

2007-08 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APRIL 3, 2008

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

The fourth meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 3, 2008, at 2:33 p.m., as a joint meeting of the bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 24 academic professional members, 19 civil service members, 108 faculty/faculty-like academic professional members, and 9 student members. President Bruininks presided.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS Information

University Senate

Amendments to the Protocol for Senate Committee Involvement in Central Administrator Searches

Approved by the: University Senate March 6, 2008
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Faculty Senate

2012-13 Morris and Twin Cities Calendars
Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 6, 2008
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

2. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE Amendments to the Faculty Senate Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure Information for the Faculty Senate

Rules 16.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* provides that: *The senior vice president for academic affairs and provost and the Tenure Committee may ... jointly approve the procedures proposed by the Judicial Committee under Section 13.2. Such procedures must be reported to the Faculty Senate and the Board of Regents before they go into effect.*

To prepare to present the Senate Judicial Committee Rules of Procedures to the Board of Regents, the rules of procedure were revised in their entirety by the Senate Judicial Committee, and then reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel.

The Senate Judicial Committee Rules of Procedures govern how the Senate Judicial Committee hears individual cases. The Senate Judicial Committee reviewed its Rules of Procedures in concert with the changes in the tenure code. There is a long history to the Rules of Procedures and they had accumulated a lot of revisions and additions; the Senate Judicial Committee this time did a systematic revision by stripping down the language, eliminating comments, expanding the definitions, and cutting the number of words by half.

There are only a few significant changes:

- The time periods for or between each step in the process have been reduced to expedite cases.
- An error has been corrected regarding burden of proof (in old Rule 17 [i]) in cases of “reasonableness of a reassignment pursuant to Section 12 of the Tenure Code.” New Rule 15 (i) places the burden on the Complainant not the Respondent (University), consistent with final Senate action on June 5, 1997.
- A Complainant may elect to have one “advisor” (new Rule 5 [b]), not two (old Rule 6 [c]).
- An “attorney” is defined (in new Rule 2, clarifying old Rule 6 [b, c, and comment]) as “an individual who has a law degree.”

These revisions has been accepted by the Senate Judicial Committee and jointly approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. They are now presented to the Faculty Senate for information.

The revised Rules are available on the web at:
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/judicial/revisedsjcrules.pdf>

**TOM CLAYTON, CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

**TOM SCOTT, CHAIR
JUDICIAL COMMITTEE**

**3. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Statement on the Faculty Consultative Committee Copyright Subcommittee
Information for the Faculty Senate**

The Faculty Consultative Committee suggests to the Provost that the standing Copyright Subcommittee it approved on March 6, 2008, be incorporated into the administrative policy implementing the Regents' policy Copyright. FCC believes the subcommittee could serve as a mechanism to help resolve copyright disputes that may arise.

Charge to the Subcommittee

The Copyright Subcommittee works with the Provost's office:

- (1) to provide advice on the administrative procedures that accompany the Regents Policy Copyright adopted in December, 2007, and as it may subsequently be modified; and
- (2) to serve as a sounding board for faculty members and administrators who encounter difficulties or problems with copyright issues, and to advise the Provost and academic units as appropriate on how such problems should be dealt with. (It is assumed that in addition to individual faculty members, deans or department heads may also wish to consult with the Subcommittee.)

It is understood that the Provost has the final authority for interpreting and applying the Regents policy and the administrative procedures.

The Copyright Subcommittee shall consist of 6 tenured or tenure-track faculty members: 2 members appointed by the Faculty Consultative Committee and 1 member appointed by each of

the following committees: Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Senate Committee on Educational Policy, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and Senate Research Committee. The faculty appointments are for an indefinite term; when any of the individuals wishes to resign, the appropriate committee shall designate someone to replace him or her. The Provost or his or her designee shall also serve as an ex-officio member of the Subcommittee. The Provost is requested to provide staff support to the subcommittee.

The faculty members of the subcommittee shall elect a chair from among their members.

The Faculty Consultative Committee (and other Senate committees as they deem it appropriate) may ask for a report from the Copyright Subcommittee from time to time.

**GARY BALAS, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**4. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Statement on Cost Pool Consultation
Information for the Faculty Senate**

The Faculty Consultative Committee recommends to the President and senior vice presidents that a representative group of the Twin Cities deans (and coordinate campus chancellors, as appropriate) either (1) be involved directly and integrally in the current mechanisms used to determine rates for the cost pools, or (2) be constituted as a separate body to review recommendations on cost pool charges and provide advice to the President on them. In either case, the review and consultation should take place before any decisions have been made about cost-pool charges or rates.

Approved March 6, 2008, by the Faculty Consultative Committee.

**GARY BALAS, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

5. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Harold A. Cloud
Professor
Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering
1927 – 2008

Stephen Feinstein
Professor
History
1943 – 2008

Arnold Henjum
Professor
Education – Morris
1925 – 2008

Frederick M. Swain

Professor
Geology and Geophysics
1916 – 2008

STUDENTS

Benjamin J. Alden
Graduate School

Jason E. Bass
Institute of Technology

6. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Gary Balas, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, did not provide a report.

