

**2011-12 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
OCTOBER 6, 2011**

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 1
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 1
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 1**

The first meeting of the University Senate and Faculty Senate for 2011-12 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, October 6, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., as a joint meeting of the two bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were 25 academic professional members, 22 civil service members, 125 faculty/academic professional members, and 17 student members. President Kaler presided.

**1. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE ACTIONS
Information**

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Resolution on the Personal Floating Holiday

Approved by the: University Senate March 3, 2011

Approved by the: Administration PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

University Senate Constitution Amendment – Civil Service Senate

Approved by the: University Senate March 31, 2011

Approved by the: Administration May 9, 2011

Approved by the: Board of Regents June 2011

Resolution on Equity during Budget Cuts

Approved by the: University Senate March 31, 2011

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

* In the face of necessary budget reductions, this administration will seriously consider all options available to ensure that impacts of budget cuts are handled humanely and without significant impact on any one group.

Policy on Individual Conflicts of Interest: Standards that Govern Those Involved in Clinical Health Care

Approved by the: University Senate April 14, 2011

Approved by the: Administration March 2011

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Statement on Access to HealthPartners Clinics

Approved by the: University Senate April 14, 2011

Approved by the: Administration – no action required*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

* I appreciate and share the concerns of the SCFA with respect to the importance of maintaining access to the HealthPartners Clinics for our faculty and staff. Both HealthPartners and Medica received copies of your memo, and understand the importance of affordable access to HealthPartners clinics for University participants. I am pleased to report that negotiations have been successful and HealthPartners will continue to be available to University faculty and staff. If you have specific questions,

the Office of Human Resources Benefits can provide further detail.

Supporting the Efforts of the Work Group Promoting Academic Civility in Graduate and Professional Education

Approved by the: University Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration – no action required
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Statement on Funding for Classroom Facilities and Technologies

Approved by the: University Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration – no action required*
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required
* I appreciate the concerns expressed in the statement regarding classroom infrastructure and technology and the intent of the recommendation. Given the current financial uncertainties, however, I cannot endorse so specific a resolution.

FACULTY SENATE

Amendment to the Policy on Expected Student Academic Work per Credit: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester

Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 4, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Policy on Grading and Transcripts: Withdrawals and Repeating Courses

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 30, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Regents Policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 30, 2010
Approved by the: Administration April 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents May 13, 2011
* President Bruininks is asking Senior Vice President and Provost Sullivan, executive officer responsible for the administration of these particular policies, to share and discuss the proposed amendments with the Board of Regents

Amendment to the Regents Policy: Code of Conduct

Approved by the: Faculty Senate December 2, 2010
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents PENDING

Amendment to the Regents Policy: Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 24, 2011
Approved by the: Administration May 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents June 2011

Amendment to the Syllabi Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 24, 2011
Approved by the: Administration June 30, 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendment to the Policy on Class Scheduling for Undergraduate and Graduate Classes

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 24, 2011
Approved by the: Administration May 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Resolution on Faculty Support for Inclusion of University Governance Activities in P&A and CS Annual Reviews

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 24, 2011
Approved by the: Administration September 23, 2011*
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

* I appreciate the dedication and commitment that our faculty and staff demonstrate through their active participation in governance and wholly support their participation in these activities. I will ask Vice President Kathryn Brown to encourage all managers and supervisors to consider and recognize that participation in governance committees and activities is included in annual reviews of performance.

2015-16 Morris, Rochester, and Twin Cities Calendars

Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 31, 2011
Approved by the: Administration June 30, 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Policy on Departmental Exams for Proficiency or Credit for Undergraduate Students

Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 31, 2011
Approved by the: Administration May 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Policy on Credit for Nationally-Recognized Exams for Undergraduate Students

Approved by the: Faculty Senate March 31, 2011
Approved by the: Administration May 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendments to the Policy on Teaching Awards

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Amendments to the Policy on High School Preparation Standards

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration PENDING
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Policy on Credit Requirements for Master's and Doctoral Degrees

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration June 30, 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Policy on Leave of Absence and Reinstatement from a Leave: Graduate Students

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration June 30, 2011*
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

*Amended to include reference to the Duluth Campus in the title, in consultation with academic leadership at UMD.

Policy on Application of Graduate Credits to Degree Requirements

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration June 30, 2011
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Policy on Appointments as Director of Graduate Studies

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 5, 2011
Approved by the: Administration June 30, 2011*
Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

*Amended to include a new temporary exclusion of three units in the AHC (Center for Bioethics, Center for Spirituality and Healing, and Allied Health) from the policy because they currently do not have a collegiate home and therefore they do not fit in to the proposed policy requirements.

2. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Policy on Adding, Changing, or Discontinuing Academic Plans
Information for the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

According to the charge to the Faculty Consultative Committee, it has the authority "[t]o act on behalf of the Faculty Senate when a decision is required prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate and when a decision is required when it would not be possible to convene a special meeting of the Faculty Senate in a timely fashion; such actions will be reported to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting and the Faculty Senate may then overrule the Faculty Consultative Committee."

The Faculty Consultative Committee voted unanimously on May 26, 2011, to approve the following change to the Policy on Adding, Changing, or Discontinuing Academic Plans (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

Adding, Changing, or Discontinuing Academic Plans

Policy Statement

~~This policy provides guidelines for the development and submission for review of proposals from University colleges and campuses for new and changed academic programs. Principles that frame this policy include:~~

- ~~• Academic programs should be aligned with the missions of their home unit, and with the University's broad institutional goals and strategic directions.~~
- ~~• Proposals for academic programs are to align with related policies, and to reflect common criteria: quality; centrality; comparative advantage; demand; efficiency and effectiveness; and, growth and leveraging of resources.~~
- ~~• Decisions to offer, change, or drop academic programs, when they have the potential to affect or involve other units within the University, require consultation early in the program development stage.~~
- ~~• The Board of Regents policy calls for Board approval of new academic programs, academic program name changes, and additions or discontinuations of academic programs.~~
- ~~• The Executive Vice President and Provost has the delegated responsibility to review and forward as appropriate academic proposals from colleges and campuses for Board consideration and approval.~~

- ~~New and changed programs may not be initiated prior to formal approval by the Board of Regents.~~

Departments, colleges, and campuses have the authority to establish, change, and discontinue academic plans and sub-plans that may appear on official University transcripts, subject to the final authority of the Board of Regents. (See Administrative Policy: Academic Unit Authority over the Curriculum and Major: Twin Cities, Crookston, Morris, Rochester.) This policy includes undergraduate, graduate, and professional credit-bearing degrees, majors, minors, free-standing minors, and certificates.

Creating, Changing or Discontinuing a Plan or Sub-Plan

Collegiate units and coordinate campuses proposing to add, change, or discontinue an academic plan or sub-plan must submit a proposal for review and approval. (See Responsibilities section below and associated procedures.) Collegiate units and coordinate campuses must have a set of publicly available standards and internal processes for developing, reviewing, and approving new, changed, or discontinued plans and sub-plans that are consistent with these procedures.

The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost is responsible for reviewing and forwarding, as appropriate, academic proposals for Board of Regents consideration and final action.

Every academic plan must have a home college(s) or coordinate campus.

Collegiate units and campuses may not advertise, initiate, recruit or admit students to new and/or changed plans prior to formal approval by the Board of Regents.

Changing Requirements of an Existing Plan or Sub-Plans

Any change in plan (e.g., major) or sub-plan (e.g., track, emphasis, concentration) requirements takes effect no earlier than the following term and will not normally be imposed on currently enrolled students who have been admitted to the plan or sub-plan, but the new requirements may be offered to them as an option. If the faculty of a collegiate unit or coordinate campus concludes that a new requirement is essential even for currently enrolled students, approval of the dean of the collegiate unit or the chief academic officer of the coordinate campus must be obtained for imposing the requirement on them.

Collegiate units and coordinate campuses must communicate to prospective and current students their local policies and decisions regarding new or revised plan or sub-plan requirements.

REASON FOR POLICY

This policy: ~~is intended to:~~

- Enhances quality, productivity, and efficiency in academic plan development and implementation by faculty, departments, collegiate units, and campuses.
- Ensures that academic plan development is aligned with unit compact statements and institutional, campus, and collegiate unit mission and strategic directions.
- Makes explicit commonly held assumptions about criteria for academic plans and connections to related policies.
- Fosters shared consultation, and where appropriate, planning across academic units.
- Enhances availability, consistency, and coordination of information about the University's academic plans for transcript records, internal analysis, accountability reporting, and accreditation.
- Ensures thorough and timely review of proposals.

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**3. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Policy on Credit and Grade Point Requirements
for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree
Information for the Faculty Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

According to the charge to the Faculty Consultative Committee, it has the authority "[t]o act on behalf of the Faculty Senate when a decision is required prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate and when a decision is required when it would not be possible to convene a special meeting of the Faculty Senate in a timely fashion; such actions will be reported to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting and the Faculty Senate may then overrule the Faculty Consultative Committee."

The Faculty Consultative Committee voted unanimously on May 26, 2011, to approve the following change to the Policy on Credit and Grade Point Requirements for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

Credit and Grade Point Requirements for an Undergraduate (Baccalaureate) Degree

Policy Statement

...

1. Limitation on skills credits.

a) ~~—(Twin Cities) 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 additional 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 three areas combined as the number that will count toward a degree. (That is, a student may count 6 skills credits, or the number of skills credits required by the major, whichever is greater.) A student may NOT count all the skills credits required by the major plus an additional 6 skills credits.~~

b) a) (Morris) No more than 8 credits in Music Ensembles, Mus 1300 through Mus 1340, no more than 4 credits in WSS 12xx Skills courses, no more than 4 credits in Varsity Athletics, WSS 1401 through WSS 1412, and no more than 4 credits in Psychology Field Experience, Psy 4896 may be applied to the 120-credit degree requirement.

...

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**4. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Resolution on Non-Renewal Policy Changes
Information for the Faculty Senate**

At its meeting on April 12, 2011, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) discussed a number of proposed changes to the University policy regarding non-renewal of P&A staff. SCFA supports many of the proposed changes, including the “clarification that non-renewal is to be based on a reason,” the integration of P&A and civil service employment in calculating years of service for determining the notice period, the discouragement of combined appointment and non-renewal letters, and the provisions regarding extension of a P&A appointment beyond the end-date of the required notice period.

There is one proposed change, however, that SCFA does not support. It is the proposal to shorten the period of notice of non-renewal in the case of long-time employees (10 completed years of service) from one year to six months. It does not appear to the Committee that shortening the notice period for long-time P&A employees would result in any significant benefit to the institution. On the contrary, it might be expected to undermine the morale and commitment of long-time employees, especially those employed as instructional faculty, who normally work under annual contracts, and for whom the search for a comparable position would have to begin early in the fall semester, if it is to be effective. As indicated by our resolution adopted at the April 12 meeting, we also share the concerns expressed by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure that a shortened notice period could have a chilling effect on the exercise of academic freedom by P&A faculty in the classroom. Further, we feel that it would be inequitable to alter the notice period currently in force for current long-time employees, many of whom will have made their work at the University their careers and are now at a stage of those careers when finding a comparable alternative position would be all the more difficult.

Given these concerns, we recommend that the University not change the minimum notice-period for P&A staff who have been continuously employed at the University for the previous 10 or more years. Naturally this recommendation is not intended to apply to employees who may be terminated for cause.

Adopted unanimously by the committee on May 10, 2011

**GEORGE SHEETS, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

5. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Robert W. Allison, Jr.
Staff
Facilities Management
1947 – 2011

Joann Anderson
Staff
Veterinary Medical Center
1944 – 2011

Wallace R. Anderson
Physician
Boynton Health Services
1924 – 2011

James D. Banister
Staff
Academic Health Center
1940 – 2011

Jerome Beker
Professor
Social Work
1933 – 2011

John O. Blaisdell
Staff
Facilities Management
1938 – 2011

Betty Brecto
Professor
Business Affairs – University of Minnesota Crookston
1926 – 2011

Lawson Bowen-Meredith
Staff
Facilities Management
1930 – 2011

Richard R. Cline
Professor
Pharmaceutical Care and Health
1970 – 2011

Kenneth Evink
Staff
Plant Services – University of Minnesota Morris
1926 – 2011

Thomas E. Fairbairn
Staff
Facilities Management
1938 – 2011

Clayton F. Giese
Professor
Physics and Astronomy
1931 – 2011

Richard A. Grant
Professor
Humanities – University of Minnesota Morris
1937 – 2011

Terrence L. Hanson
Staff
North Central Research and Outreach Center
1961 – 2011

Eugene A. Johnson
Professor
Biostatistics
1925 – 2011

Herbert W. Johnson
Professor
Agronomy and Plant Genetics
1920 – 2011

Richard L. Johnson
Staff
Energy Management-Steam Distribution
1945 – 2011

Daniel D. Joseph
Regents Professor
Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics
1929 – 2011

Jane E. Maddy
Professor
Continuing Education – University of Minnesota Duluth
1931 – 2011

Eileen G. Miley
Staff
Agricultural Economics
1921 – 2011

Vivian J. Neiger
Academic Professional
Raptor Center
1946 – 2011

Kris S. Nelson
Professor
Center for Urban and Regional Affairs
1951 – 2011

Nancy R. Novak
Consultant
Academic Health Center Human Resources
1946 – 2011

Philip M. Raup
Professor
International Agricultural Programs
1914 – 2011

Guillermo Rojas
Professor
Chicano Studies

1938 – 2011

Teresa Schoeder Sheaffer
Staff
Agronomy and Plant Genetics
1956 – 2011

Laura Shifrin
Staff
Ophthalmology
1963 – 2011

Richard E. Shope
Professor
Veterinary Pathobiology
1926 – 2011

Edward Silberman
Professor
Civil Engineering
1914 – 2011

Byron C. Smith
Staff
Finance
1918 – 2011

Mary P. Snyder
Staff
Boynton Health Services
1937 – 2011

Seppo H. Valppu
Staff
Natural Resources Research Institute – University of Minnesota Duluth
1948 – 2011

Thomas L. Waterbury
Professor
Law School
1923 – 2011

Henry H. Webster
Research Associate
Natural Resources
1930 – 2011

Roger E. Wies
Staff
Repairs Maintenance – University of Minnesota Duluth
1935 – 2011

Robert E. Williams
Staff

Facilities Management
1941 – 2011

Gloria Wolf
Staff
Psychiatry
1941 – 2011

Jack Peter Zetterberg
Senior Analyst
System Academic Administration
1950 – 2011

STUDENTS

Jada R. Brunk
College of Liberal Arts

Logan Hoehne
University of Minnesota Morris

Luke Johnson
School of Fine Arts, University of Minnesota Duluth

McKauley C. Kane
College of Science and Engineering

Bo W. Lo
College of Science and Engineering

Greg J. Moltumyr
Carlson School of Management

Bradley S. Rosendahl
College of Liberal Arts

Tim Stephenson
School of Fine Arts, University of Minnesota Duluth

Sara N. Studer
Carlson School of Management

Maria C. Tapia
College of Liberal Arts

6. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Christopher Cramer, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), began by stating that SCC has met only once between the May 5 Senate meeting and this one. The committee has had an opportunity to examine the list of University policies up for triennial review this year, and has discussed with Dean McQuaid's office the draft policy on Faculty and

Staff Travel Reporting that is presently open for comments on the University's Policy Library website.

Moving forward, SCC will be looking at those procedural changes that may be warranted in response to the creation of the P&A and Civil Service Senates this past year and has already discussed simplifications with respect to the existing consultation procedures for hiring senior administrators.

Last week the chairs of most Senate committees met to outline their expectations for their agendas for the year, and to coordinate their efforts where appropriate, one goal being to ensure the most efficient use of the time of both committee members and their sometime administrative guests.

7. INTRODUCTIONS
Amy Phenix, Chief of Staff
Kathryn Brown, Vice President for Human Resources

Amy Phenix and Vice President Kathryn Brown were introduced to the Senate.

MOTION A
Consent Agenda
Action by the University Senate

Agenda Items 8. and 9. are considered to be non-controversial 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.

8. MINUTES FOR MAY 5, 2011

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usenate/110505sen.html>

STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE

9. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
2011-12 Committees of the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate committee memberships for 2011-12.

University Senate committee memberships:

DISABILITIES ISSUES - Faculty: Dale Branton (chair), Becca Gercken, Mary Kennedy, Joanna O'Connell, Julia Robinson, Susan Rose, Michael Silverman, Frank Symons, Carla Tabourne. **Academic Professionals:** Sherry Gray, Kimberly Simon. **Civil Service:** Brian McAdams, Joanie Tool. **Students:** Rebecca Anderson, Amber Mayer, 2 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Donna Johnson, Peggy Mann Rinehart.

EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY - Faculty: Irene Duranczyk (chair), Neil O. Anderson, Michael Goh, Richard Graff, Raul Marrero-Fente, Michelle Page, Janet Thomas, Dominique Tobbell. **Academic Professionals:** Katie Ballering, Gregory Sawyer. **Students:** Lauren Beach, Yu Fu, 4 to be named. **Civil Service:** Susan Cable-Morrison, Dorothy Schlesselman. **Ex Officio:** Kimberly Hewitt, Peg Lonquist, Anne Phibbs, Charmaine Stewart, Patrick Troup.

FINANCE AND PLANNING - Faculty: Russell Luepker (chair), Sara Chambers, William Durfee, Judith Martin, Fred Morrison, Terry Roe, Gwen Rudney, Sellmann Schultz, Karen Seashore, Aks Zaheer. **Academic Professionals:** Michael Rollefson, 1 to be named. **Civil Service:** Kara Kersteter, Ann Sather. **Students:** Cody Mikl, 3 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Jonathan Binks, Lincoln Kallsen, Kathleen O'Brien, Richard Pfitzenreuter, Arturo Schultz, Thomas Stinson, Michael Volna, 1 to be named.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES - Faculty: Ted Higman (chair), David Arendale, Brent Larson, Yuk Sham, Shashi Shekhar, May Vavrus, Bonnie Westra, 1 to be named. **Academic Professionals:** Allison Jacobsen, James MacDonald, Benton Schnabel, Sue Van Voorhis. **Civil Service:** Noel Phillips. **Students:** Craig Hohn, 2 to be named. **Ex Officio:** John Butler, Ann Hill Duin, Billie Wahlstrom, 1 to be named.

LIBRARY - Faculty/PA: Neil Olszewski (chair), Jennifer Alexander, Phil Buhlmann, Michelle Englund, Elizabeth Fine, David Fox, Susan Geller, Vicki Graham, Ronald Hadsall, John Logie, 2 to be named. **Students:** Bradford Clemens, Monica Howell, Robert Muellerleile, Joseph Spanjers. **Civil Service:** Mary Ford. **Ex Officio:** Jonathan Binks, LeAnn Dean, Joan Howland, Wendy Lougee, Mary Beth Sancomb-Moran, Bill Sozansky, Owen Williams, 1 to be named.

SOCIAL CONCERNS - Academic Professionals: David Golden (chair), Carol Foth, Timothy Sheldon. **Faculty:** John Broadhurst, Stephen Gross, Maria Hanratty, Ahmed Heikal, Kim Robien, Michael Sommers, 1 to be named. **Civil Service:** Susan Cable-Morison, Teresa Schicker, Rebecca von Dissen. **Alumni:** David Fuhs, Sandra Krebsbach, 1 to be named. **Students:** Elizabeth Ault, Leah Iverson, Rebecca Shankle, Elizabeth Shay, 3 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Kaari Nelson, Michael O'Day, Amelious Whyte.

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY - Faculty/PA: Eric Watkins (chair), Dana Davis, Patricia Fillipi, Jennifer Goodnough, Francisco Ocampo, Thomas Shield, LeAnn Snow, 1 to be named. **Students:** Levi Atinda, 4 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Sharon Dzik, Laura Coffin Koch.

STUDENT BEHAVIOR - Faculty/PA: Jeanne Higbee (chair), Theresa Baultrippe, Peter Haeg, Todd Helmer, Julia Johnsen, Susanne Jones, Barney Klamecki, Katie Koopmeiners, Christian Mohr, Pamela Nippolt, William Ostvig, Andrea Smith, Marshall Stern, Mary Tate, Becky Yust. **Students:** Julie Collier, Matt Hauer, Sarah Lechowich, David Ormonde, Thomas Schink, Ami Wazlawik, at least 4 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Sharon Dzik.

FOR INFORMATION:

ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS - Faculty: James Luby (chair), Carl Adams, Roland Guyotte, Phyllis Moen, Fotis Sotiropoulos, William Tolman, 2 to be named. **Academic Professionals:** Peyton Owens, Patrick Troup. **Alumni:** Nancy Devine, Julie Johnson, Stephen Litton, Beth Pinkney, Todd Williams. **Civil Service:** Arlene Birnbaum, Diane Krawczynski. **Students:**

Bridget Thompson, Lingzhou Xue, 2 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Kristin Cleveland, Ruth Isaak, Lisa Meyer, Andrew Svec, William Wade, Billie Wahlstrom.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - Faculty: Joanna O'Connell (chair), Carl Adams, Vernon Cardwell, William Durfee, William Garrard, Jay Hatch, Lois Heller, David Kirkpatrick, Paula O'Loughlin, Nelson Rhodus, Steven Ruggles, Leslie Sharkey, Steven Yussen, 2 to be named. **Academic Professionals:** Elaine Challacombe, Stacy Doepner-Hove, Frank Douma, Mary Jetter. **Students:** 7 to be named.

SENATE CONSULTATIVE - Faculty: Christopher Cramer (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Walt Jacobs, Elaine Tyler May, Jan McCulloch, James Pacala, Kathryn VandenBosch. **Academic Professionals:** Ann Hagen, Steven Pearthree. **Civil Service:** Don Cavalier, Amy L. Olson. **Students:** Harrison Defries, Adam Matula, Jaycob Robinson, Adair Rounthwaite, 3 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Thomas Brothen, Carol Chomsky, Russell Leupker, Kathryn VandenBosch, Richard Ziegler.

**JOANNA O'CONNELL, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

END OF MOTION A

**10. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Senator Responsibilities
Information for the University Senate**

Responsibilities of Faculty Senators

In order to ensure that the faculty governance system operates effectively to represent faculty concerns and perspectives, individuals serving as Faculty Senators should:

1. Attend all University and Faculty Senate meetings or arrange for an alternate to attend
2. Review docket materials before Senate meetings and be prepared to discuss and vote on issues presented.
3. Share draft policies and policy amendments with colleagues for discussion before Senate action.
4. Distribute to colleagues in their college information on significant matters before the Senate and solicit faculty views on such issues.
5. Bring to the Senate, or one of its committees, issues of concern to their colleagues.
6. Communicate regularly with faculty governance bodies in their academic units.
7. Consider serving on one of the Senate committees.

8. Remember that, while they are elected as delegates from their academic units, “[e]ach member of the University Senate shall represent the University as a whole.”

Adopted unanimously by the Faculty Consultative Committee 8/17/06.

Responsibilities of Student Senators

In order to ensure that the University governance system operates effectively to represent student concerns and perspectives, individuals serving as Student Senators should:

1. Attend all University and Student Senate meetings or arrange for an alternate to attend.
2. Review docket materials before Senate meetings and be prepared to discuss and vote on issues presented.
3. Share draft policies and policy amendments with constituents and relevant student organizations for discussion before Senate action.
4. Distribute to constituents and relevant student organizations information on significant matters before the Senate and solicit student views on such issues.
5. Bring to the Senate, or one of its committees, issues of concern to their constituents and relevant student organizations.
6. Communicate regularly with student governance bodies.
7. Consider serving on one of the Senate committees.
8. Remember that, while they are elected as delegates from their academic units, “[e]ach member of the University Senate shall represent the University as a whole.”

Adopted unanimously by the Student Senate Consultative Committee 9/14/06.

11. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT Senate Consultative Committee Charge Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 5(I) of the University Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~). As an amendment to the University Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the University Senate (124) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the University Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

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

5. University Senate Committee Charges

...

I. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

...

Duties and Responsibilities

...

- g. To provide for a budget subcommittee of the University Senate composed of the vice chair of the University Senate as chair, and the chairs and vice chairs of the Civil Service, Faculty, P&A, and Student Consultative Committees; ~~and one faculty member and one student member of the Senate Consultative Committee chosen by the vice chair of the University Senate.~~ The Clerk of the Senate shall be an ex officio member of the subcommittee.
- h. To provide for a Business and Rules Committee composed of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Chair and one additional member of the Student Senate Consultative Committee, one academic professional member of the Senate Consultative Committee, one civil service member of the Senate Consultative Committee, the Clerk of the Senate, and the Vice Chair of the Senate. The Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee shall serve as chair of the Business and Rules Committee. The Business and Rules Committee shall be responsible for drafting the docket of the University Senate but final authority for approving the docket shall rest with the Senate Consultative Committee.
- i. To dispose of business which appears to be not germane to the purposes of the University Senate.
- j. To make editorial changes in University Senate policies and documents (including the constitution, bylaws, and rules) to reflect changes in titles of administrative offices or officers; the changes will be reported to the University Senate for information.
- k. To correct grammatical and punctuation errors and to approve other non-substantive technical amendments in existing administrative policies previously approved by the University Senate and in University Senate documents (including the constitution, bylaws, and rules); such actions will be reported to the University Senate at its next meeting and the University Senate may then overrule the Senate Consultative Committee.

COMMENT:

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) has concluded that it would be a better use of the University Senate's time to permit clerical and non-controversial changes to be made by SCC and reported to the University Senate for information—rather than having to waste the body's time voting on these matters. As provided in the language, all such changes would be reported to the University Senate at the meeting following the SCC vote and the University Senate would have the authority to overrule SCC.

Changes to the constitution, even if clerical, non-substantive, and non-controversial, would also have to be approved by the Board of Regents.

CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 152 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

12. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Resolution on Consultation Prior to Reorganization Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve the Resolution on Consultation Prior to Reorganization as follows.

Resolution on Consultation Prior to Reorganization

Preamble

The structure and organization of the University's academic units and central administration have a profound effect on faculty, staff, and students, and decisions about modifying those structures will benefit from the knowledge and experience of those affected. This resolution therefore identifies appropriate governance committees to be consulted before any major reorganization decision is made. To be effective, such consultation must occur early in the consideration of any such changes.

For reorganizations in central administration, the consultation should be with appropriate University Senate committees. For reorganizations within campuses or colleges, the consultation should be with the appropriate campus, college, and departmental governance bodies. Because major structural change within campuses and colleges has implications outside those units as well, the resolution provides for determination whether consultation with Senate committees is warranted when such change is considered.

I. Reorganization of Campuses and Collegiate Units

Proposals to establish new collegiate units, merge or eliminate existing collegiate units, reorganize a college in a substantial way, or to make a significant modification in the mission (with college- or campus-wide impact or ramification) to an existing college/campus, should be reviewed by the appropriate governance body of an affected college or campus unit. The responsible central administrator (President, Provost, or Senior Vice President) should consult with the chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) to plan additional consultation with other Senate committees as appropriate, and the timetable for such consultation. In planning for such additional consultation, the chair of SCC will coordinate with the chairs of the other Senate consultative committees.

II. Reorganization of Other University-Wide or Campus-Wide Units

Proposals to reorganize or eliminate non-collegiate, all-University units (such as the Graduate School) should be reviewed by governance bodies within the affected units and by SCC. The chair of SCC and the responsible central administrator (President, Provost, or Senior Vice

President) should plan additional consultation with other Senate committees as appropriate, and the timetable for such consultation. In planning for such additional consultation, the chair of SCC will coordinate with the chairs of the other Senate consultative committees.

III. Reorganization of Academic Units Within and Across Colleges and Campuses

Proposals to establish, eliminate, split, or merge collegiate academic departments or to move an academic department to a different college should be reviewed by appropriate college governance committees. The responsible central administrator (President, Provost, or Senior Vice President) should consult with the chair of the SCC before any final decisions are made. The chair of SCC will coordinate with the chairs of the other Senate consultative committees to ensure their involvement when appropriate. Proposals to establish, eliminate, split, merge, or move non-departmental academic units (e.g., including but not limited to centers and programs) should also be reviewed by appropriate college governance committees, but need not be reported to Senate committees.

IV. Administrative Reorganization

1. When the president considers (a) the establishment or elimination of senior administrative position(s) of high rank (vice president, provost, chancellor), or (b) a significant reorganization of the central administration, he or she should consult with the chair of the SCC. The chair of SCC will coordinate with the chairs of the other Senate consultative committees to ensure their involvement when appropriate. Approval of the committee(s) or their chairs is not required.
2. When a campus executive officer (chancellor or provost) considers the establishment or elimination of senior administrative positions for a campus, the provost or chancellor should consult with the appropriate consultative body (assembly executive committee or its faculty-student equivalent). Approval by that consultative body is not required.

COMMENT:

This resolution replaces the 1999 Policy on Reorganization adopted by the University Senate, which itself replaced several existing policies dating from 1956 through 1971. The intent is to remove ambiguities in the 1999 policy and convert it to a resolution, to be agreed on by the President and the Senate.

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

13. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Kaler said that it was a pleasure to be here and to chair his first Senate meeting. He noted that today is his 98th day as President of the University. Most people had a chance to hear his inaugural speech or review its concepts. It lays out his hopes, expectations, and aspirations for this University and his role in moving it forward. There is tremendous opportunity here as

well as substantial challenges. He looks forward to engaging the challenges, both internally and externally, and helping everyone reap the opportunities that exist here.

He believes strongly in consultation and collaboration, but he is sure that he will do something wrong during the next few months. He asked senators never to assume malice when simple ignorance is a plausible explanation. He will be learning about the University and its culture, and will continue to strive to be as open and collaborative as he can be. He wants to hear issues and concerns from senators.

President Kaler heard positive reactions from the need to bring vigor to research and make sure that classes are not boring. This is an opportunity for faculty to re-engage at a variety of levels and to reimagine how the University does what it does. This could mean being more innovative or creative in the laboratory or the classroom.

There are a variety of critical issues moving forward. He expects to announce the new Provost on Monday. He was impressed with the diverse pool of candidates and the input from the public sessions. He thanked everyone for their participation and feedback.

He has been meeting regularly with a group of senior leaders to begin addressing matters of operational excellence. This is an effort to identify the places where improved business practices and organizational structures will allow for more efficiency and effectiveness. There is great opportunity for this at the University and examples will be solicited from the University community going forward. He is determined to bring improved processes to the University, which will relieve funds that can be used in the classroom.

The Regents are meeting next week and he will present the 2012 Capital Budget. It includes HEAPR funding, utility and energy infrastructure improvements for the Twin Cities campus, an American Indian Learning Research Center in Duluth, and the Itasca Biological Station. He anticipates a modest-size bonding bill this year. If historical trends hold, the University will be able to move forward with most of these projects.

President Kaler reported that the University is seeking candidates for two high-level University-wide positions. One is the Vice President for Information Technology and the other is the replacement for Donna Peterson in Government Relations. Careful searches and hires are needed in both positions. Vice President Brown and Chancellor Lehmkuhle are co-chairing the Vice President search and Vice President Pfutzenreuter and Professor Morrison are co-chairing the Government Relations search. Searches are also underway to fill dean positions in the Carlson School of Management and the School of Dentistry.

He has met with the Faculty Consultative Committee a few times, as well as the P&A Consultative Committee, the Student Senate, and union leaders. He has also had a series of lunches with faculty members and regular visits with department heads. He is trying to get into the University community to listen and learn.

He returned yesterday from a visit to Rochester. This leaves a visit to the Duluth campus remaining. These visits highlight the importance of the coordinate campuses in the University system. The University has the ability to offer a learning environment for almost any need from a Minnesota student.

He closed with a few themes that senators will hear throughout the year. The first is excellence. There is a need to look carefully at what the University does, move the things done well to excellence and look hard at things not done well, for any reason, and decide to step back and refocus resources on things that can be done more effectively and will have a larger impact. There will be a hard look at the business side, with staff and faculty buy-in, and, on the academic

side, it is a faculty responsibility to look at the programs in an unemotional way and evaluate critically their quality. These are not easy conversations but will lead to improvements across the entire University.

Access is critically important. Costs need to be controlled to mitigate the need for future tuition increases. He is going to work hard with the state to get this message across and to explain the value that the University brings to people throughout the state. He will also work hard in the area of philanthropy to bring scholarship dollars to the University. These two areas of income, along with savings mentioned earlier, will equip the University with some fluidity to move in the direction needed.

When it comes to advocacy, people will become tired of hearing his voice, so he needs senators to talk to their elected representatives, thought leaders in the communities where they live, and engage family and friends. He believes that advocacy is a contact sport involving one-on-one discussions about the value of public higher education.

The legislative session begins on January 24. Senators will hear from the administration as they begin to shape and consult on the University's story. He hopes to proceed forward in a unified and coordinated way.

Lastly, diversity to the University population will be a continued focus. By 2035, demographers predict that the majority of the Twin Cities population will be non-white. The University has to start now to renew its commitment to bringing people from diverse backgrounds into the community and educational process. This needs to happen for students through admissions and for faculty and staff through hiring, recruiting, and retention.

14. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: While there is support for the initiatives from your inaugural speech, there is a trend that threatens the University. This is focus or obsession on the time to graduation, measured from the time someone arrives at the University. This started with undergraduates, but is being expanded to graduate students in the wave of proposed graduate education policies. While this may make sense for people who can commit fulltime, this has the effect of discouraging and, in some cases, financially penalizing units that see it as part of their mission to provide degree education to working professionals or to others who cannot commit to fulltime study in their graduate degrees. What is your view on how the University's mission extends to enrolling and educating less than full-time graduate students?

A: He was a member of the NRC committee that did the recent ranking and rating of graduate programs. A report was issued and included a concern about the time to degree and how that factors into the overall quality of a program. At the Ph.D. level, there was a substantial debate on the committee about whether a long time to a degree being a good or bad concept. The short answer is that this depends. The conversation he is interested in having and encouraging faculty to have with each other is around excellence. If there is a terrific program that focuses on providing an education to part-time students, there is not an issue. However, he is troubled by degree programs that take a long time to degree and the fraction of graduating students is small. There are few more wasteful elements than trapping someone in a degree program where that degree is an ever-receding target. If the University is not able to engage the student population, whether full-time or part-time, and enable them to effectively achieve their educational goal, then the University is not helping. This is one element of a larger evaluation.

15. UNIVERSITY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

16. UNIVERSITY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

NONE

17. UNIVERSITY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 3:03 pm.

18. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Christopher Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that FCC has engaged in substantial activity since the last report of the Chair, delivered by Professor VandenBosch in May. For more details, FCC provided a written quarterly report activities to the Board of Regents at their September meeting and that that report is available in the Regents public docket materials.

In addition to consultation on the Finance and Planning Report and Gender Equity in Salaries Study that appear later on the agenda, FCC has focused on 1) communication - how to spread the word about the fabulous work the University does to all the right constituencies and ensure that it is both understood and appreciated?, 2) accountability - what steps should the University take to demonstrate more clearly the value of state and student investment in the University and its activities?, 3) ongoing reorganization of graduate studies and the Graduate School in terms of funding, people, and metrics, 4) enrollment management - where to grow, where to shrink, how to balance cost, demand, and quality, 5) equity, diversity, and climate issues across the University, 6) the budget, 7) strategic planning newly initiated in the Office of Human Resources, 8) University autonomy in the framework of the state and its constitutional structures, 9) information and enterprise systems, EFS, PeopleSoft upgrades, and system interoperability, 10) a visit to Morris to discuss issues most pertinent to our faculty colleagues on that campus, and 11) the report of the Academic Health Center (AHC) Review Steering Committee.

FCC has also asked the Educational Policy Committee to consider whether additional context should be provided when reporting grades; the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee to assess the efficacy of post-tenure review in practice; the Faculty Affairs Committee to discuss means to characterize and communicate faculty productivity; and the AHC FCC to prepare a formal response to the AHC Review report. Members of FCC met with each provostal candidate during their individual campus visits.

To finish, he returned to item one from his list, communication. If there is one thing that the FCC would like every faculty member to think about, it is this: if you have been complacent about devoting your every waking moment to teaching and research and always felt that it was not worth your time to try to engage the incognizant public outside the ivory tower, that time has definitely passed. Faculty have great stories to tell and hearts and minds to win over by engaging with the public. He heard someone say that “faculty have work to do”. Is it yet one more thing

to get done with fewer resources and less time? Sadly, yes, but the consequences of failing successfully to engage our public stakeholders would be still more dire. In the coming year, I expect FCC to come back to this topic again and again, and the committee is eager to team with the administration, and faculty colleagues with scholarly expertise in this area, to develop new strategies for showcasing the contributions made by faculty and all University staff to the future of Minnesota.

19. FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS UPDATE

Professor Elizabeth Boyle, one of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons, is serving in this role this year along with Professor Caroline Hayes. Their role is to go to the legislature and be a faculty presence, report back to the faculty, and coordinate faculty testimony at the capital.

At the last Senate meeting last year, a bill had been worked out that severely cut the University. In the compromise bill that stemmed from the government shutdown, the University recovered some of the budget cuts that were in the earlier proposal and the limit on stem cell research was removed entirely. She thanked the faculty who played a role by talking with their legislatures, the Governor, and neighbors. This year the state will deal with capital projects and there is the possibility that budget discusses will also be reopened.

Finally, the Faculty Consultative Committee met with Senator Pappas this summer to discuss the role of faculty at the capital. She stated that the legislators want to hear from and see faculty, staff, and students. She asked senators to continue their efforts or to make contact if they have not done so in the past.

20. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES 2011-12 Committees of the Faculty Senate Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To approve the Faculty Senate committee memberships for 2011-12. A simple majority is required for approval.

Faculty Senate committee memberships:

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE - Faculty: Barbara Elliott and Christine Marran (co-chairs), Yusuf Abul-Hajj, Christopher Federico, Joseph Gaugler, Teresa Kimberley, Jessica Larson, Paul Porter, Terrence Simon, Carol Wells. **Academic Professionals:** William Craig, Gary Peter. **Ex Officio:** Arlene Carney, Paula O'Loughlin.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY - Faculty/PA: Thomas Brothen (chair), Lee-Ann Breuch, Norman Chervany, Alon McCormick, Peh Ng, Jane Phillips, Margaret Root Kustritz, Leslie Schiff, Paul Siliciano, Elaine Tarone, Cathrine Wambach, 1 to be named. **Students:** Sean Finn, 4 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Barbara Brandt, Robert McMaster, Henning Schroeder.

FACULTY AFFAIRS - Faculty: George Sheets (chair), William Beeman, Ben Bornshtein, Linda Chlan, Kathryn Hanna, Joseph Konstan, Frank Kulacki, Benjamin Munson, Jason Shaw, Geoffrey Sirc, James Wojtaszek. **Academic Professionals:** Randy Croce, Pamela Stenhjem. **Ex Officio:** Kathryn Brown, Arlene Carney, Dann Chapman, Barbara Elliott, Theodor Litman, Christine Marran. **Students:** 2 to be named.

JUDICIAL - Faculty: Paula O'Loughlin (chair), David Andow, David Biesboer, Martha Bigelow, David Born, Sauman Chu, Patricia Frazier, Marti Hope Gonzales, Satish Gupta, Kenneth Heller, Brian Horgan, Kathleen Hull, Kim Johnson, Thomas Larson, Dawn Lowe, George Maldonado, Susan Noakes, Mary Lay Schuster, Paul Shaw, Roderick Squires. **Legal Advisor:** Jan Halverson, Karen Schanfield.

RESEARCH - Faculty: Linda Bearinger (chair), Alvaro Alonso, Melissa Anderson, Anna Clark, Paul Cleary, Jerry Cohen, Demoz Gebre, Maria Gini, Seung-Ho Joo, Jennifer Linde, Randy Moore, Christopher Nappa, Kola Okuyemi, LaDora Thompson, J.T. Vaughan. **Academic Professionals:** Greg Haugstad, Kyla Wahlstrom. **Civil Service:** Margaret Catambay. **Students:** Breanne Byiers, Marc Dunham, 1 to be named. **Ex Officio:** Arlene Carney, Robin Dittmann, Frances Lawrenz, Tucker LeBien, Timothy Mulcahy, Federico Ponce de Leon, Karen Williams, Lynn Zentner.

FOR INFORMATION:

ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTER FACULTY CONSULTATIVE - Faculty: Colin Campbell (chair), Susan Berry, Cynthia Gross, Leslie Lytle, Paul Olin, Ned Patterson, Cheryl Robertson, 1 to be named. **Ex Officio:** 1 to be named.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS - Faculty/PA: Virginia Zuiker (chair), Rayla Allison, Linda Brady, Ravi Janardan, Timothy Johnson, Perry Leo, Na'im Madyun, Paul Siliciano, Jennifer Tigges. **Civil Service:** Patricia Roth. **Alumni:** Archie Givens, Tim Manning. **Students:** Robert Peters, 3 to be named. **Ex Officio:** J.T. Bruett, Lynn Holleran, Joel Maturi.

FACULTY ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS - Faculty: Timothy Johnson (chair), Patrick Arndt, Linda Brady, Sean Garrick, Susan Meyer Goldstein, Murray Jensen, Perry Leo, Virginia Zuiker. **Ex Officio:** J.T. Bruett, Lynn Holleran, Sue Van Voorhis.

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE - Faculty: Christopher Cramer (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Walt Jacobs, Elaine Tyler May, Jan McCulloch, James Pacala, Kathryn VandenBosch. **Ex Officio:** Linda Bearinger, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Carol Chomsky, Caroline Hayes, Russell Luepker, George Sheets, Kathryn VandenBosch, Richard Ziegler.

**JOANNA O'CONNELL, CHAIR
FACULTY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**21. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW AMENDMENT
Faculty Consultative Committee Charge
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article IV, Section 5(H) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~). As an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate (81) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

ARTICLE IV. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Changes to this article are subject to vote only by the Faculty Senate)

5. Faculty Senate Committee Charges

...

H. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

...

Membership

...

- The Nominating Subcommittee is responsible for identifying Twin Cities faculty candidates for the Faculty Consultative Committee. The Nominating Subcommittee shall consist of the Twin Cities voting members of the Faculty Consultative Committee (except the chair and vice chair), the chairs of Senate committees who are ex officio members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, and the immediate past voting members of the Faculty Consultative Committee. The Nominating Subcommittee shall elect a chair from among its members. The Nominating Subcommittee shall nominate twice as many faculty candidates for the Faculty Consultative Committee, who are confirmed as willing to serve, as are to be elected each year from the Twin Cities campus and from those faculty from the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections. To achieve balanced representation across the Twin Cities campus, the Nominating Subcommittee may choose to pair candidates. The final slate of candidates shall be announced in the Faculty Senate docket for a spring semester meeting. Additional nominations of eligible faculty, confirmed as willing to serve, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the Twin Cities faculty, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Senate the day before the Faculty Senate meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Faculty Senate by members of the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation when the slate is presented. If the nominees are paired, any additional nomination shall specify against which pair the nominee will run. The clerk of the Senate shall present the slate to the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation for its approval. In the event there are additional nominations, the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation will reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected by voting by secret ballot. ~~shall by vote in order to reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected. The vote shall be taken by secret ballot in a manner determined by the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation. The clerk of the Senate shall present the final slate the Twin Cities Faculty Delegation for its approval.~~ The slate as approved shall be presented to the faculty for an election, conducted in accordance with the preceding paragraph of the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

...

Duties and Responsibilities

...

- j. To ~~make~~ approve editorial changes in existing administrative policies previously approved by the Faculty Senate and in Faculty Senate policies and documents (including the constitution, bylaws, and rules), and to reflect changes in titles of administrative offices or officers; the changes will be reported to the Faculty Senate for information.
- k. To correct grammatical and punctuation errors and to approve other non-substantive technical amendments in existing administrative policies previously approved by the Faculty Senate and in Faculty Senate documents (including the constitution, bylaws, and rules); such actions will be reported to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting and the Faculty Senate may then overrule the Faculty Consultative Committee.
- kl. To provide for a Business and Rules Committee composed of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Clerk of the Senate, and the Vice Chair of the Senate. The Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall serve as chair of the Business and Rules Committee. The Business and Rules Committee shall be responsible for drafting the docket of the Faculty Senate.

COMMENT:

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) was informed about the grammatical problem with the paragraph describing the Nominating Subcommittee and associated processes, and recommends correcting the language as noted.

FCC also concluded that it would be a better use of the Faculty Senate's time to permit changes such as these, entirely non-substantive, to be made by FCC and reported to the Faculty Senate for information—rather than having to waste the body's time voting on matters that are entirely clerical and non-controversial. As provided in the language, all such changes would be reported to the Faculty Senate at the meeting following the FCC vote and the Faculty Senate would have the authority to overrule FCC.

Changes to the constitution, even if clerical, non-substantive, and non-controversial, would also have to be approved by the Board of Regents.

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 114 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

**22. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Report on Vice Presidential Units
Discussion by the Faculty Senate**

SCFP Report on Vice Presidential Units at the University of Minnesota

Background:

In the context of the “new normal” facing the University of Minnesota, questions regarding the size and scope of administration are widely discussed. A natural corollary to this question about administration is the associated cost. These issues, raised in the Faculty Senate and by individual senators, were addressed by the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) during the spring semester.

The SCFP recognized it was relatively uninformed about the size and scope of many administrative activities and felt that presentations from the vice presidents would be helpful in its understanding and fulfilling its job of advising the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Faculty and University Senates and administration.

To accomplish this, the SCFP met with heads of eight vice presidential units: Carol Carrier – Office of Human Resources, Stephen Cawley – Office of Information Technology, Tim Mulcahy – Office of the VP for Research, Kathleen O’Brien – Office of University Services, Richard Pfutzenreuter – University Budget and Finance, Robert Jones - Office of the Senior VP for System Administration, Mark Rotenberg – Office of General Counsel, Tom Sullivan – Academic Affairs.

The Academic Health Center was excluded because of a new vice-president and a reorganization of that unit which began in the winter of 2011. It is anticipated that the SCFP will review this unit later in 2011.

A number of observations, conclusions and suggestions arose from these discussions. This report does not focus on any specific unit because each is distinct in its mission and scope of activities. Nonetheless, there are generalizations that can be made and should be considered by President Kaler.

Overview:

The SCFP began with the understanding that the University is a \$3+-billion organization, measured by its budget, and that any organization of that magnitude will have administrative costs associated with carrying out its mission. The questions that have been raised are (1) whether those costs are appropriate and (2) whether they are excessive by comparison with peer institutions, and perhaps by comparison to other non-profit organizations and private-sector organizations of comparable size. The SCFP did not have data available either on the University's peer research universities or the private sector, and believes that such comparisons are very difficult to make because of the many different ways organizations, public and private, categorize expenses and employees. The committee also observed that the University is one of the largest employers in the state.

The SCFP was impressed with the vice presidential organizations and the many tasks these administrative units perform to further the mission of the University. It is apparent that increasing regulations and related compliance costs, expanding research funding, and more students result in additional administrative work leading to expansion of some units. Also recognized are the burdens placed by external and internal groups, specifically, the expectations of politicians, alumni, businesses, and other groups outside of the University. Internally, the students, faculty, staff, and Regents place demands on the administration for services and structures to improve the education, research, and service missions. Finally, current and previous administrations expanded administrative units in keeping with advances in technology and their (the administration's) visions for the future.

With a new president and new administration, the SCFP believes now is the time to look at the administrative organization and functions. The need for examination and evaluation is heightened by the budget cuts in state funding. The following observations and suggestions

should be considered in the context of strengthening the education, research, and service missions of the institution.

Observations and Suggestions:

- a. There appears to be duplication of functions within vice presidential units. For example, several vice-presidential units have their own communications, information technology, and public relations staff. There are likely functions in college, department, and division subunits that also replicate these and other central administrative functions, although the SCFP did not review the colleges. While many functions within vice-presidential organizations are justifiable, it is questionable whether all are needed or cost efficient.
- b. Each vice presidential unit has numerous subunits performing important functions for that unit but there are also centers, institutes, and programs that may be or may not be associated with the mission of the vice-presidential unit. Many of these are the result of previous presidential initiatives and administrations. Some continue their existence well past their initiation and initial justification. Some may continue to play vital roles but others do not. It is not apparent why some subunits are in the vice-presidential unit where they are placed. It is also apparent that many subunits have no regular review or a sunset provision once they have achieved their initial goals. The administration should independently evaluate all these units for their continuance, merger and/or transfer to other units.

As noted in the attached appendix, all vice-presidential units require substantial human and other resources to perform their work. Steps have already been taken to reduce costs and streamline operations in many areas. This work should continue in the context of increasing financial pressures. The SCFP intends to continue to monitor progress in these activities.

The appendix (available at: http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/scfp/vp_unit_appendix.pdf) shows an organization chart for each unit.

**RUSSELL LUEPKER, CHAIR
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Russell Luepker, Chair of the Finance and Planning Committee (SCFP), stated that two years ago there was considerable debate during the discussion of pay cuts. One of the concerns raised was administrative costs of the University. The Faculty Senate leadership and several senators asked that this be examined more thoroughly and the task was passed to SCFP.

The committee realized that it was relatively uninformed on this topic. The approach taken was to ask for statements on the mission, and budget and staffing for the past three years. This was requested from Human Resources, Information Technology, Research, University Services, University Budget and Finance, System Academic Administration, General Counsel, and Academic Affairs. The Academic Health Center was not done as it was in the midst of reorganization.

The Vice Presidents were forthcoming with data and participated in two retreats as well as committee meetings. The committee learned that there are both internal and external forces which lead to demands for administrative services. Externally this includes regulations, oversight, politicians, businesses, alumni, and donors. Internally this ranges from the Regents to students, faculty, and staff. SCFP also recognized that the student body has increased substantially, which increases the demand for teaching as well as increases in research and new technologies.

SCFP reviewed the complex organizational charts for each area as well as budgets in associated full-time equivalents, which are complex and have been decreasing. The first concerns relates to duplication of services for human resources, information technology, and public relations. Many of these functions are also duplicated in the college, department, and division levels. The committee knows that all units would like their own person in these areas but the committee questioned the efficiency of these duplicated services.

The second concern related to subunits such as office and centers. Many perform necessary functions, such as the Duluth campus or payroll. Others were good ideas at one time but may be past their viability and mission, yet they continue as there is no systematic review regarding relevance and cost benefit. Many should probably be closed, merged, or transformed.

The committee believes that steps need to be taken to streamline the organization and will continue to monitor efforts in this area. In closing he thanked the Vice Presidents and committee members for their work on this report.

23. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Gender Equity in Salaries Study
Discussion by the Faculty Senate

FROM: E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

RE: Gender Equity in Salaries Study

I received today a report from an independent consultant regarding a statistical analysis of faculty salaries by gender on the Twin Cities campus. The report is the result of a process begun by the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC), which presented to me in May 2010 an analysis that indicated the existence of a gap between male and female faculty salaries on the Twin Cities campus. I shared the WFC report with the University's Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Human Resources. Following consultation with these offices, and additional consultation with the WFC and with leadership of the Faculty Consultative Committee, I directed the Vice President for Human Resources to work in collaboration with leadership from the WFC and the FCC, the Office of Institutional Research, and the Office for Equity and Diversity, to hire an independent outside consultant to advise the University regarding best practice methodologies for performing a statistical analysis of gender equity in faculty salaries at a complex research university.

Vice President Carol Carrier formed an Executive Steering Committee consisting of herself, WFC officers Michele Goodwin and Patricia Frazier, FCC chair and vice chair Kathryn VandenBosch and Christopher Cramer, Institutional Research Director Peter Radcliffe, Office for Equity and Diversity Associate Vice President Kris Lockhart, and Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff to the Provost Sharon Reich Paulsen. The Steering Committee assisted in the selection of the consultant, drafted scope-of-work directions, and met with the consultant several times, both in person and through video conferencing. The consultant also met separately with the Women's Faculty Cabinet, with FCC, and with the Senate Finance and Planning Committee. The resulting report is attached.

The consultant found "evidence that male faculty are, overall, paid an average of 2.2% more than female faculty." The consultant further indicated that "[m]ore detailed analyses provide statistical evidence that this gap in salary is not evenly distributed across the schools/colleges nor is it evenly distributed across the ranks." The consultant noted that: "[t]hese conclusions do not identify specific individuals whose salary warrants adjustment. Further, these methods do not

identify the causes of any gap in salary, and indeed, in some circumstances a gap in salary between male and female faculty might be justifiable based on merit or other information.” The consultant emphasized that “no single statistical model can capture all of the complexities of the salary structure of a large institution like the University of Minnesota. As a result, several models were examined, each based on its own set of assumptions. . . . These analyses strongly support the overall conclusions.” Among the limitations noted by the consultant are: (1) the analyses do not take merit into account; (2) the “results have very little to say about a given individual”; and (3) the results “cannot be considered to provide a proof that there is a gender gap in salary” (emphasis in original).

The consultant’s recommendations, based on his analysis, are: (1) “Develop a system for identifying and correcting cases where an individual’s salary should be appropriately adjusted.” Based on the consultant’s experience at the University of Wisconsin, he offered specific suggestions regarding a possible process to use, noting that the process should be individualized and that “an across-the-board remedy whereby each female faculty member receives a salary adjustment of 2.2% is not recommended” (emphasis in original); (2) “Work to identify the causes of salary inequities, and develop policies to prevent their recurrence”; and (3) “Routinely monitor faculty salaries at the institutional level.” More information regarding each of these recommendations is contained in the consultant’s report.

The June 22, 2011, report is available at:

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fsenate/110622_gender_equity_report.pdf

Paper copies will not be available at the meeting.

**CHRISTOPHER CRAMER, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Senior Vice President and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan stated that six years ago he appointed a Women’s Faculty Cabinet to advise his office on matters relevant to women faculty. In May 2010 the Cabinet brought him a report which suggested there are issues on the Twin Cities campus regarding gender distribution of salary. He noted that their study and ongoing discussion has excluded the Academic Health Center due to the large number of funding sources for salaries, which makes tracking and comparisons difficult.

Provost Sullivan asked to have the summer of 2010 to review the report, statistical analysis, methodology, laws, and literature on this topic. After this period, he told the Cabinet that his approach was that if he believed there was a statistical basis to believe that there were significant differences, based upon the statistics, the appropriateness of the methodology, and evidence from other institutions as to methodology used and practices employed, he would make a recommendation to move forward.

At the end of the summer he concluded that there is a reasonable basis to believe that there is a problem which needs to be pursued. He went back to the Cabinet, formed a steering committee, and sent out an RFP to hire an outside consultant. He believed that an expert in methodology, employment practices, and salary disparity was needed. The steering committee interviewed a number of people and selected a statistics professor from the University of Wisconsin – Madison who has published in and been an expert witness in this field, and who had been a key advisor on his campus during an earlier study and remediation.

On June 23, 2011, an official report was published. The report noted that male faculty overall are paid an average of 2.2 percent more than female faculty at the University. More detailed

analysis provides statistical evidence that this gap in salary is not evenly distributed across schools or colleges nor is it evenly distributed across ranks.

The report also noted that these conclusions do not identify specific individuals whose salaries warrant adjustment, the methodology did not identify causes or circumstances for the salary gap, and the analysis was not based on any view of merit and the role that it plays. There is also no single statistical model can capture all complexities of the salary structure of a large institution.

The consultant's report includes a statement that in the literature it is noted that there may be a bias or taint in any statistical analysis regarding rank. Provost Sullivan asked the consultant if he had done an analysis on rank and the response was that he had not. When asked if it could be provided, the consultant said yes. Provost Sullivan then requested that this analysis be provided and it should be available later this semester.

The report also discussed next steps if it were assumed that there was a problem which needed to be addressed in a systematic, formal, and transparent way. The Provost's expectation is that there is still a bias and that it will be able to be seen through the statistical analysis. If this is the case, the consultant has suggested and the Provost has endorsed the idea of the University taking various steps that are already in place at Madison.

First is to develop a system for identifying and correcting cases where an individual's salary should be appropriately adjusted. This will require drilling down to the department and college levels, as this is where salary decisions are made. Second is working to identify the causes of the salary inequities and develop policies to prevent their recurrence. Third is routine monitoring at the institutional level.

Provost Sullivan stated that the consultant has been invited back this semester for broad consultation on next steps for remedy, solution, and implementation of a plan.

Q: What has been the effect of the salary freezes over the past few years on salary inequity?

A: The only good thing about the salary freezes might be that the salary inequity did not become worse. As this is a salary freeze year, it is a good time to make changes.

Q: Is there any way to consider the "gendering" of knowledge in this analysis? In addition, a faculty member's department can not be the one variable used, especially with more interdisciplinary work.

A: One underlying conclusion in the analysis is that discipline will play a role and needs to be a factor when determining remedies. Interdisciplinarity needs to remain part of any conversation about solutions.

Q: A senator applauded the effort to determine causes as he knows that underlying causes can be investigated statistically. This includes a willingness to get competing offers to leave, which is the primary mechanism today to resolve inequity without regard to particulars of gender, race, or field. Can the gender inequity be compared with a random variable, such as alphabetical ranking, to determine if gender inequity is statistically significant?

A: This question is provocative but cannot be answered because it involves too much speculation at this point without methodology and statistics. There has been substantial discussion with the consultant and the steering committee about what role, if any, retention offers play. There is some evidence in the literature that male faculty receive more retention offers than women. The question then is whether they skew the data. This is a serious conversation that departments need to have. His view is that this a market force issue and the University needs to be realistic

about it and the compression problems that follow, as units have not always been sensitive to this issue. As he participates in the rotation of department heads and chairs, he notes that turnover is remarkable and may not be healthy or helpful in terms of faculty retention and recruitment. If there is greater longevity in these positions, then there is more opportunity for professional development and smoother decision-making in the departments.

Q: Where will this effort go, in a larger sense, from this point? If the University is still fact-finding and analyzing data, how can the University be thinking about mechanisms to cure the results of the gender discrimination and assess the salaries? What is the administration's plan to look at the underlying causes and mechanisms that continue to produce these outcomes and continue to create these problems?

A: Part two of the consultant's report contains details on this topic. As he noted earlier, the consultant has been invited back for campus discussions specifically to address experiences from Madison, how similar it is to Minnesota, how successful that effort was, and how should these efforts be done differently. He has also had conversations with the deans and asked them to begin preliminarily to look within the colleges and departments to see if the present data are helpful in addressing remedies. The remedy stage is just as important as the findings, which are almost complete. The University will then need to be serious about the cause, prevention, transparency, and monitoring going forward.

Professor Christopher Cramer, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), noted that he sits on the steering committee and believes that it would be good to have some level of oversight to examine individual salaries that are out of line based on what is predicted and ask if it is reasonable and justified based on a statistical approach. A system of this kind would have value to everyone.

Provost Sullivan stated that he has had preliminary and general conversations with the chancellors as to whether a campus-specific analysis is appropriate and timely.

A senator said that some salary variables tend to cluster around groups of faculty, such as women or parents. The process at the University is that each faculty has to pick one variable to argue against when many times it is a cluster of variables. There is also no place to go after receiving an unfair salary.

Another senator stated that the 2.2 percent from this analysis is good nationally, but it still needs to be remedied even if it is not statistically significant, just individually significant. This process also allows salaries to be compared to other institutions and disciplines.

Q: Why was the Academic Health Center (AHC) excluded from this analysis?

A: The consultant felt that the sources of income for most AHC salaries were so varied and different that it would be hard to put them in a statistical model, both on an absolute basis as well as on a relative basis. This issue is true for all the AHC colleges except for Nursing. His recommendation is that each dean should begin looking at this issue. The AHC will be involved in the remedy stage.

In closing Provost Sullivan thanked the Women's Faculty Cabinet for their role in this matter and the opportunity for Minnesota to be a model.

24. FACULTY SENATE OLD BUSINESS

NONE

25. FACULTY SENATE NEW BUSINESS

MOTION:

To approve the following statements:

Statement on Professor Judith Martin
Senate Committee on Finance and Planning

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning notes with great sadness the untimely death of one of its valued members and former chair, Professor Judith Martin. Professor Martin was deeply and actively dedicated to the welfare of the University and demonstrated that commitment in her service to us over many years and in many ways. She provided valuable insights to the Committee and brought a wealth of knowledge, experience, and wisdom that are irreplaceable. She also brought warmth, a lively wit, and charm to the Committee. She will be greatly missed.

Adopted unanimously October 4, 2011

Statement on Professor Judith Martin
Faculty Consultative Committee

We join our colleagues on the Committee on Finance and Planning in expressing our deep sadness at the death of Professor Judith Martin. As former member and chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, and in her many other roles in and outside of governance, she contributed enormously to the well-being of faculty, staff, and students at the University. We and the University have suffered a great loss and we mourn her passing.

Adopted unanimously October 5, 2011

COMMENT:

The Faculty Consultative Committee asks for unanimous consent to include these two statements in the minutes of the October 6 Faculty Senate meeting.

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

26. FACULTY SENATE ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2011-12 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

OCTOBER 6, 2011

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 1

The first meeting of the Student Senate for 2011-12 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall on Thursday, October 6, 2011, at 11:36 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by ITV. Checking or signing the roll as present were student members. Chair Adam Matula presided.

**1. STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING SUBCOMMITTEE
Approval of Appointed Senators
Action**

MOTION:

That the Student Senate approve the appointment of the following Twin Cities student senators:

Claire Carlson – College of Science and Engineering
Olivia Collins – School of Nursing
Del Doherty – College of Pharmacy
Dustin Kakach – College of Biological Sciences
David Naistat – School of Public Health

**ADAM MATULA, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

2. P&A SENATE UPDATE

For Information:

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

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

Discussion:

Ann Hagen, Vice Chair of the P&A Senate, said that this is the first P&A Senate update as the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) became the P&A Senate on July 1, 2011. She serves as the Chair-elect this year. A retreat was held in August for all senators and alternates. Vice President Kathy Brown from Human Resources attended the meeting and spoke about comments from the legislature and Regents regarding too many administrators at the University. As the P&A classification includes administrators, as well as teachers, researchers, and advisors, the P&A Senate is interested in this topic.

The first P&A Senate meeting is scheduled for tomorrow. Professor Chris Cramer, Chair of the Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees, is on the agenda along with the four subcommittee work plans.

3. CIVIL SERVICE SENATE UPDATE

For Information:

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

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

Discussion:

Don Cavalier, Chair of the Civil Service Senate, said that this is the first report from the Civil Service Senate as this group was formed on July 1, 2011, to provide more opportunities for civil service employees to participate in governance and increase the visibility of this employee group. There is also a 13-member consultative committee that aligns with the rest of the Senate governance structure. A retreat was held in August and a survey of all 4700 civil service employees was conducted this summer which will provide guidance for the committee this year.

4. STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Adam Matula, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that the first priority for both groups has been to fill open SSCC and Student Senate seats. Along this line, nominations for the Vice Chair will be accepted later in this meeting. He has met with Chris Tastad to discuss Student Senate involvement in the Minnesota Student Legislative Coalition (MSLC). Nominations will be accepted later in this meeting as well to fill an ex officio position on the MSLC. Lastly members of SSCC have been invited to participate in the Provost search by meeting with each candidate during governance interviews.

5. DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT KALER

President Kaler joined the meeting to talk with the Student Senate and answer questions. He stated that he is a fan of student governance. When he was at the University as a graduate student, he served as a student representative to the Regents. He is closing in on the completion

of his first 100 days. This has been a period of listening, learning, beginning to know this University, and acquaint himself with the students, faculty, and staff, as well as friends across the state. There is passion, excitement, and affection for the institution. When people are mad at the University, it is more a feeling of disappointment in someone or something they love not doing something that they like.

His inauguration week was a special time and contains many memories for his family and him. For any student who took part in the week, he appreciated the help. He met students while walking across the Washington Avenue bridge and in the Coffman Union bowling alley.

He and his office are continuing to be as open and accessible to constituencies as possible. He continues to have a regular dialog with the Minnesota Daily to address student questions and concerns. He is looking forward to having an opportunity to go on Radio K and respond to students in this venue. It is important for him to listen to students and for students to hear from and interact with him going forward.

President Kaler spoke about the pillars of his administration, which include excellence and access. There is a need to look carefully at what the University does, move the things done well to excellence and look hard at things not done well, for any reason, and decide to step back and refocus resources on things that can be done more effectively and will have a larger impact. This will add value to each student's degree and set the stage for a successful institution.

Access is the other side of this coin and needs to be maintained for qualified Minnesota students. Costs need to be controlled to mitigate the need for future tuition increases. He is going to work hard with the state to get this message across and to explain the value that the University brings to people throughout the state.

His inauguration speech mentioned several other elements. One is diversity, which is critical to the health of the institution. One cannot deal with the future of the state of Minnesota without addressing this issue. By 2035, demographers predict that the majority of the Twin Cities population will be non-white. The University has to start now to renew its commitment to bringing people from diverse backgrounds into the community and educational process. This needs to happen for students through admissions and for faculty and staff through hiring, recruiting, and retention.

The University is the state's only public research institution so the focus on the research mission needs to be sharp and unwavering. The University has top faculty and great facilities, but needs to make sure that it has the infrastructure to support and maintain itself at a high level and can attract the best graduate and post-doctoral students.

The senior leaders have heard him discuss working more efficiently and effectively as the status quo is not acceptable. This will drive savings and efficiency. Questions to be asked include why is someone doing what they are doing, what can be done better, should it be done, and if stopped, would anyone notice. These changes will be made over time.

One of the most important things that can be done is to tell the University's story. This story makes him proud, includes cures and inventions, and generates \$8.6 billion per year for the state. The University needs student help and he will be engaging the student leaders to tell their stories to the state leaders and legislators as state support is a bedrock of the institution. However private giving and philanthropy will also be aggressively pushed for tuition scholarship support to provide access to all students regardless of their family situation. This is a wealthy community that has drawn enormous benefit from the University and now will be asked to give back.

Q: How can the Student Senate best help the University with the legislature and community?

A: Students need to be willing to engage thought leaders in the local communities. The diversity of the University system is one of the great strengths. It is no longer possible to think that the state knows that the University is a great investment and will do the right thing. The most effective people to engage the public and tell their story are students who are being impacted by the University.

Q: How do you envision getting students to the legislature?

A: The session starts on January 24 and student leaders will hear from the administration about approaches that can be taken. It is important to have large numbers of students and students from particular districts. More details will be released as the session begins but this engagement is a contact sport and he hopes students will help.

Q: What have you heard from students in your first 100 days?

A: He has heard about student pride in the University and concern about class size and availability. Overall most students are satisfied with their education. Some students are concerned about budget allocations and tuition increases, which may be based on financial data that is not transparent. This means that the University's communication on these issues is not clear for all students. He has tried to show students that he hears their concerns by putting one-third of the extra funding from the legislature towards mitigating the 2013 tuition increase. He asks to be judged on what he says and does. If there are points of disagreement, then a discussion needs to take place.

Q: Are any students or student groups going to be involved in the legislative preparation?

A: Government Relations needs to work with the student groups to coordinate a University message of positive goodness. He acknowledges that some student views will not be congruent with his views but need to be expressed. He does not believe that students and the University should be pitted against one another as this is not helpful to either group.

Q: Besides tuition costs, what other students issues will be a focus?

A: The University needs to continue to supply a path to graduation in four years. This means that timely and sufficient course availability is a key factor. Good advising is also important so that students receive realistic advice going forward. These are two areas in which he can have the greatest impact.

Q: As the University will be asked to streamline its processes, a concern is that a liberal education is harder to justify on paper. How important is a liberal education and how will these differences be reconciled?

A: The United States is still the best in the world in higher education and health care. The fundamental reason why American higher education is the best is because it is founded on a cornerstone of a liberal arts education. A student's ability to think rationally, question, to be critical, to express themselves in writing and orally is essential to what the University does. Stepping back from this mission would be stupid and diminish the quality of the University's education. Liberal education is also a critical part of the creative process. A student can imagine new ways of thinking and expression through liberal education. A different process that could be examined instead is the University's tolerance for or aversion to risk.

Q: What is the status of the Provost search?

A: He received an acceptance of his offer today and there will be a public announcement next week.

Q: How will decreased spending on risk affect the number of student jobs available?

A: It is too early for specifics. There are jobs to be done and people here doing work. The goal will be to make sure that employees are doing the most important jobs.

Q: While the United States does humanities well, many of these departments are under attack. There is a crisis in Europe and Canada, and has lead to students from other countries being frightened of closed departments when they come to the United States for an education. What is the University's commitment to graduate education in these areas?

A: There is an international and national debate on the nature, structure, and value of PhDs in these areas. The task for faculty and students in these fields is to answer the question as to why they are under attack. Sometimes it is because some elements within these fields are not as intellectually rich and deep as they should be. His challenge is to reinvent the scholarship to make it intellectually rich, relevant, and impactful to today's society. The vigor and enthusiasm will return. There are some areas, likely not at the University, where work in these fields is redundant and does not train students to engage the problems that face the country and culture today.

6. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – no report.

Duluth – Harrison Defries stated that UMDSA has been reaching out to the other campus student groups to improve relations. They have also been focused on improving the online course guide and the multiculturalization of the curriculum.

Morris – Jaycob Robinson said that MCSA is working on public relations with the student body and increasing the diversity of its constituency. They also recently approved the MSLC charter.

Rochester – Evan Doyle noted that RSA is just starting and looking to expand its membership. It has been involved in selecting equipment for the new campus facility.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly – no report.

Minnesota Student Association - Lizzy Shay said that MSA has approved a bylaw change to integrate MSLC into the organization and its budget. There has been a high degree of freshmen involvement and three interns.

7. MINUTES FOR MAY 5, 2011

Action

MOTION:

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssenate/110505stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**8. 2011-12 COMMITTEES OF THE STUDENT SENATE
Action**

Student Senate committee memberships:

STUDENT AFFAIRS - Students: Silvia Canelon (co-chair), Kristy Eder, Patricia Nguyen, Rachel Nguyen, Brandee Polson, Lauren Schrader, 3 to be named. **Faculty/PA:** Joyce Holl (co-chair), Anthony Albecker, Elena Machkasova, Amber Peifer, Michael Stebleton, Carlos Torelli. **Alumni:** Nathan Pelzer. **Civil Service:** Thomas Bilder. **Ex Officio:** Kendre Turonie, Amelious Whyte.

FOR INFORMATION:

ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTER STUDENT CONSULTATIVE - Students: Sean Corvin (chair), Samantha Berget, Aklilu Beyenne, Mark DeRocher, Kit Johnson, Steve Larson, Chase Lembeck, Barry Park, Lynn Seuer, Leah Tacheny, Bill Tessman, Lindsey Tischer, 6 to be named.

STUDENT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - Students: To be named (chair), 7 to be named

STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE - Students: Adam Matula (chair), Angela Bartholomew, Harrison Defries, Jaycob Robinson, Adair Rounthwaite, and 5 to be named.

**JOANNA O'CONNELL, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**9. NOMINATIONS 2011-12 STUDENT SENATE/
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR**

Joshua Preston was nominated for the Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Vice Chair position. SSCC will finalize this position.

**10. ELECTION OF 2011-12 TWIN CITIES MEMBERS OF THE
STUDENT SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Election by Twin Cities Senators Only**

Sophie Wallerstedt was elected as the undergraduate representative. There were no nominations for a graduate/professional representative.

**11. ELECTION OF 2011-12 TWIN CITIES UNDERGRADUATE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES MEMBER
Election by Twin Cities Undergraduate Senators Only**

Jonathan Coleman, Isaac Monke-Lundberg, and Kyla Olson were elected.

**12. 2011-12 SENATE AGENDA ITEMS
Discussion**

Senators mentioned the following possible agenda items for this year:

- Retreat should be planned so that senators can create goals and initiatives for the year as well as provide an opportunity to meet
- New administrators should be invited to speak to the Student Senate
- More discussions should take place with the student associations/assembly as well as MSLC
- Resolution should be proposed with state-wide significance

13. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

14. NEW BUSINESS

Adam Matula stated that nominations would be accepted today for senators who are interested in serving in one ex officio position on the MSLC.

Joshua Preston noted that MSLC is an effort to centralization communication for effective student lobbying throughout the University system. This is not a new initiative but was in place until 10 years ago when student funding to the organization was cut. Last year's rally at the capital showed that one student rally per year is not effective. What is needed is a sustained and organized lobbying effort from students for the entire legislative process. MSLC organized this summer and reached out to each campus for members. The MSLC charter is still waiting approval from some campuses.

Q: What is the timeline to form the MSLC?

A: There are already representatives in place from each campus even without an approved charter. Literature has also been drafted and representatives are being asked to organize one public session on each campus to solicit student input. Next week the organization plans to testify on the redistricting proposal.

Dustin Kakach, Kyle Olson, and Andy Showalter expressed interest in the position. It was agreed that the charter would be forwarded to them before final nominations were accepted and SSCC selected the ex officio representative.

15. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:41 pm.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor

APPENDIX A

ELECTED MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES, 2010-11 (key to unit codes follows membership list)

ELECTED FACULTY/FACULTY-LIKE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS

	Unit	Term		Unit	Term
Abosch, Aviva	25	11-14	Eells, Linda	23	11-14
Allen, Sharon	25	06-12	Elliott, Sean	25	11-14
Anderson, Kristin	32	09-12	Federico, Christopher	22	10-13
Arnold, Bill	35	10-13	Gewirtz, Abigail	15	11-14
Avery, Patricia	15	11-12	Gulliver, Robert	35	09-12
Bache, Robert	25	06-12	Gundel, Jeanette	22	10-13
Bakdash, Bashar	7	07-13	Gupta, Angela	26	11-14
Barnes, Randal	35	09-12	Gupta, Kalpna	25	07-13
Bebeau, Muriel	7	09-12	Hamamoto, Darryl	7	06-12
Beeman, William	22	07-13	Hartley, Debra	22	11-12
Belani, Kumar	25	06-12	Heimdahl, Mats	35	09-12
Bohjanen, Paul	25	09-12	Hellerstedt, Wendy	32	09-12
Bond, Daniel	3	09-12	Hertz, Marshall	25	10-13
Boulger, James	25	06-12	Ho, Karen	22	10-13
Bradeen, James	17	11-14	Hogquist, Kristin	25	10-13
Braun, Bruce	22	09-13	Hollister, David	15	11-14
Breen, Sheri	27	11-14	Horgan, Brian	17	10-13
Brown, Robert	22	09-12	Hunter, David	25	09-12
Brunner, C. Cryss	15	11-13	Ingbar, David	25	07-13
Buhlmann, Phil	35	10-13	Jara, Cynthia	8	11-14
Burns, Matthew	15	11-14	Jasper, Daniel	8	11-13
Campbell, Colin	25	09-12	Kalambokidis, Laura	17	10-13
Campbell, Stephen	35	10-13	Kaler, Eric	30	11-12
Caraway, Teri	22	11-14	Kaminsky, Amy	22	11-14
Chervany, Norman	24	07-13	Kannan, Mathur	41	10-13
Church, Tim	32	11-14	Kirkpatrick, David	3	11-14
Churchill, Julie	41	09-12	Kohlstedt, Sally Gregory	35	10-13
Cleary, Paul	25	09-12	Konstan, Joseph	35	09-12
Cloyd, James	29	10-13	Kotlyar, Michael	29	11-14
Cody, 22udia	26	11-14	Kudrle, Robert	31	07-13
Cohen, Gary	22	11-14	Kulacki, Frank	35	09-12
Cohen, Jerry	17	10-13	Labuz, Joseph	35	11-14
Connett, John	32	11-14	Largaespada, David	25	09-12
Coulter, Jeffrey	17	10-13	Leitner, Helga	22	09-12
D'Amato, Anthony	17	09-12	Lilyard, Caroline	23	10-13
Davies, Rebecca	41	11-14	Liu, Donald	17	09-12
Davis, Dana	25	11-14	Looman, Wendy	28	11-13
Deane, Bradley	27	09-12	Low, Walter	25	09-12
Dee, Jayne Hager	26	09-12	Lytle, Leslie	32	11-14
DiCostanzo, Alfredo	17	11-12	Mann, Traci	22	09-12
Duke, Gordon	24	09-12	Marczak, Mary	26	09-12
Durfee, William	35	11-14	Marden, Albert	35	09-12

	Unit	Term		Unit	Term
Marsolek, Chad	22	11-14	Ricketts, Richard	13	08-14
Martenson, Diana	26	09-12	Robinson, Julia	8	09-12
McComas, Jennifer	15	11-13	Rodman, Gilbert	22	10-13
McCormick, Richard	22	11-14	Rodriguez, Michael	15	09-12
McGuire, Lisa	23	09-12	Rowekamp, Jenise	5	11-14
McLoon, Linda	25	10-13	Ruden, Paul	35	11-14
Mescher, Matthew	25	10-13	Sarafoglou, Kyriakie	25	11-14
Miller, Cara	26	11-14	Schottel, Janet	3	10-13
Minicucci, Larissa	41	10-13	Schuster, Joseph	25	11-14
Montgomery, Rebecca	17	11-14	Sell, George	35	10-13
Morrell, Peter	17	11-14	Shank, JB	22	11-14
Morris, Leslie	22	11-13	Shier, Thomas	29	08-14
Morrison, Fred	21	09-12	Shimizu, Yoji	25	07-13
Murtaugh, Michael	41	09-12	Sick, Brian	25	07-13
Ng, Peh	27	10-13	Siepmann, Ilja	35	10-13
Orr, Harry	25	10-13	Simon, Terrence	35	09-12
Osterholm, Michael	32	10-13	Smith, Cheryl	17	11-14
Ostrow, Steven	22	07-13	Stelson, Kim	35	11-14
Page, Michelle	27	07-13	Strock, Jeffrey	17	09-12
Pearson, Kathryn	22	11-14	Stromberg, Bert	41	11-14
Peden-McAlpine, Cynthia	28	09-14	Taussig, Karen-Sue	22	09-12
Peterson, Sabrina	17	09-12	Thorpe, Suzanne	21	07-13
Poch, Robert	15	10-13	Tims, Albert	22	10-13
Pogoff, Lisa	32	11-14	van Ryn, Michelle	25	11-14
Porter, Mary	25	10-13	Vercellotti, Gregory	25	06-12
Prell, Riv-Ellen	22	09-12	Wakefield, Ray	22	06-12
Pyles, Lee	25	10-13	Waldfogel, Joel	24	11-14
Rabinowitz, Paula	22	11-14	Wambach, Cathrine	15	09-12
Ramachandran, Gurumurthy	32	10-13	Watson, Christopher	15	09-12
Rayburn, Judy	24	07-13	Watson, Peter	22	11-12
Reinders, Anke	3	10-13	Wells, Carol	25	11-14
Rhodus, Nelson	7	09-12	Wolfe, Thomas	22	11-12

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

	Unit	Term		Unit	Term
Ben-Ner, Avner	24	11-14	Jacobs, Walt	22	11-14
Bitterman, Peter	25	10-13	May, Elaine Tyler	22	11-14
Chomsky, Carol	21	08-12	McCulloch, Jan	15	09-12
Cramer, Christopher	35	09-12	Pacala, James	25	11-14
Ehlke, Nancy	17	10-13	VandenBosch, Kathryn	3	09-12
Ericksen, Janet	27	11-14			

ELECTED STUDENT MEMBERS

	Unit	Term		Unit	Term
Aasness, Alisha	6	11-12	Naistat, David	32	11-12
Bode, Hannah	11	11-12	Nelson, Sara	18	11-12
Brakke, Noah	14	11-12	Olson, Kyle	22	11-12
Carlson, Claire	35	11-12	Preston, Joshua	27	10-12
Coleman, Jonathan	24	11-12	Rybak, Lindsay	15	11-12
Collins, Olivia	28	11-12	Saphner, Katharine	22	11-12
Deland, Lauren	18	11-12	Schreiner, Joshua	22	11-12
Doherty, Del	29	11-12	Schuster, Damien	22	11-12
Dorumsgaard, Cody	12	11-12	Sellner, Wesley	35	10-12
Dullinger, Jackie	6	11-12	Showalter, Andy	27	11-12
Durham-Shapiro, Emily	18	11-12	Singh, Amit	18	11-12
Ha, Kevin	21	11-12	Strand, Zachary	22	11-12
Heyduk, Courtnee	34	11-12	Vandevoorde, Kathleen	18	11-12
Hoffmann, Melody	18	10-12	Vincent, Jared	10	11-12
Judd, Chris	17	11-12	Wallerstedt, Sophie	22	11-12
Kakach, Dustin	3	11-12	Warner, Nathan	35	11-12
Monke-Lundberg, Isaac	22	11-12			

STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

	Unit	Term		Unit	Term
Bartholomew, Angela	6	11-12	Mohn, Becky	22	11-12
Defries, Harrison	12	11-12	Park, Sharin	22	11-12
Khan, Kanza	34	11-12	Robinson, Jaycob	27	11-12
Matula, Adam	35	11-12	Rounthwaite, Adair	18	10-12

ELECTED ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS

	Unit	Term		Unit	Term
Anderson, Neil D.	26	08-14	Kucera, Jean	22	11-14
Craig, William	38	10-13	Kurtti, Erling	40	09-12
DeZelar-Tiedman, Christine	23	09-13	Murdoch, Cynthia	37	11-14
Dilworth, Stephanie	8	10-13	Pearthree, Steven	15	10-12
Doerr, Susan	33	07-12	Schulz, Cathy	15	11-13
Enrici, Pamela	13	08-14	Seifert, Laura	22	11-12
Fulda, Henry	27	10-13	Shamliyan, Tatyana	32	10-13
Gilbert, Scott	35	10-13	Simon, Kimberly	16	08-12
Grimes, Stacey	31	11-14	Trautman, Travis	37	11-14
Hagen, Ann	7	11-13	Waldemar, Sarah	33	11-14
Hearn, Stephen	23	08-12	Wareham, Roger	27	10-13
Jansen, Kirsten	22	06-12	Weber-Paxton, Sheryl	5	11-14
Jetter, Mary	19	09-12			

ELECTED CIVIL SERVICE MEMBERS

	Unit	Term		Unit	Term
Barsness, Josette	35	07-13	Nyberg, Dennis	24	11-12
Cable-Morrison, Susan	19	09-12	O'Neill, Bill	40	11-14
Cavalier, Don	6	10-12	Olson, Amy L.	29	11-13
DeVriendt, Rod	41	08-12	Paton, John	25	11-14
Engbretson, Brent	1	11-14	Roth, Patricia	4	11-14
Fedie, Elizabeth	25	10-13	Seeger, Paula	37	10-13
Flynn, Everett	30	10-12	Stevens, Chris	13	11-13
Frank-Quick, Alison	28	11-14	Tool, Joanie	32	07-13
Hussain, Rahfat	7	11-14	Van Eps, Sharon	27	11-14
Kurland, Jeffrey	4	10-13	Wagner, Susan	22	09-12
Lantz, Caryn	19	10-13	Wallace, Terri	22	10-13
Mason, Lisa	34	11-12	Willhite, Gary	6	11-14
Nielsen, Carol	15	10-13			

UNIVERSITY SENATE CODES

	Unit		Unit
Academic Health Center	1	Human Resources	19
Agricultural Experiment Station	2	Information Technology	20
Biological Sciences	3	Law	21
Budget & Finance	4	Liberal Arts	22
Continuing Education	5	Libraries	23
Crookston	6	Management	24
Dentistry	7	Medical School	25
Design	8	Minnesota Extension	26
Duluth, Business and Economics	9	Morris	27
Duluth, Education and Human Service Professions	10	Nursing	28
Duluth, Fine Arts	11	Pharmacy	29
Duluth, Liberal Arts	12	President	30
Duluth, Other (includes non- collective bargaining faculty/academic professionals from Duluth)	13	Public Affairs	31
Duluth, Science & Engineering	14	Public Health	32
Education and Human Development	15	Research	33
Equity & Diversity	16	Rochester	34
Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences	17	Science & Engineering	35
Graduate School	18	Student Affairs	36
		SVP for Academic Affairs/Provost	37
		SVP for System Academic	38
		Administration	
		University Relations	39
		University Services	40
		Veterinary Medicine	41

APPENDIX B MEMORIAL STATEMENTS

James D. Banister

James D. Banister died on April 5, 2011 in Minneapolis, Minnesota at the age of 70 years. He is preceded in death by Dorothy Banister and will be deeply missed by his sons, Vaughn and Jon; grandchildren, Vaughn, Airelle, Joshua and Loren; brothers, John, Clyde and other family members and friends as well as University of Minnesota colleagues.

Jim came to work for the University of Minnesota in 1973 as a Facilities Planner in the Office of Planning and Programming, now called Office of Space Management. In 1997, he joined the new AHC Office of Facilities and Capital Planning from where he retired in 2000. Jim was an active member of the Higher Education Facilities Management Association, a teacher of space management in higher education and interacted widely across University of Minnesota schools, colleges and departments to help respective units make the best and highest use of their physical space.

Jim was an avid reader, a martial arts enthusiast, and a U.S. Navy veteran.

Jerome Beker

Jerome “Jerry” Beker, 78, died August 13, 2011, after a long battle with cancer. Jerry impacted the lives of many, in both his personal circles as well as his professional work. He was Professor Emeritus at the School of Social Work after a distinguished career specializing in Youth Studies for more than 25 years and was a leading writer, editor, and voice in his field. He was director of the Center for Youth Development and Research from 1978 to 1988, and he was a Fulbright scholar in Israel from 1988 to 1989. His burial was in Israel. He is survived by his wife, Emily, his sons, Joshua and David, and seven grandchildren.

John Blaisdell

John Blaisdell worked for Facilities Management maintaining the University's physical assets so that students, faculty and staff could fulfill their vital mission of learning, teaching, research and outreach. His contributions to the FM team were appreciated.

Lawson Bowen-Meredith

Lawson Bowen-Meredith worked for Facilities Management maintaining the University's physical assets so that students, faculty and staff could fulfill their vital mission of learning, teaching, research and outreach. His contributions to the FM team were appreciated.

John B. Carlson

John B. Carlson, Professor Emeritus of Biology at the University of Minnesota Duluth, died in Duluth on April 6, 2011 at the age of 85 after battling Alzheimer's disease for 15 years. He joined the Biology Department at UMD in 1954 and retired in 1987. John was an outstanding teacher of botany, best known for his excellent laboratory courses in microscopy techniques and in plant structure and development. He graduated from high school in Virginia, Minnesota.

After two years of wartime service in the U. S. Navy in the Pacific, he graduated from Virginia Junior College in 1948. He earned a bachelor's degree from St. Olaf College in 1950 and a Ph. D. from Iowa State College in 1953. His research included investigations of the structure of soybean and wild rice plants. John is survived by loving family members: Delores Carlson - his wife of 61 years, four children, eight grandchildren, five great-grandchildren, one brother, and one sister. His former UMD colleagues and students remember him with fondness.

Herbert W. Johnson

Professor Herbert W. Johnson, Ph.D., former Head (1964-84) in the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, passed away Sunday, May 22, 2011, in Sun City, AZ.

Dr. Johnson was born July 3, 1920, in Boliver, Tennessee. He passed away at the age of 91 on Sunday, May 22, 2011, in Sun City, AZ, due to complications from congestive heart failure.

Dr. Johnson received his B.S. degree from the University of Tennessee in 1942 and his M.S. (1948) and Ph.D. (1950) degrees in Plant Breeding from the University of Nebraska. He was a Research Agronomist, ARS, USDA, Raleigh, NC, 1948-53; Research Agronomist and Leader, Soybean Investigations, ARS, USDA, Beltsville, MD, 1953-64; and Head in the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota, 1964-84.

After retiring and moving to Sun City, Arizona, in 1987, Dr. Johnson and Lois enjoyed the Arizona sunshine and getting in a lot of time on the golf course. Dr. Johnson was preceded in death by his wife, Lois, and is survived by their three children: Steve, Jeff, and Susan.

Richard Johnson

Richard Johnson worked for Facilities Management maintaining the University's physical assets so that students, faculty and staff could fulfill their vital mission of learning, teaching, research and outreach. His co-workers in FM remember Dick as a quiet, gentle soul. He moved to Alaska after retirement where he spent his time hunting and fishing. His contributions to the FM team were appreciated.

Daniel D. Joseph

Dr. Daniel D. Joseph, a retired University of Minnesota Professor of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, passed away at 82 on May 24, 2011 in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Dr. Joseph was born in Chicago, Illinois in March 1929. He received a Masters Degree in Sociology at the University of Chicago before attending the Illinois Institute of Technology for Mechanical Engineering. He earned a Ph.D. in the field in 1963.

Dr. Joseph first came to the University of Minnesota as an Assistant Professor of Aerospace Mechanics and Engineering in 1963. He became a full professor for the department in 1968. He went onto become one of the University of Minnesota's most decorated professors.

Dr. Joseph served as the Russell J. Penrose Professor and Regent's Professor. In addition, he was a Distinguished Adjunct Professor of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering at the University of California, Irvine and an Honorary Professor at Xi'an Jiaotong University of China. He was a visiting professor in several countries, including England, Italy, France, Australia, and Israel. Dr. Joseph held a membership in all 3 national academies: the American Academy of Arts and

Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the National Academy of Sciences. He was awarded the GI Taylor Medal, the Guggenheim Award, the Timoshenko Medal of the ASME, the Schlumberger Foundation Award, the Bingham Medal of the Society of Rheology, the Fluid Dynamics Prize of the APS, the Professional Achievement Awards from Illinois Institute of Technology and University of Illinois, and the Distinguished Service Award from the U.S. Army. Dr. Joseph was also listed in the Thompson Scientific-ISI Highly Cited Researchers and was a Fellow of the American Physical Society (APS). He wrote five books and more than 300 articles for professional journals.

However, Dr. Joseph was most proud of the graduate students he mentored. He pinned their pictures to his office wall, while he kept his metals and awards in the drawer. His students are now working around the world in North and South America, Europe, and Asia.

For more than thirty years, Dr. Joseph was a world-renowned expert in fluid mechanics. He held 10 patents and consulted with many companies including Pillsbury, Gillette, Hershey's Chocolate, and oil companies around the world. Among his industry accomplishments were improving oil movement through a pipeline and ink through a ballpoint pen.

Dr. Joseph retired from the University of Minnesota in 2009. However, he continued research with a former student.

Dr. Joseph was preceded in death by his son, Michael Joseph. He is survived by his wife Kathleen Jaglo Joseph of Minneapolis; sons Charles Joseph of Clifton, N.J., and Samuel Guillope-Weissler of Paris; daughter Shifra Chana Hendrie of Morristown, N.J.; and 13 grandchildren.

Over Dr. Joseph's 46-year career at the University of Minnesota, he helped the Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics department rank as one of the best in the world. His exceptional accomplishments in teaching and research proved to be an asset to the University and truly invaluable to the students he taught.

Henry H. Webster

Henry H. "Hank" Webster, Research Associate Emeritus in the Department of Forest Resources, passed away suddenly on June 25, 2011, at the age of 81. His career included work as a research scientist with the U.S. Forest Service; Department Chair in Forestry at both Iowa State University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison; State Forester of Michigan; and first Executive Director of what is now the Great Lakes Forestry Alliance, which he was instrumental in establishing. He also served as the Alliance's Project Director for a multi-state forest resource assessment based at the University of Minnesota.

Hank is survived by his wife of 26 years, Jan Hacker; daughter, Catherine Jorgensen; and grandsons, Andrew (Nicole) Jorgensen and Timothy Jorgensen. Hank was a pleasure to interact with...he was always very kind, incredibly insightful and a fantastic wealth of information on the management and politics of natural resources management. Plus he had a great sense of humor! Hank maintained an office in the Department of Forest Resources and remained engaged with colleagues long after his retirement and will be greatly missed.

Robert E. Williams

Robert E. Williams worked for Facilities Management maintaining the University's physical assets so that students, faculty and staff could fulfill their vital mission of learning, teaching,

research and outreach. His contributions to the FM team were appreciated.

Jack Peter Zetterberg

The University community lost a dedicated and visionary leader when Dr. Peter Zetterberg, 61, died suddenly in June. Dr. Zetterberg served the University of Minnesota for more than 30 years, during which time he was one of the University's most trusted advisors on tuition policy, scholarships, need-based financial aid, and educational access for Minnesota students. He was the architect of many of the University's most successful tuition strategies, including 13-credit tuition banding, which provides a financial incentive for students to take a higher course load, resulting in more timely graduation and reduced total cost of education. His work on behalf of the University improved access and affordability for thousands of Minnesota students each year.

Peter served as the director of the Office of Institutional Research and Reporting; led the semester-conversion process; and served as the lead University analyst on important projects such as tuition modeling, financial aid allocation and policy, human resource assessment, curricular review, and innumerable budget modeling initiatives. He is also credited with the development of what is now called the University of Minnesota Promise scholarship program, a national model for improving access to higher education for low-income students.

In 2009 Peter received the President's Award for Outstanding Service, one of the University's most coveted honors, which recognizes service to the University that goes beyond the regular duties of a faculty or staff member and demonstrates unusual commitment to the University community. Peter was just such an individual; he cared deeply about the University and about the ability of higher education to enrich lives and serve communities. He will be greatly missed.