

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, October 20, 2011
3:00 – 4:30
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Walt Jacobs (chair pro tem), Angela Bartholomew, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Don Cavalier, Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Russell Luepker, Adam Matula, Jan McCulloch, James Pacala, Steven Pearthree, Adair Rounthwaite

Absent: Thomas Brothen, Chris Cramer, Ann Hagen, Amy Olson, Kathryn VandenBosch, Elaine Tyler May, Harrison Defries, Jaycob Robinson

Guests: Michele Gross (Director, University Policy Program)

Others: Jon Steadland (President's Office)

[In these minutes: (1) report on the Senate Committee on Student Affairs; (2) policy-review process and administrative policies to be reviewed 2011-12; (3) change to the procedure, Senate Committee Involvement in Hiring Senior Administrators]

1. Report on the Senate Committee on Student Affairs

Professor Jacobs convened the meeting at 3:00, explained that Professor Cramer was out of town, and asked Mr. Matula to comment on the report on the Senate Committee on Student Affairs. He noted that this Committee had charged an ad hoc committee to review the activities of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs and to make recommendations for changes. Mr. Matula's predecessor, Aaron Carlson, was on the ad hoc committee, but Mr. Matula reported that he was familiar with the ad hoc committee's report because he had been briefed on it by multiple members of the committee. [The report can be found at http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/scsa/1108scsa_report.pdf]

The major change is in the number of students, increasing it from 9 to 12, Mr. Matula reported; the students are selected by the Committee on Committees. The important thing is to select students who want to be on the committee and attend meetings, Professor Chomsky commented. She said the report seemed very thorough.

The Committee approved the report unanimously.

2. Policy Review Process and Policies to be Reviewed 2011-12

Professor Jacobs welcomed Ms. Gross to the meeting to discuss the process for reviewing administrative policies and a preview of the administrative policies that are up for review during this academic year.

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

Ms. Gross explained the comprehensive policy-review process, noting that policies are to be reviewed every three years and that a second round of reviews is now beginning. She began by noting the questions that are posed to policy owners, those administrative officers responsible for oversight and implementation of a policy.

Core questions to consider during a comprehensive review

- Is the policy still needed? Does it still meet the criteria in the policy on policy? Is it consistent with governing policies/laws?
- Is the purpose and goal of the policy still being met?
- Are changes needed to improve effectiveness?
- Are the thresholds, approval levels, requirements appropriate for the risk managed? What would be the impact of changing these? What's the "cost" to continue with the requirements that are in place today?
- What have been the weak points in the policy?
- What is the level of compliance?
- Are there common concerns captured through the feedback boxes, or other sources available to the policy/process owners?

If the policy is still needed and changes are proposed

- What is the impact of the changes?
- How will these changes be communicated?
- How will the effectiveness or compliance with the policy be measured?

The point, Ms. Gross said, is that policy owners are supposed to realize they are to examine their policies while conducting the comprehensive review.

Is there a set schedule of reviews, Professor Jacobs asked? It is a three-year review cycle, Ms. Gross said, and they do remind policy owners about the reviews and that they complete it in a reasonable amount of time. They can do a review earlier than the three-year cycle would require, Ms. Gross affirmed, and in some cases reviews are very brief. Others, such as the heavily-used travel policy, are extensive; the travel policy took over a year.

The key steps in a policy review are these, Ms. Gross explained next. [The PAC is the Policy Advisory Committee, a group of senior staff from vice-presidential offices; the PPC is the President's Policy Committee, the group of vice presidents and senior officers delegated authority by the President for final approval of administrative policies.]

- Policy owner review policy (consistent with practice, review core questions from previous slide, etc.)
- If changes are identified, consults with key audience(s) such as faculty governance
- Revise policy draft as needed
- Prepare Comprehensive Review Form and submit to Director, University Policy Program
- Present to PAC
- Make revisions as needed
- Present to PPC for approval

- Make revisions as directed by PPC
- Post for 30-day open comment period
- Consider comments and revise as needed
- Publish revised policy in Policy Library

If a policy does not reflect current practice, it is up to the policy owner to keep it current, Ms. Gross reported. They can bring a policy for changes on their own initiative. The PPC considers and acts on the policies, but does not get into the details (process). These support documents are available to them, however.

Professor Chomsky said that the Committee has sometimes found that administrators have not consulted on policy changes—and mostly because new people do not know the process. How does she make sure that policy owners know to consult? Mr. Pearthree noted that it is not just faculty members who wish to be involved in consulting.

How do they know? Because they have a consultation matrix on their website, Ms. Gross said, and she reminds policy owners that it is there. She wants to be sure that the right policies go to the right audiences. In some cases there is a need to move quickly (e.g., the policy covering students who might have had the flu during the period when there was concern about a pandemic) and the standard consultation may not be able to occur. The policy owners bring a revised draft, or discuss changes and then develop a draft. The policy owners come to PAC with the revised drafts. PAC's primary goal is to focus on clarity, consistency, and content in policies. After that a policy goes to PPC for review from the institutional perspective. Is the matter worthy a policy? Is this a risk that needs managing? PPC considers new policies, major changes to existing policies, and policies that are to be discontinued.

After the PPC decision comes a 30-day review, which is announced in the Brief electronic newsletter. (Anyone can comment any time on a policy, Ms. Gross explained, but it is during the 30-day review that one can affect current proposed changes.) For example, they received many comments on the conflict-of-interest policy, some of them not positive, and those comments had a significant effect on the final policy.

Once the 30-day review has passed, and PPC approval obtained, the revised policy is published in the policy library [which can be found at <http://policy.umn.edu/>].

Professor Chomsky pointed out that there may be consultation and approval required by governance groups. It is not a case of simply revising and then publishing a new or changed policy. That is all to happen before a policy goes to the PPC, Ms. Gross said. Sometimes meetings may not align perfectly, so on occasion PPC will do a provisional approval, pending approval by the University or Faculty Senate.

Ms. Gross provided a list of policies coming up for review.

Research

Procuring, Using, and Disposing of donated Human Bodies Used for Research
Conducting Research with Human Embryos or Embryonic Stem Cells

Activities Involving Potential Hazardous Biological Agents
Fixed Price Contracts, Including Clinical Trials

Human Resources

Academic Misconduct

Bereavement Leave for Faculty and Academic Professional and Administrative Employees
Employee Absences for Religious Holidays
Managing Nepotism and Personal Relationships
Paid Medical Leave and Disability Benefits for Faculty and Academic Professional and Administrative Employees
Pre-Hire Background Verification
Sexual Assault, Stalking and relationship Violence
University state of Emergency: Human Resources Implications of Pandemic Influenza
Unpaid Personal Leaves for Faculty and Academic Professional and Administrative Employees

Operational and Administrative

Acquiring a U Card

Distributing Publications and Installing Banners at the University
Environmental Management
Getting Access to University Buildings
Security ID Badges
Using and Leasing University Outdoor Space: Twin Cities
Copyright Ownership
Establishing Administrative Policies

Financial

Accepting Revenue via Payment Cards
Establishment and Use of Agency Funds

Education and Student Life

Resolving Alleged Student Conduct Code Violations
Withholding Diplomas and Official Transcripts from Students

Information Technology

Accessibility of Information Technology

Professor Jacobs asked if she expected any controversies. Not that she knew of, Ms. Gross said. Professor Jacobs asked about the proposed policy for the U Card. Ms. Gross said that that policy change did not progress on the standard review and approval path. The policy change concerns went directly to the policy owner rather than through a 30-day review process, and the final outcome was to not implement the change. Another policy being reviewed is the one governing outside consulting, but there are no significant changes proposed.

Professor Chomsky asked if Ms. Gross had heard anything about developing a definition of plagiarism. She had not, Ms. Gross reported. In some cases she is involved in the outset of policy development while in other cases proposed changes are brought to her later.

Ms. Gross commented that some policies have not gone through the first round of comprehensive review, but they will in the near future.

Professor Jacobs thanked Ms. Gross for her report.

3. Change to the Procedure on Senate Committee Involvement in Hiring Senior Administrators

Professor Jacobs next reported on the recommendation from the Faculty Consultative Committee that the procedure for hiring senior administrators be changed to identify the Senate Consultative Committee as the body to be consulted for every senior position, rather than, separately, the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Student Senate Consultative Committee, the P&A Consultative Committee, and the Civil Service Consultative Committee. This Committee (SCC) has representatives from all groups.

And as part of the procedure, Professor Chomsky added, the chair of SCC, if asked for names for a search committee, or invited to candidate interviews, will pass on the invitations to all the consultative committees. Everyone would know about the searches; it is this Committee's responsibility to forward the invitations rather than asking the central administration to do so.

The Committee approved the change unanimously.

Professor Jacobs adjourned the meeting at 3:40.

-- Gary Engstrand