**7. MINUTES FOR MARCH 6, 2008
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate and Faculty Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/080306sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**8. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
Resolution on Fair Trade Coffee
Action by the University Senate**

Resolution on Fair Trade Coffee

Whereas, coffee is the second-largest legally traded commodity in the world market only behind oil; and

Whereas, coffee is generally produced in developing countries where workers and farmers suffer from exploitative conditions as well as a lack of access to market information; and

Whereas, farmers are forced to sell their coffee below market value at less than the cost of production and subsequently pushing them into severe hardship or leaving no option but to sell and leave their land; and

Whereas, with Fair Trade Certified coffee farmers obtain prices of 100-200% higher in comparison to non-Fair Trade; and

Whereas, workers on Fair Trade farms have safe working conditions, equity for women, freedom of association, and strict prohibitions on child labor; and

Whereas, the Fair Trade system works within cooperatives where long-term trading partnerships are established allowing farmers to get advance credit on coffee purchases to ensure that farmers can avoid insecurity surrounding the next harvest; and

Whereas, Fair Trade cooperatives are committed to community development and democratically decide on how to invest Fair Trade revenues in infrastructure such as healthcare and education; and

Whereas, Fair Trade coffee uses sustainable production practices, and is often Organic and Shade Grown improving the health of the environment and consumers alike; and therefore be it

RESOLVED that the University of Minnesota require in all food service contracts it signs into with food service providers that all coffee sold on its campuses (Twin Cities, Morris, Duluth and Crookston) must be 100% Fair Trade Certified including all coffee retail locations, catering operations, and residence halls; and be it further

RESOLVED that whenever possible, this coffee be Organic, Shade Grown, and purchased from a local roaster.

Approved by the Social Concerns Committee December 10, 2007

Approved by the Student Senate November 29, 2007

**KATHERINE FENNELLY, CHAIR
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Fennelly, Chair of the Social Concerns Committee, said that this resolution was brought to the committee by the Minnesota Public Interest Research Group (MPIRG) after polling over 2000 students and 100 faculty from the University system for support. The University's trend is towards selling for fair-trade certified coffee, but only 30 percent of the purchases are certified at this time.

Q: Does this resolution pertain to non-UDS vendors on campus?

A: Yes. Caribou Coffee will be 100 percent fair-trade certified in a few months and Starbucks will likely follow. This requirement would be included in all contracts upon renewal.

Q: Would the resolution affect coffee in vending machines?

A: Yes. Purchases for the residence halls are already fair-trade certified.

A motion was made to add Rochester to the list of campuses in the resolution. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

A senator said that purchasers should have free choice and not require 100 percent fair-trade coffee.

Another senator then stated that any coffee can be sold as fair-trade certified.

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

APPROVED

9. EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Resolution to Offset Imputed Income Tax Related to Same-Sex Domestic Partner Benefits
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

The University Senate requests that the administration provide a mechanism to remedy the income differences between similarly-situated heterosexual and gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees caused by state and federal tax codes as they affect the provision of medical and dental benefits for spouses/partners.

COMMENT:

Heterosexual married University employees receive medical and dental benefits from the University on a tax-favored basis when they cover spouses. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees with registered same-sex domestic partners do not generally qualify for this tax-favored status when they cover their partners. As a result, gay, lesbian, or bisexual employees pay additional taxes based on the value of the University's contribution to the cost of medical and dental coverage for their partners.

In order to ensure that and gay/lesbian/bisexual employees are treated equitably, the effect of this taxation should be taken into account, and their gross pay increased so that their net (after tax) income will be the same as similarly-situated heterosexual employees.

The Senate understands that the University is not responsible for the disparity created by the tax code, but believes that the institution should take appropriate steps to remedy the unequal treatment. The Senate thus asks the administration and the Regents to provide the financial equity currently denied by the tax codes and, in so doing, become a national model for non-discrimination.

Approved March 24, 2008 by the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee

FOR INFORMATION:

The Senate Committee on Equity, Access and Diversity (EAD) adopted a resolution concerning the effects of the tax code on gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees with a registered domestic partner (the text below). That resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), which crafted a different resolution (the one above, on the docket for action). EAD decided to endorse the SCFA resolution; the original EAD resolution is presented to the University Senate for information and background.

Resolution to Offset Imputed Income Tax Related to Same-Sex Domestic Partner Benefits

Our University's academic strength comes from breadth and depth of scholarship and diversity of schools of thought, modes of inquiry, academic disciplines, and social communities. We strive to

support our community of diverse personnel, sometimes at great institutional cost. We support a university day care center, though many of us do not have children, as the day-care center facilitates the full participation of working parents. We support mechanisms for our international faculty and staff to receive the documentation needed to work equitably alongside members of our community who are U.S. Citizens. By investing in these and other activities, we ensure that our university's status as a model public research institution will continue to grow.

One way in which our University has demonstrated its commitment to building a community is by providing medical and dental benefits to the committed, same-sex domestic partners of faculty and staff members, just as benefits are provided to husbands and wives of legally married faculty and staff. However, the mechanism by which this is accomplished has resulted in a substantially unequal taxation between heterosexual married employees and employees whose same-sex partners hold university benefits. Specifically, the university's contribution to the cost of the partner's benefits is treated as taxable income. This inequality occurs because federal and state laws deny committed same-sex partners the right to marry. The university's contribution to married spouses' benefits is not taxable; hence, heterosexual married employees do not accrue a tax burden. Because of this asymmetry, an employee whose same-sex partner receives benefits may get a substantially lower net salary than a married heterosexual employee whose base salary is identical. Moreover, the additional taxable income that the university provides may move an employee into a higher tax bracket, given the current state and federal progressive taxation practices. This affects faculty and staff at all income levels, and is particularly burdensome on those whose incomes are at the lower end of the distribution. The burden is so big that some staff and faculty may opt not to provide benefits for their partners, as the additional taxes would take away from income that they need to pay for more immediate necessities for themselves and their families.

The asymmetry between the tax burden on married heterosexual and committed same-sex domestic partners greatly undermines the university's mission of being a true equitable community. Indeed, we are compelled by our University's own non-discrimination policy, as this unequal taxation runs sharply contrary to the policy that we have adopted. A mechanism is needed to remediate this inequity. Four principles drive the specific mechanism that we recommend the university adopt. It should maintain the confidentiality of faculty and staff who receive these benefits; it should require the least special effort on the parts of the faculty and staff who receive this benefit; it should be able to be implemented by the University quickly; and it should be publicized by the University to anyone who works here or who might take a job here. The mechanism that we recommend is that additional money be added to individuals' gross income, using a formula that would assure that the net income that the individual receives is identical to what she or he would receive if the same-sex domestic partner benefits were not taxable. This policy of 'grossing up' is used widely in the private sector in cases where, for example, a company wishes to provide a performance bonus of a pre-specified amount to an employee. This would not change the individual's base salary, and would be added on solely to offset the tax burden.

In addition to remediating the existing inequity, this proposal is an opportunity for the University of Minnesota to set a national trend in providing full access to employees in committed same-sex relationships. Currently, no other universities provide this type of mechanism. The innovative nature of this proposal will set our university apart from its peers, and will contribute to our common mission of advancing our status as a leading public research university. Moreover, it is our hope that this mechanism will provide additional momentum for proposed state and national legislation to eliminate this problem altogether by mandating that domestic partner benefits not be taxed. The University of Minnesota's leadership role in addressing this situation may thus help to eliminate the problem altogether, and to create a more just and equitable society outside of our University.

Approved by the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee March 2008

**MARGARET MOSS, CHAIR
EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE**

**GEOFFREY SIRC, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Benjamin Munson, member of the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee (EAD), said that there are 100-145 employees who take same-sex domestic partner benefits, which are then treated as additional taxable income at the state and federal levels. This amounts to a difference of about \$1070 per year. As this process is contrary to the University's non-discrimination policy, EAD has been working on the proposal presented today to "gross up" a person's pay so the net amount is equivalent to that received by everyone else. And while salaries are public, this payment would need to be done in such a way as to not reveal who is a registered same-sex domestic partner, since this information is confidential.

Dann Chapman said that these types of payments have been done by the University. A specific dollar amount is calculated that an employee should receive. Since there is a tax consequence to receiving this amount, the actual amount is "grossed up" so that the take-home is equivalent to the amount originally intended.

Q: How would this affect faculty in a union?

A: An agreement would be needed with the union to make this payment.

Q: Would the extra funding come from central or the unit?

A: It has not been determined from where funds would be allocated. The administration would make this determination. However, if funding were allocated from the unit, then there would be a disincentive to hire someone with same-sex domestic partner benefits.

Q: Since retirement is based on salary, would this proposal provide an advantage to some people?

A: The grossed up amount is not part of an employee's base salary, so it would not contribute to retirement.

Q: What is the total cost to the University?

A: Philosophically, cost was not an issue when the University made the decision to offer same-sex domestic partner benefits, so if the University wants to offer equal benefits, then this should be implemented. If this amount will compromise the amount that the University can spend on benefits, then everyone should stand together and bear a portion of this burden. Mathematically, Employee Benefits still needs to determine the tax rate for each employee, but an estimate at this time is \$300,000 per year. The tax rate estimate, used in the private sector, is based on a person's base salary.

A senator said that this proposal would increase personnel costs for determining benefits.

Another senator stated that fundamental fairness is the basic issue of this motion, not implementation.

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

APPROVED

10. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks talked about academic freedom and its fundamental value to the University. This body has spoken over the decades in support of academic freedom. He has been asked questions about controversies in the papers, the most recent of which involved research on biofuels production and its impact on the use of land.

Last year, the Theatre Department voted to perform a Dario Fo play, "The Pope and the Witch," which triggered a flood of letters to campus. The year before, 27 House members signed onto a bill to essentially take away every dollar of state support to the University if it chose to conduct stem-cell research.

He wants to assure the University community that the Regents do not waiver in supporting the rights of University faculty. Each of these incidents has been a teachable moment to talk about why academic freedom matters and its fundamental role. The University needs to be thoughtful about its responses and see them as a chance to educate the public.

The soybean growers support University research related to crop health, and during this recent controversy they were threatening to withdraw this support. A final decision will be made next week. President Bruininks said that he, along with several deans, spent several hours meeting with commodity groups to hear their concerns and explain that the University is working on sustainable ways to create biofuels from a wider range of alternatives.

President Bruininks then turned to the central corridor light rail line being proposed. He reminded senators that the Regents passed a resolution in 2001 to run the line through a tunnel under Washington Avenue. However, due to the high cost a tunnel is not a feasible option, yet the line needs to come through or by campus since it is estimated that 35 percent of the riders will be from the University.

A decision was then made to explore an at-grade option on Washington Avenue. He asked senators to visualize the campus road structure. 80 percent of people using these roads are coming to the University, and Washington Avenue handles almost 50 percent of the traffic coming to campus.

In 2001 and again this fall the University asked that a northern alignment be considered. This is the University's preferred route, even though there is not an approved ridership plan for it. The Metropolitan Council felt that this route would reduce ridership. However, when U-Pass and Metropass card holders were checked, 98 percent work North of Washington Avenue, and therefore would be close to the northern alignment route.

The University has hired, at its expense, an engineering firm to study these issues. They will produce a feasibility study and a cost estimate by the end of April and the ridership will be available by early May. This study will then be sent to the Metropolitan Council.

President Bruininks said that he is deeply worried that the Washington Avenue route will compromise the ability of the University to get its work done and move people in and out of

campus. For example, 500,000 go to the University hospital and clinics, and they do not take the bus. There are also 10 pedestrian crossings during a given day on Washington Avenue that are more substantial than any crossing in downtown Minneapolis. The trains will also pass within 50 feet of the Institute of Technology Characterization Lab. The scientists from this lab are saying that their instruments are so sensitive that the vibrations from the train will render them useless. The lab would have to be moved, but it would cost \$6-10 million and would have to be paid for as part of the construction costs.

If someone lives in the neighborhood, he would like them to be engaged in the public discussions. He has also asked the Faculty Consultative Committee to weigh in on this issue. Information is available on the University's website, with talking points and technical information from faculty. The consequences of this decision are long-term and will have a profound, and perhaps adverse, impact.

11. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: Is the counter-argument to the northern alignment that it will delay the line for one year?

A: Yes, as well as potentially making the route less competitive due to increased proposals or less funding in future years. However, this is a 100-year investment, so all alternatives should be carefully considered. If it is not done right, the Academic Health Center could lose 10 percent of its total operating budget in a given year, which amounts to \$130 million.

Q: Is the Senate being encouraged to oppose the current alignment?

A: There is no organization in the state that believes more in the value of public transit than the University, due to high usage by University community members. The University believes that a central corridor line is needed, but is disputing the route through campus. If it is run down Washington Avenue, the University has discussed a pedestrian mall and a transit mall. The transit mall is narrower and would provide lanes for buses and emergency vehicles. Traffic currently on Washington Avenue would then need to be moved to other roads, and mitigation would be needed. These might cost \$80-100 million, but the light rail budget only includes \$39 million for all mitigation. He is worried about the compressed schedule and the lack of modeling of the long-term consequences to the University.

Q: While civil service and academic professionals are encouraged to participate in the Senate and its committees, there is an impediment in terms of release time to serve and service not being counted towards a person's annual review. How can this issue be addressed?

A: He will meet again with the leadership groups to determine what can be done and ways to better support governance.

12. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

13. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

14. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate was adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

15. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Gary Balas, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that the committee has met with the Twin Cities' Deans Council to discuss common issues, including communication, Wave-One colleges, core versus interdisciplinary programs, cost pool charges, impact of the budget model, spousal hires, and metrics and measures.

The Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) also presented the new student rating of teaching forms. He expressed appreciation to the Student Senate for working with SCEP on a joint agreement for this form, and personally thanked Ron Miller, Chair of the Student Senate.

FCC unanimously voted to approve a statement on the budget model and endorse the faculty health care savings plan, both of which are on today's agenda for action.

16. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISON UPDATE

Professor Martin Sampson, Faculty Legislative Liaison, stated that the legislative bonding bill has already been completed, and is widely supported by both sides. He thanked all faculty who have contacted their legislators, as well as several people in the Legislature – Senator Pappas, Representative Rukavina, Senator Langseth, and Representative Hausman. Student leaders have also testified in support.

The administration has also done a superb job making its case and persuading the Legislature of the relationship between the health of the University and that of the state. The ambience is much different from four years ago.

This year's bonding bill establishes the biomedical science authority for four additional buildings at the University. There was debate on the percentage to be paid by the state, with the compromise being 75 percent. The University will issue the bonds and be reimbursed by the state for a total of \$219 million.

A separate issue is that the state expects a \$1 billion shortfall which will lead to budget cutbacks. The question is what the University's share will be. The Governor proposed \$27.2 million, the Senate \$25.5 million, and the House \$6.2 million. This figure has yet to be determined.

The Governor has said that the bonding bill total cannot exceed \$825 million, but the bill passed yesterday was \$925 million. The Governor can either veto the entire bill or use line-item vetoes.

This will generate discussion about the bonding capacity for the state. There are five criteria, of which one, three percent of total revenue, is mentioned the most but is never close to being approached. There is also a question about whether the University's bonds count towards this amount, since bonds issued for the stadium did not count but the conference committee chair has noted that they do count.

If the Governor does veto the bonding bill, then faculty will need to contact their legislators.

In closing, the Faculty Senate gave a round of applause to the two Faculty Legislative Liaisons.

**17. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION
Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members**

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Delegation confirm the reappointment of two faculty for an additional three year term on the Committee on Committees. A simple majority is required for approval.

GARY ANDERSON: Associate Professor of Dentistry, School of Dentistry. University Senate member: 1989-92. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2007-08.

JEANNE HIGBEE: Professor of Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, College of Education and Human Development. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 2007-08; Student Behavior, 2006-09.

INFORMATION:

The Nominating Committee Bylaws specify that the it may present the name of an individual, eligible for re-election, to the Delegation for confirmation of reappointment without another candidate on the ballot to fill the position.

**CATHY FRENCH CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**18. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION
Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members**

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation approve the following slate of nominees to fill five 2008-11 Twin Cities faculty vacancies on the Committee on Committees. A simple majority is required for approval. Once the slate is approved, a ballot will be distributed for voting.

FIRST PAIR

GRAHAM CANDLER: Professor of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

ROBERTA HUMPHREYS: Professor of Astronomy, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: 1983-86, 1990-93, 1996-98, 2002-03, 2007-10. Senate/Assembly Committee

participation (past and present): Arts, Sciences, and Engineering Provostal Consultative, 1996-97; Consultative, 1994-95, 1998-99; Educational Policy, 1981-84; Faculty Affairs, 1988-91, 2001-02; Nominating, 2001-02.

SECOND PAIR

DIANE KATSIAFICAS: Professor of Art, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Council on Liberal Education, 1995-98; Judicial, 2000-06.

JOANNA O'CONNELL: Associate Professor of Spanish and Portuguese, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 2005-06. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Equity, Access, and Diversity, 2004-08.

THIRD PAIR

DAVID FAN: Professor of Genetics, Cell Biology and Development, College of Biological Sciences. University Senate member: 2004-07. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

CAROL LANGE: Associate Professor of Medicine, Medical School. University Senate member: 2006-09. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

FOURTH PAIR

CARL ADAMS: Professor of Information and Decision Sciences, Carlson School of Management. University Senate member: 1984-87, 2005-06. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): All-University Honors, 2007-10; Committee on Committees, 1991-92, 2000-06; Consultative, 1994-97 (Chair, 1995-96); Faculty Affairs, 1990-94 (Chair, 1992-94); Finance, 1986-87; Planning, 1986-87.

JENNIFER KUZMA: Associate Professor of Public Affairs, HHH institute of Public Affairs. University Senate member: None. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

FIFTH PAIR

JAY COGGINS: Associate Professor of Applied Economics, College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences. University Senate member: 1999-2000, 2001-02, 2007-10. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

DAVID RAGSDALE: Professor of Entomology, College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences. University Senate member: 1999-2001, 1998-2001. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): None.

FOR INFORMATION:

The Faculty Senate Bylaws specify that the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation shall elect by written ballot faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Committee on Committees from a slate of candidates provided by the Nominating Committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the slate must be in the hands of the Clerk on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted. The elected Twin Cities faculty members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2008-09 are:

Robert Gehrz, Institute of Technology
Michael Hancher, College of Liberal Arts
Joan Howland, Law School

Mary Jo Kreitzer, School of Nursing
J. Michael Oakes, School of Public Health
Stephen Weeks, College of Design

**CATHERINE FRENCH CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the slate was approved. Ballots were then distributed.

APPROVED

**19. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Resolution on the Budget Model
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends to the President that:

1. The Vice President for Research should be an integral part of the process by which decisions are made to allocate resources to all aspects of the University mission.
2. There be changes to the way that cost-pool rates are set and reviewed. Specifically, (a) establish college revenue budgets before setting cost-pool unit expense budgets and link them, so that if college revenues decline, cost-pool charges also decline, (b) establish performance metrics and quality standards for all cost-pool funded units and establish a corresponding mechanism to protect colleges if cost-pool units perform below standards, and (c) require all cost pools to report on the input received from the colleges.
3. A system of incentives be established for cost management and colleges guaranteed that they will retain for a period of time the savings they generate. Mechanisms should be in place to insure that colleges and administrative units can retain their savings and that these will not be offset by allocations from state funds.
4. A faculty committee be created to formulate basic rules that simplify interdisciplinary research. (Interdisciplinary research and centers that cross college boundaries are not directly addressed in the new budget model.)

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) and the Senate Research Committee last year appointed a joint ad hoc subcommittee to examine and make recommendations about the University's new budget model. The subcommittee submitted a report last fall; this recommendation to the Faculty Senate represents a distillation of some of the recommendations made by subcommittee members on SCFP in addition to the report. These are the recommendations that SCFP believes most important at this time. There are other recommendations that the Committee will bring to the Faculty Senate at a later date.

The report of the ad hoc subcommittee can be found at:
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/scfp/budgetreport.html>

**JUDITH MARTIN, CHAIR
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**20. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE
RESEARCH COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Resolution on the Faculty Expertise Database
Action by the Faculty Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

This item consists of two motions. Separate votes will be taken on each of the motions.

MOTION 1:

The University of Minnesota should adopt an integrated software system that serves as a comprehensive repository of University faculty and staff activity and expertise. This system should include the features of an expertise database while supporting annual activity reporting, the promotion and tenure process, and other relevant reporting functions. As an expertise database, this system should allow students and colleagues in and out of the University to quickly find information. Elements essential to such a system include:

- The ability to import appropriate existing information from existing Enterprise systems.
- Active involvement of faculty, departments, and colleges, with central administration for development of a flexible and robust structure to support the different needs of the various disciplines and units.
- Careful construction of security measures to protect private, sensitive, or proprietary data.
- A mechanism to assure timely updates to the data.
- Investment for training to use the system and for ongoing user support.
- A user-friendly interface and a variety of avenues for data entry, expertise searches, and report generation.

Other considerations to maximize the effectiveness of the system may include integration with the grants management system to allow for easy assembly of bio-sketches and other reports, the ability to create curricula vitae, and the capacity to compile departmental/collegiate/university-wide reports.

Approved March 3, 2008, by the Research Committee
Approved March 4, 2008, by the Information Technologies Committee
Approved March 11, 2008, by the Faculty Affairs Committee

**DAN DAHLBERG, CHAIR
RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**MARK SANDERS, CHAIR
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE**

**GEOFFREY SIRC, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Mark Sanders, Chair of the Information Technologies Committee (SCIT), said that a subcommittee with members from three Senate committees was formed in 2006 to address the capability of maintaining a centralized database of expertise at the University. This database would be helpful for evaluating future metrics and public engagement activities. A 22-page report was generated and is available on the SCIT website. Two motions from that report are for action today.

Q: Will faculty be able to edit this information?

A: Yes, but the details are yet to be determined. The intent is to be user-friendly, but pre-populated with information.

Q: How will this interact with EGMS?

A: EGMS and several unit databases will be integrated, since some of these other databases are out-of-date.

A senator stated that she is in support of this proposal, but urged caution in the development. Time needs to be taken to make it right.

Another senator questioned what will be considered appropriate information for importing and how will uniformity be maintained.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and motion 1 was approved.

APPROVED

MOTION 2:

Any new expertise database should include the capacity to be mined for information for the purposes of creating grant management documents across the University.

COMMENT:

The Senate Research Committee supports the creation of the expertise database but believes that it will be maximally helpful to the faculty if can also serve as a mechanism to speed up the preparation of grant-management documents (reports, applications, etc.).

**DAN DAHLBERG, CHAIR
RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and motion 2 was approved.

APPROVED

21. COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION Revised Liberal Education Requirements Action by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation

The revised Liberal Education requirements are available on the web at:
<http://www.myu.umn.edu/public/cle.html>

A paper copy will also be available at the meeting.

This is the second meeting at which these requirements have been discussed.

**LESLIE SCHIFF, CHAIR
COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Leslie Schiff, Chair of the Council on Liberal Education (CLE), said that since 1994, the Twin Cities' campus has worked with a set of common requirements defined in 1991 by the Howe Committee. These were adjusted slightly in 1999 to reflect the change to semesters, but they have not been analyzed since 1991.

In 2006, Vice Provost Swan increased the membership of CLE to 21 members and charged it with reviewing the requirements in the context of the other strategic positioning activities that was occurring. CLE then met twice per month for 15 months to discuss the value of liberal education, models at peer institutions, and what was and was not working at the University. During this process, members put aside their disciplinary interests and focused on what was best for all students.

Although CLE did not expect to end up with a structure of cores and themes, the analysis showed that the structure was not broken, but that it had suffered in implementation. The recommendations focus on making the existing structure more robust and subject to assessment.

She assured senators that the process has been broadly consultative by obtaining input from students, faculty, advisors, and administrators. After producing a preliminary report in October, feedback was taken on a website, through four forums, and with the Council for Enhancing Student Learning, the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), and the Faculty Senate. The report was revised in January, and a final version was approved by SCEP and FCC in February.

From the proposal, there is no net change in the number of requirements; there will still be seven cores to give students a chance to do the work of the discipline. There are bullet points in the description that clearly stipulate what criteria CLE will look for in liberal education courses, with the goal of increased transparency for faculty and students.

Two items, causing some angst, have not changed from the previous guidelines: 1) liberal education courses should be taught by regular faculty except under extraordinary circumstances, and 2) in large classes there should be the opportunity for small-group experiences.

Also, the size of the core has grown since it was initiated in 1994. Rather than dictate the number of courses to be approved, CLE decided instead to set a clear and rigorous set of criteria for use during re-certification.

Lastly, the proposal includes five themes. CLE agreed that one of the major flaws in the old system was that in courses that tried to satisfy a core and theme, often the theme suffered. CLE is now asking that a theme be fully integral to a core course that also includes a theme.

A senator stated that the CLA department chairs have reviewed the requirements and have devised a list of suggestions to the liberal education requirements. He expressed appreciation to CLE for its work and noted that there is general support for its provisions; however, much of the implementation will fall to CLA as an unfunded mandate. CLA already has teaching devoted to freshmen seminars, honors courses, and required discipline courses. There is an implication that these guidelines will force courses to be redesigned or created to fulfill the requirements. There will also be an impact on TAs, small group experiences, and how regular faculty on leave will be able to be replaced for these courses. There is a concern about restricting the requirements to courses that do not have prerequisites and therefore not providing opportunities for transfer students and students with AP credits. With a restricted number of courses being approved, course enrollments will rise, however, large classrooms are at a premium. More core courses should also be approved by CLE. Lastly, it is not a reasonable requirement that the principle faculty member be required to be the primary person who comments on papers in writing intensive courses, versus a TA.

Professor Schiff said that CLE is not expecting that the size of the core will change. CLE did discuss faculty on leave and felt that this situation might qualify as an extraordinary circumstance, but there was general agreement that graduate students should not teach liberal education courses. She then noted that the Vice Provost will have to deal with the financial issues of implementation.

Q: Will transfer students be able to apply previous credits towards these requirements?

A: This will be handled by the Minnesota transfer curriculum. AP credit still needs to be finalized.

A senator then said that another unfunded mandate is the faculty time to re-evaluate and update a course for re-certification. Also, since a faculty member does not always own a course, different faculty might teach the course each semester, each with his or her own emphasis. The goals of this process are laudable, but the implementation needs to be less burdensome for faculty and students.

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

APPROVED

**22. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Health Care Savings Plan Proposal
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has discussed a proposal to adopt a health-care savings plan. The funds accumulated in the plan (during a faculty member's years of employment) would be used to pay for health-care expenses in retirement. Mr. Chapman and Ms. Singer from Employee Benefits will be at the Faculty Senate meeting to present information about the plan. Faculty Senators are encouraged to read carefully item #3 in the 3/11/08 minutes of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, which can be found at: <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/36896>. This item is on the docket for discussion only, and will be brought back for action if it appears the majority of the Faculty Senate is in favor of it.

[This proposal applies only to tenured and tenure-track faculty; faculty-like academic professionals, while part of the Faculty Senate, are not included in this proposal and therefore should not offer comments.]

This is the first meeting at which this proposal has been discussed.

**GEOFFREY SIRC, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**GARY BALAS, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Kathryn Hanna, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), reminded senators that everyone has health care costs upon retirement, which are estimated at \$4500 per person for premiums. The IRS has a provision for a retirement health care savings plan, which is contributed tax-free and can be used tax-free. Currently, the University contributes 13 percent towards the Faculty Retirement Plan, with faculty members contributing another 2.5 percent. The proposal would take .5 percent from the faculty member's contribution to the retirement plan. The plan is administered by the Minnesota State Retirement System (MSRS), and provides a range of investment options. If a faculty member dies with funds remaining in the account, money would be directed towards a beneficiary for use tax-free for health expenses or paid out in a tax-free life insurance benefit.

Jackie Singer, Director of Retirement Benefits, said that this benefit shares characteristics with the HSA health plan and the flexible spending account, but is a separate and distinct health care offering. The proposal involves no increase in out-of-pocket expenses for faculty. When asked if this amount will be enough, based on a conservative estimate of a 30 year career, a faculty member would have \$25,000 in a retirement health care savings plan. This would not cover premiums for more than three years. However, if there is general agreement, the formula can be modified in the future.

She stated that the catch is that it is a mandatory plan at the same rate across the employment category and the funds can only be used for approved medical expenses, which include health care premiums, long-term care, and any expenses covered by a flexible spending account.

There are exemptions to participation for foreign nationals and anyone with fully-paid employer medical coverage. Anyone who leaves the University before retirement can also use funds for the plan.

Q: Why is this plan administered through MSRS instead of the University?

A: This plan is only available for public employees, so the administrator needs to be able to do the investments, record-keeping, and payments. MSRS has this ability.

Q: Are same-sex domestic partners recognized as beneficiaries?

A: Same-sex domestic partners have historically been disadvantaged by this plan since the IRS does not recognize the partnerships. Someone cannot claim their partners expenses while they are living, but the partner can be the beneficiary of the tax-free life insurance benefit.

Q: Can someone opt-out if they are now a United States' citizen, but plans to move and become a citizen of another country after retirement?

A: This is a question for MSRS about the IRS policy.

Q: Will the Faculty Senate be getting opinions from a wider group of faculty?

A: A survey can be done.

Q: This seems like a great opportunity for everyone, so there is a question of who is benefiting from this proposal.

A: Most of the feedback on this issue has not been against the proposal, but has been about taking away a person's choice, since the decision is for the entire employment category. Faculty have the greatest benefit, but the University will save funds from FICA and Medicare taxes.

A senator said that this proposal does not amount to a high cost in savings compared to the much higher cost of what is spent after retirement. Faculty should grab this opportunity.

Another senator asked if the percentage could be included in the survey.

Q: Why does the University not coverage retirees' medical benefits?

A: Subsidized retirees' medical benefits are going the same way as defined benefit programs. For instance, Michigan State spends \$30 million per year on this benefit, which is a large drain on institutional resources. Instead, the University provides an array of medical plans through a competitive bid process.

23. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Revised Educational Policies

Discussion by the Faculty Senate

5. Degrees

Credit Requirements for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree

1. Degrees are awarded by the University, not by colleges or departments or campuses. Degree requirements and standards are set by the University, but the determination of some requirements and standards are delegated to departments, colleges, and campuses.

2. Baccalaureate degrees consist of a minimum of 120 semester credits. College/campus approval is required for any baccalaureate degree programs that require more than 120 credits. Proposed baccalaureate degree requirements in excess of 132 credits must also be approved by

the appropriate chancellor or provost in consultation with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.

3. Requirements regarding breadth of study (commonly known as liberal education requirements) and other campus-wide graduation standards must be approved by the governing body for that campus.

4. Limits on use of S/N Grades

a. The maximum number of S/N credits allowed to a student is 25% of degree-qualifying University of Minnesota credits (from any campus).

b. No unit shall allow S/N grading in program and major course work unless the S/N grading system is preset by the unit for specific courses.

c. For a student who completes only the minimum number of 30 credits at the University, no more than 8 may be taken S/N.

d. Subject to the overall University policy contained in this paragraph, colleges, campuses, and programs may specify what courses or proportion of courses taken by its students or its prospective students must be on the A-F or S-N grading system.

5. D Grades Not Permitted in Major Courses: Required courses for the major in which a student receives a D grade (with or without plus or minus) do not count toward the major (including transfer courses). All other courses (including courses in the major field that are not required to complete the major) will count toward a degree if the student earns a D or better.

6. GPA Requirement for Graduation: The cumulative GPA required for graduation shall be 2.00, and shall include all, and only, University course work. (That is, a student who is admitted to a degree program or major and who completes all campus, college, and program requirements with a minimum GPA of 2.00 in University course work in the major and a cumulative GPA of 2.00 in University course work shall be allowed to graduate). No academic unit may impose additional gradepoint standards or conditions to graduate.

7. Limitation on Skills Credits: No more than 6 semester credits from physical education, study skills, or applied music (in any combination and including transfer credits) will count toward a student's degree, unless the credits are a required part of the student's program requirements. This provision does NOT mean a student may count 6 credits of physical education, 6 in study skills, and 6 in applied music; it establishes a TOTAL of 6 credits from all four areas combined as the number that will count toward a degree.

Campus-Specific Credits Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees

All credit awarded by the University, regardless of the campus or type of instruction, shall count toward the credit requirements for the degree (subject to the limitation on skills credits), but this policy establishes additional requirements for campus-specific coursework from the campus from which the student seeks to graduate.

A student's college or campus may, under extraordinary circumstances, waive the requirements in sections 2, 3, and 4, below, but not section 1.

1. To be eligible for a University of Minnesota undergraduate degree, a student must present at least 30 semester credits awarded by the University of Minnesota campus from which he or she is seeking to graduate.

2. Students must complete at least half of upper division major work on the campus from which they are seeking to graduate.
3. At least 15 credits of the last 30 credits earned prior to the awarding of a University degree must be awarded by the University of Minnesota campus from which a student is seeking to graduate.
4. For students who seek an academic minor, to be eligible for record of a minor on the University of Minnesota transcript, students must take at least three upper division credits in the minor field at the campus from which they will receive their degree.

Promoting Timely Graduation

The University expects most undergraduate students to graduate in a timely manner, defined here as four years. All departments and programs must have in place a curricular plan that allows students to graduate in four years. Such a plan should assume that students will enroll for at least 15 credits per semester, on average, but the plan may not require that students enroll for more than 17 credits per semester, on average. Course offerings must be scheduled on a two-year horizon so that students can progress in a way that leads to timely completion.

All admissions and registration materials must contain language emphasizing to students that they must complete at least 15 credits per semester on average to graduate within four years, and all advisors must inform students of the need to complete 15 credits per semester on average in order to graduate in four years.

The administration shall adopt policies, and further publicize existing policies, which will facilitate timely graduation for most students (within four years). The Office of the Provost shall engage in regular conversations with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy about these policies and their effectiveness.

[Note for the policy office: the following three policies should be linked/be together.]

Academic Unit Authority Over the Curriculum

Subject to the final authority of the Board of Regents, departments, colleges, and campuses have the authority to establish their curricula and the requirements for majors and minors, and to add to or remove courses from both in accordance with rules established by the college or campus.

Expiration of Old Credits

In order to ensure that graduating students will be up-to-date in the discipline, an academic unit (a department or comparable unit) may decide not to accept course work towards satisfying requirements for the major or minor if the course was taken too long ago. Any such time limit shall be clearly and regularly communicated to prospective and current students.

Revisions of Courses Required for a Major

Subject to the final authority of the Board of Regents, departments, colleges, and campuses have the authority to eliminate or substantially revise courses required for the major and to eliminate or revise prerequisites for the major in accordance with rules established by the college or campus. Such new requirements will not normally be imposed on currently-enrolled full-time students but may be offered to them as an option. If the faculty of a unit conclude that a new

major requirement is essential even for currently-enrolled students, approval of the dean of the college must be obtained for imposing the requirement on current students.

Units must clearly communicate to prospective and current students their policies and decisions regarding new or revised requirements for the major.

Degrees With Distinction and Degrees With Honors

1. General Provisions

- a) Any campus may offer both degrees with honors and degrees with distinction, only one, or neither.
- b) A student may obtain both a degree with honors and a degree with distinction, if offered by the campus attended.
- c). For the purpose of awarding degrees with honors and degrees with distinction, the overall performance of degree candidates on each campus shall be judged in relationship to the performance of degree-seeking students on that campus, not in relationship to other University students.
- d) To qualify for either a degree with distinction or a degree with honors, a student must have completed 60 or more semester credits at the University. For the purposes of meeting the grade point average standards set forth in this policy, only University course work shall be counted.
- e) It is the expectation of the Senate that in general, a campus will not award degrees with honors and with distinction, in total, to more than approximately 10 – 15% of any graduating class.
- f) The University transcript will contain a brief explanation of the difference between a degree with distinction and a degree with honors.
- g) The Office of the Registrar shall annually report to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy data on the number and percentage of students on each campus who receive degrees with distinction and degrees with honors.

2. Degrees with Distinction

- a) The initiative in establishing degrees with distinction shall lie with the campuses concerned and must be approved by the chief academic officer on the campus.
- b) To graduate "with distinction," a student must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.750 or higher at the time the student graduates. To graduate "with high distinction," a student must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.900 or higher.
- c) The grade point average alone shall be used in determining the granting of degrees "with distinction" or "with high distinction." Campuses may choose to offer only degrees "with distinction" or only degrees "with high distinction," but in either case they would be subject to section 2(b) of this policy.

3. Degrees with Honors and Campus Honors Programs

- a) The requirements for a degree with honors shall not consist of only the accomplishment of a designated amount of course work or achievement of a stipulated grade point average, but shall

also include a definite standard of excellence in scholarship with specific evidence of ability to accomplish independent or original work. To obtain a degree with honors, the student must participate in a fully-developed campus honors program.

b) The initiative for establishing degrees with honors (that is, cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude) shall lie with each campus and must be approved by the senior academic officer on the campus. Qualifications for degrees with honors must meet the requirements of sections 3(b-d) of this policy.

c) A campus desiring to grant degrees with honors must propose an honors program, specifying how honors students are to be selected, the nature, depth, and breadth of the honors requirements, and the general requirements for obtaining a degree cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude.

d) The minimum grade point average in upper division (i.e. after the completion of 60 semester credits) required for achievement of a degree "cum laude" shall be 3.500, that for a degree "magna cum laude" shall be 3.666, and that for a degree "summa cum laude" shall be 3.750. Campuses have the authority to adopt higher grade-point averages.

e) Campuses shall attempt to ensure that there is reasonable consistency across units in the amount of work required of its students to obtain degrees with honors.

COMMENT:

A joint Senate Committee on Educational Policy/Faculty Consultative Committee (SCEP/FCC) ad hoc subcommittee has been working since last fall to reorganize, revise, re-title, and generally try to make more sensible all of the University's Senate-adopted educational policies. (The subcommittee members are: Cathrine Wambach, CEHD, subcommittee chair and also chair of SCEP; Carol Chomsky, Law, FCC; Tina Falkner, Office of the Registrar; Jim Leger, IT, SCEP; and Leann Alstadt, a student member of SCEP.)

The original plan was that the subcommittee would simply parse existing policies (which are not well-organized or labeled) and reassemble them into more logical and understandable documents. As it did its work, however, it became clear that some of the policy provisions were outdated, ill-organized (the result of accretion rather than thoughtful organization), and unclear, so the subcommittee concluded it needed to do a more significant overhaul. The policies are now being grouped into logical categories and in some cases carefully reworded. The subcommittee has sought to retain the intent of existing policies, adding new or amended policy where there appeared to be a gap.

The tentative plan is to bring the policies in sections to SCEP, the FCC, and the Faculty Senate, receive comments and advice, bring them again for acceptance (but not vote), and then bring all of the sections at once for a final vote of adoption. At that point all the existing policies will be superseded. This approach seemed more practical than adopting the policy provisions piecemeal, over the next year. Because some of the revised policies draw from more than one existing policy, to adopt them piecemeal could mean conflicting provisions would be in force. The situation would be confusing for faculty, students, and advisors.

The draft policies are also being circulated to the deans and to the Council of Undergraduate Deans. We would like the colleges and the Provost's office to be involved in the discussions as they proceed so that once the Faculty Senate acts, administrative approval and implementation will follow without controversy. It is not expected that final Faculty Senate action will come before next fall (at the earliest), and more likely next spring semester.

The Morris campus and the professional schools have been asked to highlight any provisions they do not believe do or should apply to them. These drafts represent a melange of policies that affect only undergraduates, policies that affect all students, all-University policies, and Twin Cities policies. The subcommittee did not intend to recommend imposition of policy requirements where they would be inappropriate, but in the course of trying to make them all coherent, the distinction among campuses and among different levels of education may occasionally have been lost.

The policy sections are:

1. Class Scheduling
2. Examinations and Study Days
3. Classroom and Course Expectations and Syllabi
4. Grading, Transcripts, and Credits
5. Degrees
6. Rating of Teaching and Teaching Awards
7. Calendars
8. Admissions and Curriculum and Program Expectations

**CATHRINE WAMBACH, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Cathrine Wambach, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that a subcommittee of SCEP and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has been reviewing the 30 current educational policies with a goal of reorganization and better access to the information. The plan is to bring a series of documents that contain the policy language from multiple sources combined in new policies.

The intent was just to reorganize current language, but the subcommittee found that some policies needed to be edited or deleted if obsolete. The plan is that the different policy groupings will be brought for comment over several meetings, and then for approval as an entire set next spring.

She asked that senators review the language and email her if they see any text that is wrong or inappropriate.

Q: Since some policies just affect the Twin Cities, how will this be indicated in the policies?

A: Coordinate campuses can email her if a policy, or portion of a policy, does not pertain to them. The policy library will then identify what applies to the University or just the Twin Cities.

24. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

25. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

26. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor