Degree programs should respond to demonstrated “gaps” in program availability in the Twin Cities metropolitan area or in other parts of the state.

No partnership degree program unnecessarily duplicates any existing degree program(s) in any college or campus of the University of Minnesota.

Degree programs should be delivered to students such that their access to courses offered by partner institutions is “seamless” (i.e., no need to navigate two different registration systems).

The institution awarding the degree should be evident to students upon initial application for admission to the degree program.

Certain partnership degree programs might be offered by other institutions, such as Metropolitan State University, in a partnership involving two-year colleges and University of Minnesota resources.

Degree programs should incorporate appropriate instructional technology to enable students to learn effectively and efficiently.

In most cases, the coursework most appropriately delivered by the University of Minnesota should consist of upper-division coursework in the major field of study.

The curriculum should be delivered in a manner and in locations compatible with the schedules of working adults.

Development and approval of degrees must involve appropriate consultation with leadership and faculty in appropriate colleges of the University.

A core group of tenured University of Minnesota faculty, often housed in different departments or collegiate units, is ultimately responsible for the degree program, although ad hoc committees provide curriculum design.

Applied, partnership degree programs must be evaluated on a periodic basis, at which point the program's viability is evaluated based on program quality, value to students and employers, program demand, and financial considerations.

Criteria for Program Review and Evaluation

Although the six criteria noted below are fundamental, another set of broader questions serves as the context for applying the criteria for partnership degree programs. Those questions include the following: What are the educational needs of residents of the metropolitan area, and does the partnership degree program respond to the economic development needs of the area? In partnership with MnSCU, does the University of Minnesota have the capacity to respond to those needs, and what strategic investments are necessary to build faculty expertise to respond to future needs? Are there institutional and inter-system strategic issues that need to be identified to guide decision-making about the institution to offer a particular partnership degree? What are the relevant institutional performance measures to be used in evaluating the positive and negative effects of developing the new partnership degree program?

The issues to be addressed in proposing partnership degree programs are identical to those used in the submission of all new degree program proposals for approval by the Board of Regents. Appendix A is a copy of the outline used in summarizing information for submission to the Board of Regents. Implicit in that review process are the six fundamental criteria to guide decision making about academic programs offered by the University of Minnesota, including all degree programs delivered in partnership with MnSCU institutions. Those six criteria, first articulated in *A Commitment to Focus* in 1986, are as appropriate today as when first proposed a decade ago:

Quality: The degree to which the program provides high quality educational opportunities consistent with the mission of the University of Minnesota.

Uniqueness: The extent to which the degree program offers opportunities for students that are not available elsewhere in Minnesota, especially in the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Connectedness: The extent to which the degree program connects with and relates to other degree programs on the Twin Cities campus rather than exists as an isolated degree program.

Integration: The extent to which the degree program's various components and services are coherent and internally consistent in meeting the educational needs of Minnesota and the seven-county metropolitan area.

Demand: The extent to which student demand for the degree program is present or is projected for the future.

Cost-effectiveness: The extent to which the degree program costs are commensurate with the outcomes, build upon current academic resources, and can be operated at reasonable costs.

Current Status of Partnership Degrees

Each of the programs was to be continued for a four-year period, at which point the program's viability will be evaluated based on program quality, value to students and employers, retention and graduation rates, program demand, and financial considerations. Only the first two partnership degree programs have been in existence long enough to expect to have had graduates. Three students have completed the B.I.N., and eight students have completed the B.A.B..

Many of the active students (i.e., students who have expressed interest in the program and have taken at least one class) are MnSCU students who are exploring the program but are not yet formally University of Minnesota students. The information presented below was current as of the beginning of fall 1998.

	Number Active	Number Graduates	At Admission Mean Age	Mean GPA
Bachelor of Applied Business	141	16	32.4	2.91
Bachelor of Information Networking	77	9	32.5	3.02
Bachelor of Emergency Health Services	7	--	32.9	2.82
Bachelor of Construction Management	7	--	25.7	3.28

Process for Creating Future Partnership Degrees

The January 1998 *Partnership Agreement for Public Higher Education* places the development of additional partnership degree programs within the broader context of increased cooperation between the two public systems to meet the higher education needs of Minnesota citizens and Minnesota's businesses and industries. The higher education organizational structure in place when the first partnership degrees were created has changed, and that change has implications for both the current as well as any future partnership degree programs. Furthermore, since the program review and approval function of the Higher Education Coordination Board was eliminated effective July 1, 1995, there is no longer a statewide process to review proposals for new degree programs.

Given the articulation of the above guidelines and principles, how might they guide our current thinking about the four current partnership degree programs? The four partnership degree programs were conceived and developed in the context of an organizational structure for public higher education in Minnesota that no longer exists. The four partnership degree programs were designed to enable students to complete a University of Minnesota degree by completing designated coursework in selected community colleges in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Although the degree programs have much in common relative to their genesis and philosophy, each is quite distinct. Variations exist relative to the needs being addressed, the existence of degree programs offered by other institutions in MnSCU, preliminary evidence about the educational levels of individuals applying for admission to the degree programs, and the

feasibility of delivering the degree programs at sites throughout the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

The 1998 *Partnership Agreement* indicates that the two public systems “agree to join in joint strategic planning, develop incentives for implementing partnerships, and streamline the process for approving and implementing cooperative activities.” As an important first step in that direction, the chief academic officers of both systems (the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of MnSCU and the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University of Minnesota) will co-chair an Inter-System Policy Committee, which will provide oversight and a coordinating mechanism for joint working groups. One of the first joint working groups to be appointed will be one charged with responsibility for addressing inter-system issues relative to extant and future applied partnership degree programs.

Since the rationale for the partnership degree programs emphasizes that the career-oriented baccalaureate degree programs are responsive to the documented need for a new type of degree program, one of the first tasks is the development of a vehicle for the systematic identification of new program needs. The 1998 *Partnership Agreement* suggested that future collaborations might lead to partnership degree programs in agriculture, food production, health care, technology, and other fields. Businesses and industries that have identified gaps in the availability of educational programs need a clear point of access to those within the University of Minnesota, who in consultation with similar staff in MnSCU, explore the feasibility of developing a particular new educational program.

The following steps should be followed in developing and proposing new partnership degree programs:

Step 1: In this informal process, University College staff, together with leadership and faculty in University of Minnesota collegiate units, consult with business and industry, in collaboration with representatives of MnSCU, to identify educational programs suitable for further exploration as partnership degrees.

Step 2: After their consultation with the units involved, University College consults with the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost for approval to proceed to the curriculum design phase.

Step 3: Appointment of curriculum design committee that includes representation of faculty from University units, faculty from partner institution(s), and business and industry representatives from the sectors the partnership degree program is intended to serve.

Step 4: Review and approval by University College Academic Council with simultaneous reporting to the Twin Cities Assembly Committee on Educational Policy.

Step 5: Review and approval by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Step 6: Review and approval by the Board of Regents and, as appropriate, simultaneous review and approval by the MnSCU Board of Trustees.

For Further Information:

Dr. Darwin D. Hendel
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
234 Morrill Hall
University of Minnesota
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 625-0129
FAX: (612) 624-6057
E-mail: hendel@mailbox.mail.umn.edu

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy reviewed these guidelines over the course of several meetings, made a number of suggestions that were incorporated, and approved them on October 21, 1998. They are presented for information to the Senate.

JUDITH MARTIN, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Judith Martin said that this policy has been developed to monitor the programs in collaboration between the University and the MnSCU system. Currently, there are four degrees which have been put into place with what has seemed to some as inadequate faculty oversight. This policy is proposed for future partnership degrees.

CONSENT AGENDA
Action

Agenda Items III. through IV. are considered to be noncontroversial or “housekeeping” in nature and are offered as a “Consent Agenda” to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. A simple majority is required for approval.

III. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 15

The University Senate minutes are available on the Web at the following URL:

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/u_senate/sen101598.html

IV. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Committees of the University Senate, 1998-99

MOTION:

To approve the following additions to University Senate committee memberships for 1998-99:

DISABILITIES ISSUES - Students: Amanda Perlman.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY - Students: Shumaila Anwer, Martin O'Hely, Tina Rovick.

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT - Students: Shawn Elison.

FINANCE AND PLANNING - Students: John Schmit, Laura Taken.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES - Students: Kevin McDowell, Ben Metzler, Andy Roterling.

LIBRARY - Students: Amy Gregoret, Jesse Grenz, Mark Zell.

RESEARCH - Students: Jesse Grenz, Peter Reichert, Barbara Van Drasek..

SOCIAL CONCERNS - Students: Sabeen Altaf, Nicholas Dehnert, Stephanie Eckroth, Thomas Haakenson, Jenny Nate, Jennifer Watts.

STUDENT AFFAIRS - Students: Sabeen Altaf, Jesse Berglund, Thomas Haakenson, Brittany Leigh, Laura Taken, Hillary Walters, Jennifer Watts, Britta Ylikopsa.

FOR INFORMATION:

ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS - Students: Stephanie Eckroth, Amy Kudronowicz, Peter Reichert.

CONSULTATIVE - Faculty: Marilyn Grave.

SALLY GREGORY KOHLSTEDT, Chair
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

DISCUSSION:

The Consent Agenda was approved with no discussion.

APPROVED

[End of Consent Agenda]

**V. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Eligibility Requirements for Student Senators
Action**

MOTION:

To amend the University Senate Constitution, Article III, Section 4b, as follows: (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; new language is underlined)

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE

4. Election of University Senate Members

...

b. The elected representatives of the students to the University Senate shall be chosen by secret ballot by the student constituency enrolled in the several institutes, colleges, or schools as specified in the bylaws. Only full-time students in each institute, college, or school shall be eligible to vote. Each institute, college, or school shall establish its own procedures to determine qualification ~~as a full-time student.~~ of those students eligible to vote.

There shall be one student member for each initial 1,000 full-time students or fraction thereof in each student constituency plus one additional student senator for each additional 1,000 full-time students or major fraction thereof in such constituency. At Morris and Crookston there shall be two student senators for each initial 1,000 full-time students or fraction thereof in each student constituency plus one additional student senator for each additional 1,000 full-time students or major fraction thereof in such constituency.

~~Any student who has twenty-four credits in residence at the University and at the time of voting is carrying at least nine credits in his or her institute, college, or school shall be eligible for election as a student representative to the University Senate. Graduate School students shall be eligible for election if they have nine credits in residence at the University and are full-time students at the time of voting or are certified as the equivalent of full-time students by the Graduate School. Continuing Education and Extension students shall be eligible for election if they have earned twelve credits in residence during the previous five years and are carrying three credits at the time of voting. Full-time students in each institute, college, or school shall be eligible to vote. Each institute, college, or school shall establish its own procedures to determine qualification as a full-time student.~~

To be eligible for election to the University Senate, a student must have earned the required number of credits in residence at the University, as described below:

- University College students shall be eligible for election if they have earned at least twelve credits in residence during the previous five years and are carrying at least three credits at the time of voting.
- All other students shall be eligible for election if they have earned within the past year and are currently carrying at least two-thirds the number of credits required for full-time student status as defined by the Office of the Registrar for their college of enrollment. Graduate School students carrying one credit ABD (all but dissertation) at the time of voting or who are certified as the equivalent of full-time students by the Graduate School shall be eligible for election.

COMMENT:

The above amendments to the Senate Constitution were approved by the Student Senate at its May 14, 1998, meeting and are presented for consideration by the full Senate. If approved, the amendments will lower the Senate eligibility requirements allowing students to be eligible to serve as senators earlier in their college careers. This would allow more students to be involved in University governance and, hopefully, result in fewer vacant student seats. As a constitutional amendment 135 affirmative votes are required at one meeting or 102 at each of two consecutive meetings. The motion received 102 affirmative votes at the October 15, 1998, meeting.

RYAN FALK, Chair
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

A senator asked if this motion pertained to quarters or semesters.

Ryan Falk responded that the first paragraph, which refers to University College students, pertains to quarters, while the second paragraph works under both systems. The first paragraph will be revised when the rest of the changes are made to the University Senate Constitution.

A vote was then taken and the motion was approved with 108 votes in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

COMMENT ON ITEMS VI. and VII.:

The Senate adopted the Nepotism and Consensual Relationships Policy and the Sexual Harassment Policy in slightly different form on April 16, 1998. In the process of preparing them for action by the Board of Regents, changes were made in their format and wording. The original drafters believe that the changes do not alter the intent of the Senate. The Senate

Consultative Committee decided that the revised text should be resubmitted to the Senate for its approval. The Senate Consultative Committee recommends approval.

**VI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Nepotism and Consensual Relationships Policy
Action**

MOTION:

To amend the Nepotism and Consensual Relationships Policy, as follows: [additions are underlined; deletions are ~~struck out~~]

NEPOTISM AND CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS

Subd. 1. Philosophy. ~~The University of Minnesota acts in accord with the public policy to encourage and foster, to the fullest extent practicable, the employment of properly qualified persons regardless of their age, race, religion, creed, color, disability, sex, marital status, public assistance, veterans status, sexual orientation, or national origin.~~

Subd. 2. Prohibition. ~~Except as authorized in writing by the senior vice president for academic affairs, the University does not permit persons who are related through blood, marriage or other committed relationships to participate in decisions to hire, retain, promote or determine the salary of the other person, or to be responsible for the evaluation, supervision, or assignment of the work of the other person. Any employment relationship with contravenes the requirements of the previous sentence must be identified and submitted in writing to the senior vice president for academic affairs.~~

Subd. 3. Exceptions. ~~The senior vice president for academic affairs may authorize reporting arrangements which prevent violations of this policy and/or authorize exceptions from this policy after a written determination that it is in the best interest of the University, there is no reasonable alternative, enters into a written agreement with the involved persons, and provides for annual monitoring.~~

SECTION I. DEFINITIONS.

Subd. 1. Member of the University Community. “Member of the University community” or “University member” shall mean any University of Minnesota faculty member, student, or staff member, or other individual engaged in any University activity or program.

Subd. 2. Personal Relationship. “Personal relationship” shall mean marital or other committed relationship, significant familial relationship, or consensual sexual or romantic relationship.

SECTION II. EMPLOYMENT AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES.

Subd. 1. Prohibited Activities. A member of the University community may not directly influence the University employment or academic progress of a University member with whom he or she has a personal relationship. Prohibited activities include, but are not limited to, hiring, promotion, supervision, evaluation, determination of salary, grading, and advising.

Subd. 2. Noncompetitive Appointments. This policy does not prohibit noncompetitive appointments of spouses and partners otherwise authorized by University policy.

Subd. 3. Relationships With Current Students. Personal relationships between faculty members or advisors and their current students are very unwise and may violate other University policies, even when prohibited activities have been avoided, because of the trust accorded to faculty members and advisors by students, the power differential inherent in academic associations, the difficulty of making alternative arrangements for grading and evaluation, and the risk of real or perceived favoritism toward the student in the personal relationship and the potential harm to this student and other students.

SECTION III. ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTIVES.

Subd. 1. Procedures Required. The president shall adopt procedures for the implementation of this policy. The procedures must contain the provisions outlined in subdivisions 2-5.

Subd. 2. Consultation. Consultation shall be mandatory for University members who are or will be in a position to engage in an activity prohibited by section II.

A consultation process shall be designed to ensure that:

- (1) appropriate steps are taken to avoid the prohibited activity,
- (2) steps taken will not unreasonably disadvantage either University member,
- (3) the consultation is with an appropriate administrator, and
- (4) appropriate confidentiality is provided.

Subd. 3. Goal of Consultation. Compliance with this policy may be achieved either by structuring the conditions of the employment or academic association of the related parties so as to avoid or eliminate the prohibited activities or by avoiding the personal relationship that may lead to the prohibited activities. The structuring of the association must be done after appropriate consultation and must not unreasonably disadvantage either University member.

Subd. 4. Power Disparity. When a power disparity exists in the employment or academic association of the individuals in the personal relationship, the employment or academic interests of the subordinate must be protected when structuring the association to avoid the prohibited activity.

Subd. 5. Exclusions. In exceptional circumstances an exclusion from section II, subd. 1 may be granted when eliminating the prohibited activities would unreasonably disadvantage one or both of the University members involved in a personal relationship. In the event that an exclusion is granted, safeguards must be implemented to help ensure that any employment or academic decisions regarding the involved University members are made impartially.

SECTION IV. DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

A violation of section II, subd. 1 may lead to disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment or academic dismissal. Participation in and adherence to the consultation process may mitigate disciplinary action.

SARA EVANS, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

KENT BALES, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Carol Chomsky talked about the process by which this policy, and the one following, reached the Senate. She recalled that two years ago the Senate adopted different versions of the Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships Policy. At that time, the previous administration had some concerns about the policy, so a committee was set up to produce a new draft for the Senate. This new draft was approved by the University Senate last April. At that time, the committee informed the Senate that the Regents' office intended to look at the policy and do some editing to put it into regental format. When the drafting was completed by the Regents' office, there were more changes made than just removing the purpose language from the policy. This resulted in a series of meetings between the Regents' staff and the drafting committee to put the policy in a new format, but that left it substantively the same as what the Senate adopted in April. These policies were then presented to the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) for their approval. While the SCC, as well as the drafting committee, felt that the policies are substantively the same as those adopted in April, the SCC felt that it was not their role to make that determination in place of the full Senate. She concluded that the Senate needs to vote whether or not they are substantively the same as what was adopted in April. She then opened the floor for questions.

Professor Fred Morrison, Vice Chair of the SCC, said that he insisted that these policies be returned to the Senate, because the SCC should not be in the routine of substituting its judgment for that of the full Senate. He agreed that the intention of the Senate is being carried out and urged the senators to vote in favor.

A senator asked whether the last sentence of the policy, "All such discipline shall be in accordance with the appropriate University employment policies" could be reinserted in the Regents' version of the policy.

Professor Chomsky responded that the committee was satisfied with omitting this language because it is true that any action must be in accordance with those other policies.

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

APPROVED

**VII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Sexual Harassment Policy
Action**

MOTION:

To amend the Sexual Harassment Policy, as follows: [additions are underlined; deletions are ~~struck out~~]

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

SECTION I. DEFINITION.

Subd. 1. Sexual Harassment. “Sexual harassment” means unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and/or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

(1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s employment or academic advancement in any University activity or program;

(2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis of employment or academic decisions affecting this individual in any University activity or program; or

(3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment in any University activity or program.

Subd. 2. Member of the University Community. “Member of the University community” or “University member” means any University of Minnesota faculty member, student, or staff member, or other individual engaged in any University activity or program.

SECTION II. POLICY.

Subd. 1. Prohibition. Sexual harassment by or toward a member of the University community is prohibited.

Subd. 2. Responsibility to Report. Department heads, deans, provosts, chancellors, vice presidents, and other supervisors and managers must take timely and appropriate action when they know or should know of the existence of sexual harassment. Other persons who suspect sexual harassment should report it to an appropriate person in their unit or to the University equal opportunity officer.

Subd. 3. Administrative Responsibility. Each campus must adopt procedures for investigating and resolving complaints of sexual harassment in coordination with the director of equal opportunity and affirmative action.

Subd. 4. Disciplinary Action. A violation of this policy may lead to disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment or academic dismissal.

SARA EVANS, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

KENT BALES, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

The policy was approved with no further discussion.

APPROVED

**VIII. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy
Action**

MOTION:

To amend Section III of the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy, as follows: [additions are underlined; deletions are ~~struck-out~~]

III. OTHER TRANSCRIPT SYMBOLS

1. There shall be a temporary symbol I, incomplete, awarded to indicate that the work of the course has not been completed.

The I shall be assigned at the discretion of the instructor when, due to extraordinary circumstances, the student was prevented from completing the work of the course on time. The assignment of an I requires a written agreement between the instructor and student specifying the time and manner in which the student will complete the course requirements. ~~during the student's next period of enrollment.~~ In no event may any such written agreement allow a period of longer than one year to complete the course requirements.

~~For undergraduates and adult special students, work to make up an I must be submitted within 72 hours of the last final examination of the student's next period of enrollment at the University; if not submitted by that time, in the sixth week of the next term the I will automatically change to an F (if the student was registered on the A-F system) or an N (if the student was registered on the S-N system) for the course. For graduate and professional students, an I is to remain on the transcript until changed by the instructor or department.~~

For graduate and professional students, an I is to remain on the transcript until changed by the instructor or department.. For all other students, work to make up an I must be submitted within one year of the last day of final examinations of the term in which the I was given; if not submitted by that time, the I will automatically change to an F (if the student was registered on the A-F system) or an N (if the student was registered on the S-N system) for the course.¹

When an I is changed to another symbol, the I is removed from the record. Once an I has become an F or an N, under the provisions of the preceding paragraph, it may subsequently be converted to any other grade, upon petition by the instructor (or the department if the instructor is unavailable) to the college.

A student does not need to be registered at the University in order to complete the work necessary to convert an I to a grade with credit in the time and manner previously agreed upon between the student and the instructor.² The instructor is expected to turn in the new grade within four weeks of the date the work was submitted by the student.³

¹ If an I changes automatically to an F or an N, the instructor has the discretion to reinstate the I for another year.

² An I will be converted automatically to an F or an N even if a student graduates: if a student receives an I in a course, but he or she graduates (that is, has enough credits without the course in which the I was received) before the year has run, and the student does not make up the work, the I will convert to an F or an N after the degree has been granted.

³ This may mean that there would be, temporarily, an F or an N on the transcript: if the student waits until the last week or so to turn in the work required to make up the I, and the instructor uses all or nearly all of the four weeks allowed to grade the work, the one-year period will lapse and the I will be changed to an F, until the instructor changes the grade.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy was informed that the new PeopleSoft computer program will not allow enforcement of the current policy with respect to Incompletes: it cannot discriminate between the passage of time for students who are enrolled and those who are not. It can, however, measure the passage of time generally.

As a consequence, SCEP recommends the change indicated, TO BE EFFECTIVE FALL SEMESTER, 1998. Incompletes will continue to change automatically to an F or an N, depending on which grading system the student enrolled under, but will do so only after the lapse of one year from the end of the final examination period for the term in which the Incomplete was earned.

JUDITH MARTIN, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Judith Martin, chair of the Educational Policy Committee, said that the current practice is that a grade of an Incomplete automatically becomes an F after one quarter. The new PeopleSoft computer system, however, can not track this change. This policy will continue to allow an Incomplete not to change into an F for a graduate student, and for undergraduates will allow the Registrar to change an Incomplete to an F after the end of one year. She then opened the floor for questions.

A vote was then taken and the motion was approved with no discussion.

APPROVED

IX. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

NONE

X. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Yudof said that there is more political complexity in Minnesota than in Texas, and that he is looking forward to working with the new governor. The University needs to extend a hand of friendship and work as actively as possible to make the transition easy and to articulate the views of the University.

XI. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: Due to the need for renovations on the Twin Cities Campus, a number of classrooms will be out of commission during the 1999-2000 academic year, when the University moves to semesters, and when the demand for adequate instructional space will be greater than current demands. What steps have been taken to address this potential complication?

A: This is a concern of the University since for two years people and departments will be moving and the Enterprise System will be starting. There already exists a classroom shortage on the East Bank. The renovation projects that will have the most impact will be in Ford Hall, Murphy Hall, Architecture Building, and Owre Hall. Together, 331 classrooms will be lost. If the supplemental capital proposal for Nicholson Hall is passed, another 11 classrooms will be lost. This amounts to roughly only 20-25% of East Bank classrooms would be available for Fall Semester in 1999. The Registrar's Office is using new software to identify all these problems; in December, a set of recommendations will be submitted and by January a plan will be presented. Faculty can help by sticking to standard meeting and class schedule patterns, complying with the course time distribution policy to spread courses throughout the day, allowing other courses to be held in departmental classrooms, specifying equipment needs in advance, and being flexible in terms of location preference.

XII. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

XIII. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

XIV. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY

R. Joel Tierney
(University Attorney)

STUDENTS

Grace Elijah
College of Liberal Arts

Summer Rose Pray
College of Liberal Arts

Keej Thoj
Institute of Technology

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor

NOVEMBER 5, 1998

The second meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1998-99 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 5, 1998, at 3:07 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 115 voting faculty/academic professional members, 2 ex officio members, and 2 nonmembers. President Mark Yudof presided.

CONSENT AGENDA
Action

Agenda Items I. through II. are considered to be noncontroversial or “housekeeping” in nature and are offered as a “Consent Agenda” to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. A simple majority is required for approval.

I. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 15

The Faculty Senate minutes are available on the Web at the following URL:

http://www.umn.edu/usenate/faculty_senate/fac101598.html

II. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Committees of the Faculty Senate, 1998-99**MOTION:**

To approve the following additions to Faculty Senate committee memberships for 1998-99:

FACULTY AFFAIRS - Students: Janet Holdsworth.

FOR INFORMATION:

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE - Faculty: Marilyn Grave.

SALLY GREGORY KOHLSTEDT, Chair
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

DISCUSSION:

The Consent Agenda was approved with no discussion.

APPROVED

[End of Consent Agenda]

III. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

**Administrative Procedures for the Interim Regents' Policy on Faculty Development Leaves
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the Administrative Procedures for the Interim Regents' Policy on Faculty Development Leaves (additions are underlined, deletions are ~~struck-out~~):

Administrative Procedures for the Interim Regents' Policy on Faculty Development Leaves

1. Purpose. The continuing development of a university depends upon having a faculty that grows ever more knowledgeable, that is better able to communicate its knowledge to students and to society alike, and that creates new uses for the knowledge that it has made available. To assist in such professional growth and renewal, to attract and retain a faculty dedicated to fulfilling these missions, and thus to ensure the future vitality and quality of the University of Minnesota, the Regents have established Academic Development leaves for the faculty. The policy *Faculty Development Leaves* and these procedures for administering it supersede those concerning sabbatical and single quarter leaves for the faculty.

During recent years, rapid changes in the nature and number of tasks to be carried out by faculty members in their teaching, research, creative and outreach activities have made it all the more necessary for them to acquire new skills and knowledge in order to discharge their duties in the best possible manner. It is therefore in the interest of the University of Minnesota to provide better means for faculty development, including wider use of faculty development leaves.

Members of the faculty receive academic development leaves so that they can pursue more intensively already fruitful work or begin new studies, investigations, research, scholarly writing, and artistic projects. Leaves also may be used for curriculum development and other improvements to teaching. The professional development enabled by these leaves benefits students, citizens of Minnesota, and all who are affected by the research, teaching, creative activity, and service to society that are the University's missions.

2. Kinds of Leaves

Sabbatical Leaves are described in Section III of the policy *Faculty Development Leaves*; single-semester leaves are described in Section IV. These procedures should be read in conjunction with the policy, not as a substitute for it.

A. Single-Semester Leaves

Unless the president or regents decide otherwise, up to four percent of the faculty at the tenured rank of instructor, and probationary and tenured ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor can be authorized for single-semester leaves during one fiscal year. This formula is taken from the Regents Policy *Single-Quarter Leaves*, no longer in effect with the adoption of the policy *Faculty Development Leaves*.

B. Sabbatical Leaves

Section I. Accrual of Credit. Credit toward these leaves is accrued during continuous terms of service to the University and is lost by any interruption in that service, other than by an approved leave of absence, except as described below. For any sabbatical leave of a semester's duration, the second semester (or second half of the year, as appropriate) shall be credited toward future single semester and sabbatical leaves. Thus, by choosing the single semester sabbatical option, the privilege to the second semester (or second half of the year) is waived.

Credit is not accrued during approved leaves such as these:

- (1) a sabbatical leave;
- (2) appointment to University-sponsored research programs for more than half-time, resulting in a faculty appointment of less than half-time;
- (3) a leave of absence without pay, including leave to accept a fellowship or grant, to accept a visiting or other appointment in another university, college, or business, or to serve elsewhere on a teaching or technical assistance project not administered by the University;
- (4) a leave of absence with pay other than an academic development leave;
- (5) summer research or teaching.

Credit is accrued during any approved single-semester leave.

Section II. Prior Service. For new faculty hires, normally no more than three years of credit will be granted for service at another institution.

Section II. III. Application, Review, and Funding.

Subd. 1. Declaring Eligibility. When sufficient eligibility credit has accrued, or will do so in the succeeding year, a member of the faculty may present a detailed proposal of work to be done during the leave. Normally, the department or college will call for such proposals early in the academic year, for leaves to be taken the following year. As specified in Section II, Subd. 8 of the Regents' policy, worthy sabbatical leaves may be

restructured or delayed for up to one year to relieve departmental or collegiate constraints.

Subd. 2. Application Contents. The application shall be made ~~upon~~ on a form ~~to be~~ provided by the collegiate unit and ~~concerning~~ consisting of, at the least, the following items:

- (1) name, rank, and department;
- (2) dates leaving and returning;
- (3) statement of successive changes in rank and salary;
- (4) reason for taking leave, place where leave will be spent, and an outline of the program of studies or other work that the applicant proposes to follow;
- (5) ~~statement~~ dates of any all previous leaves granted, and the results of that grant; a copy of the summary report of the most recent leave;
- (6) a definite statement of commitment to devote the leave to the program outlined and afterwards to continue service to the University for at least one year; ~~on the same pay, though with no prejudice to receiving any advance that would have been paid had the applicant not been absent on leave;~~
- (7) the date (within three months of returning) ~~on or before~~ by which the applicant agrees to file a summary report with the departmental unit and college concerning the results of the work done while on leave.

Subd. 3. Review. Both departments and colleges shall devise procedures for assessing whether the work proposed by applicants is worthy.

(1) The department administrator (as defined in Section 1, Subd. 3, of the policy), subsequent to whatever review has been devised by the department, describes in writing to the dean and to the applicant the extent to which the work proposed for the period of the leave will advance the career of the applicant and how it will further the work of the department or otherwise change it for the better. The departmental administrator also will describe what arrangements can be made for carrying on the work of the department in the applicant's absence.

(2) The dean, informed by whatever review is required by the college and satisfied that the work proposed for the leave will advance the applicant's career and, secondarily, improve the department or the college, will confer with the departmental administrator concerning arrangements to be made for continuing the work of the department during the applicant's leave. If necessary, the collegiate administrator will arrange for additional funding for the applicant's department or for transfer of effort from other departments.

Subd. 4. Salary. The salary during the leave is based upon the faculty member's recurring salary at the time of the leave.

Subd. 5. Supplementary Funding. ~~For sabbatical leaves of more than one semester, or more than five and one-half months for those on fiscal year appointments, there will be a competition for supplementary funding. The funding expected for this competition by 2002-~~

2003 is \$1,500,000 and includes what formerly was called “Bush” money. The \$310,000 annual Bush Salary Supplement Program will be discontinued upon implementation of the interim policy and will be replaced by an expanded salary supplement pool jointly funded by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (2/3) and the colleges (1/3). A total of \$750,000 is expected to be available for those taking sabbaticals during the 1999-2000 academic year and \$1,500,000 for each of the subsequent years that the interim policy remains in effect. For sabbatical leaves of two semesters, or 11 months for those on fiscal-year appointments, faculty may request (using procedures established by the college) salary supplementary funds to cover an additional 25% of their recurring salary (not to exceed \$20,000). Candidates are encouraged to seek funding from non-University sources to cover the salary supplement. The college administrator shall provide the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost an annual report of the faculty granted salary supplement funds.

Section III. IV. Scheduling. Sabbatical leaves and single-semester leaves for faculty on academic year (B) appointments shall begin and end so as to coincide with the beginnings and endings of semesters; sabbatical leaves and single-semester leaves for those on fiscal-year (A) appointments shall be scheduled at times reasonable and convenient for the department or unit. A leave of more than one semester normally is taken in consecutive terms.

Section IV. V. Grievances. As provided in Section III, Subd. 9 of the Regents policy *Faculty Development Leaves*, administrative delays of more than one year, denials of proposals found to be worthy by the procedures established within the departmental, collegiate, or administrative units, or violations of these procedures are grievable. The grievance must allege that the delay, denial, or violation ~~was not made in accordance~~ conflicts with a relevant University rule, regulation, policy, practice, procedure or criterion, and that it constitutes a clear abuse of discretion. Grievances may be filed with the University Grievance Office, which will assist in the process of filing a formal grievance. Should a grieved denial be found to have merit, the consequences are these: in addition to the leave in question, which shall be granted, the period of time during which the leave was inappropriately denied shall be subtracted from the eligibility period required for any succeeding leave, unless the grievance panel rules otherwise.

Section V. VI. Loss or Suspension of Eligibility. Credit toward single-semester leaves and sabbatical leaves is lost by any interruption in continuous service to the University other than an approved leave of absence. Retirement and severance from service are such interruptions. All credit toward eligibility is lost by an individual given notice of non-reappointment or termination of appointment. (Such credit is restored, however, in the event that the notice is successfully grieved.) All credit toward eligibility shall be suspended for an individual when there is strong evidence that the individual's appointment will be terminated prior to what otherwise would be the closing date of the period of leave plus the period of return to service.

3. Transition from Quarters to Semesters

Subd. 1. Transferring Accrued Credit. Up to six years of credit towards a sabbatical can be transferred under the new policy, so that for 1999-2000 this accrued credit and a worthy proposal make one eligible for a year's sabbatical leave. Up to four years of credit toward eligibility for a single-semester leave may also be transferred. However, during the year 1998-99 those with three years of credit towards eligibility may apply without prejudice for a single-semester leave in 1999-00. In other words, the procedures for awarding single-quarter leaves will remain in effect for applications made during this transitional year for leaves to be taken during the first year of single-semester leaves.

Subd. 2. Converting Credit. For faculty members on academic-year (B) appointments, three quarters equals two semesters or one year. A remainder of one quarter does not count, but a remainder of two quarters counts as one semester.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) presents these leave procedures for action to the Faculty Senate, developed by the Benefits Subcommittee of SCFA. We note that they are procedures for the interim policy on leaves.

One train of thought was that SCFA should take time to write all new procedures to accompany the new leave policy adopted by the Faculty Senate on October 15. We believe, however, that it was better for SCFA and FCC quickly to review and approve these (which it did)and recommend action to the Faculty Senate on November 5. We recommend this speedy action in order that procedures would be in place so that our colleagues have a way in which to apply for leaves for 1999-2000; because the policy to which they apply has only interim status, we believe that action is appropriate. If problems in the procedures become known, we shall return promptly to the Faculty Senate with proposal for change (or, if any delay will harm the ability of faculty members to obtain leaves, FCC will use its executive authority to conditionally approve changes, subject to confirmation by the Faculty Senate at its next meeting).

FCC and SCFA thus recommend that the Faculty Senate approve these procedures.

KENT BALES, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Kent Bales, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), said that much of the drafting of these procedures had been done by the Benefits Subcommittee of SCFA and then reviewed by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). The procedures were also shown to the Council of Deans. The Council of Deans, at times, sees things that the subcommittee did not see, and at other times, recommends changes that the committee can or cannot live with. The changes in this draft are few and include:

- Addition of creative activities in the purpose
- Section II, Prior Service has been added and displaces the other sections

- Subdivision 5 was rewritten to make more explicit where money comes from and how it can be spent

He then opened the floor to questions.

Q: Please clarify Section II.

A: This new language was meant to be a clarification of what was previously there. The point is that if a faculty member needs to be two-thirds time, of that time no more than half-time can be on a non-faculty appointment, such as a research appointment.

Q: If a faculty member has a research grant that pays three-fourths of their salary, does sabbatical now not accrue?

A: If the grant was University sponsored, then this would not affect the faculty member.

Q: Will the faculty decide how the money is distributed?

A: The funds will be decentralized and the units will decide how to distribute the funds according to their own procedures. The purpose section of this policy states that sabbatical leaves may be granted for curriculum improvements.

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

APPROVED

**IV. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Academic Appointments Subcommittee
Information**

(DRAFT UNDER CONSTRUCTION)

Putting the House in Order: A Report of the Joint Committee on Academic Appointments

I. Executive Summary

Both the composition and the duties of university faculty have changed radically over the past half century, sometimes by rational choice but often by the acquiescence of faculties, administrators, and trustees to what seemed brute economic and political force. The changes in the composition of the faculty often have been for the better when viewed from the perspective of social diversity, but they have been for the worse when seen from almost all others. Tenured and tenure-track faculty proportionally are fewer and in some instances absolutely so. In their places are sometimes those who do nothing but research, sometimes teachers hired by the term,

which varies from a quarter or semester to several years in length. Recently, university faculties and professional associations have taken special note of these changes in what seems to be jointly a crisis of conscience and a recognition that reform must come now or never, that we are near the end of a road. We propose resolutions concerning both crises. The principal one would modify Minnesota's job classifications and hiring practices so that all of those whose work is "faculty-like" are classified as such. Other resolutions concern setting appropriate ratios of tenured and tenure-track faculty and non-tenured faculty and improving our treatment of the latter.

II. The Charged Duties

This committee was created from members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and charged with three general tasks. The first is to describe and investigate the current varieties of academic appointments at the University of Minnesota and the policies and practices concerning them. The second is to propose whatever revisions are necessary in the current classifications, policies, and practices so that these may be regularized and published as a single policy. The third is to devise ways of ensuring that hires within each category are made according to needs identified by the bodies charged with establishing educational policy (The Senate and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy), and further that members of each academic classification participate in forming and implementing educational policy in their units. Soon after its formation, the committee sought representation from the Academic Staff Advisory Committee and from the ranks of temporary and part-time teachers.

III. Caveat

Because we recommend changes in whom the University classifies as "faculty" and how such colleagues as these are appointed, two mistaken inferences have been drawn in. One is that we want to dilute the faculty by removing all distinctions between the "regular" (tenured and tenure-track) faculty and the various kinds of "non-regular" (non-tenure-track) faculty. The other is that we do not value those who do the work of faculty, though often without recognition that they do so, and want to remove them from our midst. Our recommendations are intended to strengthen the regular faculty. Yet we acknowledge the valuable contributions throughout the years of full-time non-regular faculty, especially in the professional schools, and of adjunct faculty throughout the university. They bring expertise to the teaching and often to the research and scholarship that are the University's reasons for being. We also acknowledge the need for the temporary and part-time teachers who help departments to survive unusual circumstances. It is hard to imagine a university without such members, nor do we want to work in such a place. Instead, we would like to count them as colleagues—to identify them as "faculty" in some sense—and also to regulate their employment. For we are convinced that the current situation endangers the vitality of this research university and that the manner of employing such teachers, and in some instances what has become an unhealthy reliance upon them, are major aspects of this danger.

IV. The Major Issues

1. *The Decimation of the Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (TTTF)*. There has long been a trend in American colleges and universities to employ more temporary, part-time, or what have come to be called loosely “adjunct” faculty (who often are full-time and effectively permanent except in hard times). In some instances the TTTF has grown more slowly, in others it has been reduced, and in many places it has remained the same in size—hence proportionally smaller. Between 1975 and 1995, TTTF fell from 45% of university and college teachers to 35%, while non-tenure-track (NTTF) and part time faculty increased from 34% to 47%. The remainder in these data are graduate assistants, whose share of the whole fell from 20% to 19%.ⁱ What it took the aggregate of American colleges and universities twenty years to accomplish, the University of Minnesota accomplished in ten. Between 1987-88 and 1997-98, TTTF were reduced by 12%, from 3,208 to 2,828, while term appointments of NTTF increased by 21%.ⁱⁱ Beyond that the picture is incomplete, because the data often do not exist.

2. *The Increase in Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF)*. The rest of those teaching our students, some of them also doing research and service exactly as though they were TTTF, are hard to count because they do not count as faculty. Among those countable are the “term” faculty defined in the tenure code, and their numbers have increased in some parts of the university, declined in others. The Academic Health Center has turned to making a number of clinical appointments in a new kind of term appointment, a practice now described in the tenure code. Most other term classifications, however, have lost ground to the hard-to-count and easy-to-fire Professional Academic Staff, who by regental definition are professionals “not engaged in full-time teaching and scholarly work, as are faculty, but rather are assigned to duties enhancing the research, teaching, and service functions of the University.”ⁱⁱⁱ

3. *The Proliferation of Uncounted Faculty-Like Appointments*. Yet within the sub-classifications of the category “Academic Staff: Professional” are the Teaching Specialists, the Education Specialists, and the Lecturers who do almost nothing but teach—usually *many* students. Their numbers are ascertainable only locally, because employment practices vary from unit to unit, and because, like term faculty employed at less than 67%, they are statistically invisible. In addition, we know personally and anecdotally of Professional Academic Staff members appointed within other sub-classifications who teach, do research and scholarship, and perform service or outreach just as though they were faculty. Others act in place of the faculty, doing the unacknowledged work of faculty, such as the Clinical Professors of the Law School, who, despite their title, are Professional Academics. But officially, by University policy, they are not counted as faculty. Yet they and the T Specs, Ed Specs, and Lecturers are the ones filling in the decimated faculty ranks. A similar loss of civil service personnel to Professional Administrative classifications is evident. Civil servants and the TTTF share one significant attribute: job security. That is not granted to most Academic Staff. Each year they are notified of their “non-reappointment” and then (most of them) later rehired in a legality-driven ritual that humiliates and makes anxious the affected members of the Academic Staff (some 75% of the total) and that disgraces our university.

4. *What’s Wrong with This Picture*. It is badly askew from about every angle. The loss

of TTTF has weakened the quality of education afforded graduate and undergraduate students alike. It endangers as well the university's reputation for the cutting-edge research that contributes so much to the economic, social, and artistic well-being of the citizens of Minnesota, both by reducing grant income and by making it more difficult to recruit distinguished older faculty, promising younger faculty, and graduate students of the highest quality. From another perspective, reliance upon temporary and part-time hires removes from decision-making about the curriculum (by TTTF) the very people most intimately knowledgeable about it (the NTTF who staff the basic courses). The key link between policy planning and practical suggestions for change is broken, since those teaching do not set educational policy for the very courses they teach. On occasion such hires may put into the classroom teachers inadequately prepared and supervised. Most important to well qualified NTTF in all this is the frustration of their hope to realize their potential as professional educators. Finally, from the perspective of policy-making and planning for the University as a whole, there is the paucity of information available about who does what—and this in the “information age”!

V. RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 1. All appointments for which the assigned duty is teaching or for which the assigned duties consist of teaching in conjunction with other traditional academic work of the faculty (research and scholarship, service and outreach) shall be made within the “Academic” category “Faculty” (94xx), except for full-time employees who teach or do research for no more than 25% of their time. Any appointments of either nature currently made within other categories shall be changed to an appropriate Academic Faculty category (94XX), without any loss of benefits to those so reclassified. A new policy on “Academic Appointments” shall be written by the Tenure Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, with participation by members of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee and temporary and part-time teaching staff. Appointments for research and scholarship or for service and outreach shall continue to be classified as they are now.

Comment. This reform of the appointment categories for “non-regular faculty” (i.e., for term faculty not tenured or on tenure track) and for “P & A” personnel who spend most of their time doing faculty work is intended to simplify the often bewildering categories of personnel who perform the duties of teaching and research that characterize membership in a university faculty and to make the numbers of TTTF and NTTF easily ascertainable. We recommend that *Academic Professionals* (AP) be defined as practicing professionals not primarily doing teaching or conducting research. The work that they do is related to a specific degree, without which they would not be qualified to do their work (Examples: psychologists, physicians, lawyers.) *Professional Administrators* (PA) do administrative work for which an advanced degree may or may not be required. Moreover, when one is required, the degree itself may not be directly related to the performance of one's administrative duties. (Examples: directors of programs or centers, presidents.) Personnel within these categories whose work is primarily not that of faculty would remain as they are. Currently employed P & As who do faculty-like work as teachers and researchers, however, would be re-classified into new categories for non-

regular faculty. Such classifications represent more clearly current reality and would facilitate accounting—and provide accountability—for the work of academic personnel. Such reclassification of P & A who do faculty work would not lessen their fringe benefits or other entitlements. (We use here the loose term “P & A” because both Academic Professionals and Administrative Professionals turn up on the teaching rolls, when these can be created.)

While realizing that our recommendation to redefine the classifications Academic Professional and Administrative Professional lies beyond the scope of our charge, we hope that the Academic Staff Advisory Committee and the Office of Human Resources will find its intent to be friendly and consider doing something like it. The professional integrity of these useful colleagues seems to us to be compromised by current practice within some units.

Resolution 2. No more than 15% of the faculty of the university may be NTTF, and no more than 25% of the faculty of a college or similar unit may be NTTF. Exceptions to the limitation placed upon schools, colleges, and departments may be granted by the Executive Vice President and Provost (or other presidential designee), but only with the concurrence of the Senate committees on Educational Policy and Faculty Affairs. The decision will be based upon written justification for the exception and evidence that teaching and research of high quality will be maintained or improved within the unit requesting the exception. By a majority vote of the regular faculty, schools, colleges, and departments may reduce the proportion of non-regular faculty allowable within their units, except that any non-regular term faculty and re-assigned Academic Professional personnel within the unit may not be dismissed as a consequence of this decision.

Comment. This resolution draws upon a recommendation of the AAUP and limits the number of NTTF by limiting their proportion within the university, colleges, and departments. Administrators and TTF will then be accountable for observing these limitations. Calculations of these proportions may be by FTE. By permitting variances from the AAUP’s 15%/25% model, however, the committee would enable professional schools and other possibly worthy employers of professional NTTF to represent their interests in a non-prejudicial manner.

Resolution 3. In order to increase the quality of education and to improve work conditions in the employment of temporary and part-time faculty such as Teaching Specialists and Education Specialists, departments employing such Academic Professional “faculty” immediately should hire by the year rather than by the term and reward the best of such NTTF by granting, after an appropriate probationary period, two- or three-year contracts. The *Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty, September 26-28, 1997* provides good guidelines for responsibly treating these junior colleagues. (See appendix.) These personnel will be appointed within the new non-regular faculty classifications called for in 4 below. While this change will assure more appropriate treatment in review, promotion opportunities, and the like, the number of NTTF who are temporary and part-time, and the impact of their employment upon the quality of the institution, will still need to be addressed. The

Faculty Senate authorizes the creation of a committee reporting to the Senate Committees on Educational Policy and Faculty Affairs that shall recommend to the Senate ways of regulating the employment of temporary and part-time faculty at Minnesota.

Comment. The annual needs of most departments using temporary and part-time faculty are predictable enough that most such appointments at present need not be term-to-term. Professional associations are now recommending to their membership ways to do right by temporary and part-time faculty, within whose ranks are greater proportions of women and minorities than within the TTTF. (See the October 1998 issue of PMLA for the Modern Language Association's recommendations.)

Resolution 4. The Senate directs the Joint Committee on Faculty Appointments to devise a coherent and uniform system for non-regular faculty appointments outside the tenure system, one that will be congruent with the tenure code. The committee will integrate its proposals with those of the Tenure Subcommittee (as charged in 1 above) and will consult more widely than it has been able to do so as best to meet the needs of departments and colleges and to respect their traditional practices.

Comment: The subcategories of appointments within the class will have to be amplified, and the titles appropriate to each subcategory defined. Furthermore, for each subcategory, appropriate hiring criteria and procedures, probationary periods, work expectations, and terms of appointment will need to be defined. In consulting with colleges and departments about their traditional practices, the committee will also be able to identify those units most likely to seek an exceptional status and to begin to assess their special needs.

VI. Conclusions

Clearly, the radical changes in who teaches at colleges and universities in the United States will have profound influence upon the future. More specifically, both the system of tenure and the nature of the research university are in danger of being weakened or lost. The Michigan Report is eloquent on both counts: "if present trends continue, the tenure system may simply disappear, without a proper consideration of what would be lost." And again, "One of the hazards of the use of non-TT faculty is that very often, in these cases, the link between teaching and research is broken: the faculty are hired either to teach, or to do research, but not to do both. If such faculty came to dominate this University, that would change the fundamental nature of the institution."

Our spotty evidence suggests that Minnesota may be in a somewhat better position than Michigan to resist these changes—or, more precisely, to manage them effectively. Despite our losses in TTTF, we seem to rely less upon NTTF, at least for teaching. To be sure, this iceberg may be abnormally heavy with ballast, so that the tip that we can see is proportionally smaller than we take it to be.

To know that, however, we have to reform our appointment practices so that we can tell at a glance—or at a computer's run through the data bases—where we stand. And while we are doing that we should put into place mechanisms for guiding decisions throughout the university about how we grow and reconfigure ourselves, whether as units or as a whole.

Respectfully submitted,

Kent Bales (SCFA), Chair; Karen Alaniz (ASAC); Carole Bland (FCC); Lucy Carlone (Italian); Eville Gorham (SCFA); Gordon Hirsch (SCEP); April Knutson (French); Katherine Kolb (French); Michael Korth (FCC; UMM); Roberta Humphreys (FCC); Kathleen Newell (SCEP); Cleon Melsa (SCFA; UMC); Richard Purple (SCFA); Palmer Rogers (SCEP); Kyla Wahlstrom (ASAC)

Appendix: Evidence for Recommendations

The joint committee considered many kinds of evidence. We sought and created for ourselves data concerning the University of Minnesota. We were granted a preliminary report by conference call of a study by Roger Baldwin and Jay Chronister into the use of NTTF at a number of American colleges and universities. We read with care two reports written during the 1997-98 academic year, *one The Report of the Study Group on the Changing Nature of the Professoriate* at the University of Michigan, the other the *Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty*, September 26-28, 1997, participants in which were convened by eight disciplinary associations, the AAUP, and the Community College Humanities Association.

Reliable data about who does what academic work at Minnesota has been hard to obtain, and what we have is as significant for what it cannot tell us as for what it can. Early on, we learned that our employment categories can be a barrier to getting at the reality of a situation, a discovery confirmed by Baldwin and Chronister's observation that Minnesota has one of the most complicated systems of employment categories that they encountered. Consider, for example, the annual recommendation to the Board of Regents of candidates for promotion and tenure. While in one place it purports to represent "the faculty" in a summary table, by this is meant appointments at 67% time or above. Omitted wholly in this accounting, then, is all teaching done by employees appointed outside the Tenure Code and many teaching part-time. It thus reports the clinical faculty of the Medical School and miscellaneous term appointments but excludes the Teaching Specialists, the Education Specialists, and the Lecturers who teach in such greater numbers these days in the College of Liberal Arts. CLA ran the present data for us, giving us a good sense of how much that college has come to rely upon these temporary and part-time Academic Professional teachers (and convincing us of CLA's concern that it treat these personnel better). CLA's is the richest data that we have, but it hardly represents the university as a whole. The most comprehensive data came from the Office of Planning and Analysis, which integrated the course registration system and the academic personnel database to create a report on "Sections Taught by Employee Type for the Academic year 1996-97." In somewhat simplified form, the results were these: TTTF taught 62.3% of courses and sections, NTTF taught 21.1%, and graduate students taught 15.1 %. (1.5% was "missing.")

Three things are wrong with this data, however. 1) Such a report cannot be constructed historically—we can't take a similar "snapshot" of 1987-88—so we can construct no trend-line using these databases. 2) It reports courses taught, so probably under-represents the proportion of regular faculty teaching, since TTTF are likely to have lighter loads than the T Specs, Ed

Specs, and Lecturers who probably represent a good one-third of the NTTF's 21.1%. 3) The inclusion of graduate students complicates comparisons with Michigan's report, which excludes them. For purposes of comparison with that report, which counts the heads of TTTF and non-regular faculty on the Ann Arbor campus, we can represent Minnesota's TTTF as teaching 74% of the courses other than those taught by graduate students and the NTTF faculty as teaching 26%. Fudging the TTTF up a bit and the NTTF down a bit may get closer to reality.

In 1996, 66% of the faculty at Ann Arbor were TTTF; in 1987, 77% had been. During that decade the total faculty had increased from 3,446 to 4,402, the largest increases coming in the categories "Clinical" and "Lecturer," the later roughly equivalent to our P & A teachers. Since the number of Michigan's TTTF remained exactly the same during this time, they lost ground proportionally, while NTTF increased their numbers by 50%.

While it is unclear exactly what has happened at Minnesota during these years, 3,208 regular faculty (TTTF) and 392 non-regular faculty (NTTF, but not all of them) were reported to the regents in 1987-88, and 2,828 regular faculty and 473 non-regular were reported in 1997-1998. In ten years, that is, the university had lost 380 regular faculty (12%) and gained 81 non-regular (20%). Since the latter count excludes P & As, the increase in NTTF at Minnesota must be considerably larger than this reported 20%. (This we know from the OPA report, which shows 9.7% of sections taught by P & As, and anecdotally.) We can extrapolate what that increase might be from an analysis of the growth in NTTF within the Academic Health Center, since its non-regular faculty are reported regularly to the regents. In 1987-88, Medicine had 32 recommended for promotion and Public Health 6, and of those numbers 27 were tenured or to be tenured and 11 were non-regular. In 1997-98, however, Medicine recommended 44 for promotion and Public Health 6, and, of these 50, only 18 are tenured or to be tenured, while 32 hold non-regular appointments. In a decade, that is, the proportion of regular faculty has decreased from 71% of the AHC's candidates for promotion to 36% of them. In raw numbers, regular faculty recommended for promotion have decreased from 27 to 18, while non-regular appointments have increased from 11 to 32, or 290%, an increase that dwarfs Michigan's total of 50% but is in line with increases reported there by Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy. In short, the 20% gain in non-regular faculty reported to the Regents is attributable probably in whole to the Academic Health Center.

Compared to Michigan, then, our situation is this. Michigan's TTTF has remained the same in numbers but represents a substantially smaller proportion of total faculty. Minnesota's TTTF has been more than decimated in numbers (with a 12% loss in a decade) and is smaller by a proportion that we do not know, since we cannot count the NTTF under the current accounting system. Both Michigan and Minnesota have increased substantially the numbers of NTTF, but they know at Michigan how large that increase has been, while here at Minnesota we do not. That is because we maintain the fiction that "faculty" are only those described within the Tenure Code—all others to us are simply academic personnel.

The *Statement on Part-Time Faculty* provides a larger description of the changes that beset Michigan and Minnesota. Between 1970 and 1993, the proportion of part-time and adjunct faculty increased from 22% to more than 40% overall. The current mean for four-year institutions is about 29%, a proportion that the Statement implies is lower at institutions with

post-baccalaureate programs because of the large number of graduate assistants employed by them. Since neither our study nor Michigan's breaks out these groups,^{iv} we don't know how we stand on this change, but again we know that our not knowing is a consequence of the way we categorize those who do faculty-like work for us.

ⁱ Ernst Benjamin's AAUP data, as reported in the *Newsletter* of the Organization of American Historians, 26:3, August 1998. The proportional changes give a clearer picture of the changes: tenured faculty fell by 14%, from 29% of the whole to 25%; probationary faculty fell by 37%, from 16% to 10%; and graduate assistants fell by 5%, from 20% to 19%. NTTF, however, increased by 40%, from 10% to 15% of the whole, while part-time faculty increased by 33%, from 24% to 33%. TTF and the graduate students they teach and mentor are the losers; some of those graduate students, by joining the ranks of the temporary and part-time, became winners of a sort. The story is well known.

ⁱⁱ Source: Annual Promotion and Tenure Recommendations to the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents. See Section 6, above, for refinement of these data.

ⁱⁱⁱ Board of Regents Policy on Academic Staff Professional and Administrative, subd. 2.

^{iv} Michigan has current data but none for 1987, so omitted these categories. (*Report*, note 2.)

COMMENT:

The Academic Appointments Subcommittee, jointly appointed by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and Senate Committee on Educational Policy, prepared the following draft report and has discussed it with the two parent committees as well as the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs. A number of questions and issues were raised in those committee discussions, and as a result, the Subcommittee wishes to report on the concerns and to seek comment from the members of the Faculty Senate. The discussion should focus on the four resolutions contained in the draft report.

KENT BALES, CHAIR
ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Kent Bales, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), explained that this item was being presented for information in order to elicit the response of the Senate. The handout distributed to the senators was intended as a guide to the report. The current version of the report had several advantages over the previously distributed report; for instance, the evidence was moved to an appendix. One disadvantage was that the committee members' names were buried within the report, appearing just before the appendix. He then opened the floor to questions.

Q: How would this policy affect industry practitioners, often adjunct faculty, or visiting faculty who may be hired to teach a specific course during the quarter?

A: Visiting faculty are hired under the provisions in the Tenure Code for making such term hires. Adjunct faculty are often hired as P & A. The number of visiting faculty over the past decade has declined, possibly due to a decrease in free money to hire such people. The committee agreed that qualified practitioners who bring a unique perspective to the students should be able to continue teaching in those units that have a clear need for their service. However, they should be counted so that everyone knows their number. Provisions have been made for exceptions to the 25% limit to accommodate those professional schools that rely heavily on practitioners. The committee felt that, since there are so few of these schools, exceptions would only need to be granted in a small number of cases.

Q: Would the 15-25% limit be based on a head count, regardless of the number of courses taught by each adjunct faculty member?

A: The head count would be used for part-time hires. The committee was divided on this question but agreed to the view presented in the report.

Q: In reference to Resolution 2, is it true that any program with more than 25% NTTF would have to be granted an exception?

A: Yes. The rationale for this proposal is not to micromanage departments, but to ensure that departments who rely on NTTF have legitimate needs and a clear educational policy regarding the roles of NTTF within the department.

Q: If the percentage of NTTF is calculated by FTE, would departments be punished for hiring health care professionals with expertise that the TTTF faculty cannot offer graduate students?

A: It is important that graduate students be taught by active members of the graduate faculty.

Q: Three years ago a small department lost four faculty members late in the year. They could not be replaced before classes began in fall. By hiring professionals, the department would have been in violation of Resolution 2. Instead, this department would need to go to the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) for permission to hire. What amount of leniency is permitted for faculty mobility?

A: The committee will consider language to solve this type of problem. As it currently stands, the dean would approach the Provost, who would grant permission in an emergency situation. SCEP and SCFA also meet every two weeks, so a turn-around from these committees would be quick. This point comes from the AAUP, as they want the University to find an appropriate mix.

Professor Sara Evans, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), asked the senators whether they were worried about restricting flexibility or the erosion of the proportion of TTTF. There is a national trend with a declining proportion of TTTF who are doing the teaching and research; this is perceived as a potential threat to the tenure system and the tradition of academic

freedom. There are legitimate reasons to hire people not in traditional faculty lines, but then their work needs to be defined differently. The faculty must address this issue and advise the administration on what is appropriate. If the faculty duck this issue, then they must live with the consequences.

Q: Was the committee's recommendation tied to IMG and the budget? What about the percentages within IMG?

A: IMG was discussed. One reason that the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) and SCFA agreed so quickly last year to the creation of this joint subcommittee was that it was the suspicion that IMG budgeting might accelerate the trend towards the hiring of more NTTF. Percentages were not discussed yet, but they will be.

A senator thanked the subcommittee for raising issues that have been of concern to TTTF in smaller units throughout the University. One issue that has not been raised is that many times quarter-to-quarter hires are made which creates a revolving door within the unit. Second, women have been abused by this system in that they perform all the activities of TTTF on annual basis without any protection or benefits. Finally, the burden of carrying out faculty governance and curriculum development is falling on fewer TTTF.

Another senator commented that this policy should take precedence over IMG concerns since the policy's intent is to restrict or eliminate abuses that people might be tempted to commit under IMG. Also, the administration needs to work with the deans to discourage the excessive use of NTTF personnel.

A senator then commented that the Libraries are no longer able to hire into faculty positions. Since only academic professionals can be hired, this unit surpasses the 25% guideline. Therefore, language should be included to exclude the Libraries.

Q: A distinction can be seen between professionals hired to teach distinct courses or people on a NTT doing the work of faculty on a full-time basis. Perhaps, instead of using a percentage, could another class could be developed similar to the visiting professor class for professionals who would only be teaching one class?

A: The subcommittee has already talked about this issue. An alternative policy, without a check mechanism but simply setting ideal limits, might work.

A senator spoke in favor of the motion by saying that a check is needed. In the Carlson School of Management, part-time faculty are used so frequently that the department chair spends all their time hiring. The school has also had problems with accreditation standards because of part-time faculty. The current incentive structure favors adjunct professors, who are constantly being hired without any system in place to determine standards for these people. This leads to a poor academic community as well as poor instruction.

Professor Bales said that the committee wants input on what would identify a person as being a faculty member. Would this person do the essential job of teaching or do a mix of teaching and

research? What about the people who mostly do research while advising a few Graduate Students who they work with? He asked senators to send any answers or suggestions to the subcommittee.

V. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Sara Evans, chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), reported that the FCC will be holding several discussions on the Intellectual Future of the University. It has become very clear that discussions of this type need to start in many places and in many different forms to get people talking across disciplines and colleges. FCC has no answers, but hopes that by bringing this issue to the University community, advice can be given to the administration.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

VII. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor