

**Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)**  
**January 23, 2020**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**

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

[**In these minutes:** Debrief from December 2019 Senate Meeting on Proposed Changes to the Liberal Education Curriculum Requirements; Safe Transfer Legislation; Miscellaneous Committee Business]

**PRESENT:** Amy Pittenger (chair), Phil Buhlmann (vice chair), Mark Bee, Sheri Breen, Colleen Flaherty Manchester, Tabitha Grier-Reed, Michael Kyba, Lynn Lukkas, Ned Patterson, John Deen, Les Drewes, Frank Gigler, Jennifer Goodnough, Julie Olson, Donna Spannaus-Martin, Clifford Steer, Carol Chomsky

**REGRETS:** Rhonda Franklin, Peggy Nelson, Jessica Larson

**ABSENT:** Rob Blair

**GUESTS:** Provost Karen Hanson; Sally Kohlstedt, chair, Liberal Education Redesign Committee; Bob McMaster, vice provost and dean, Office of Undergraduate Education; Amy Ma, chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee; Gurtaran Johal and Aryka Klemme, Minnesota Student Association representatives

**OTHERS ATTENDING:** Brianne Keeney, President's Office; Marcia Nichols, UMR

**1. Debrief from December 2019 Senate meeting discussion on proposed changes to the liberal education curriculum requirements:** Professor Pittenger called the meeting to order and welcomed Provost Karen Hanson; Professor Sally Kohlstedt, chair, Liberal Education Redesign Committee; and Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Bob McMaster. Professor Pittenger reminded members that at the conclusion of the December 2019 Senate meeting, senators rejected Plan A, and did not say yes to Plan D, which left the University with its current liberal education (LE) curriculum. She said that her impression from both the November and December 2019 Senate meetings was that there was strong support for certain aspects of the plans, particularly Plan D. Professor Chomsky agreed and said she came away from the December meeting with the sense that senators did not want to drop the liberal education redesign efforts given all the time and energy that had been put into it, but that neither Plan A or Plan D was quite right.

Vice Provost McMaster reported that the Council on Liberal Education is being re-established and will have a new chair and its membership is being expanded to provide for more intellectual variance on the council. He also noted that he met with the undergraduate associate deans earlier this week and they made it clear that they want to maintain the current/existing LE curriculum requirements rather than revisiting plans A & D.

Professor Kohlstedt acknowledged that the Liberal Education Redesign Committee (LERC) could not come to agreement on a single plan, which was the reason for bringing two options to the Senate. However, she noted, that there were elements of the plans that had almost unanimous agreement from LERC members, particularly the new definitions in the appendix. She then inquired further about the associate deans interest in maintaining the status quo. Vice Provost McMaster explained that after two years of work on redesigning the LE curriculum, the associate deans indicated they were ready to move forward given the outcome of the December Senate meeting (no real resolution). He added that most of the deans are satisfied with the existing LE requirements, and felt there was no need to spend more time and energy on adjusting the proposed requirements; they simply want to move ahead. Professor Kohlstedt asked whether Vice Provost McMaster also asked faculty how they wanted to proceed. She said it would be interesting to know whether the associate deans and the faculty feel the same way because there were a lot of faculty who were excited about the prospect of revising/updating the LE curriculum. In terms of the LE definitions, said Vice Provost McMaster, they could be revisited given they map fairly easily to the existing requirements. Professor Pittenger commented that because the definitions are technically not a change in the LE curriculum structure, maybe revisiting the definitions could make the current LE curriculum more operational/functional.

Professor Pittenger reported that she and Professor Buhlmann, FCC vice chair, met with Jennifer Gunn, director, Institute for Advanced Study (IAS), and Brianna Menning, program and communications manager, IAS, and went over the results from the November *Our University History* forum. She said the table notes and summary of the forum will be shared with the FCC. A theme that emerged from the forum was how the University should educate its community as well as the State of Minnesota and the world about Minnesota and its history on an ongoing basis, which directly relates to the LE curriculum requirements.

Professor Patterson asked how often the University should be reviewing its curriculum? Professor Kohlstedt responded that, on average, curriculum is looked at in-depth every seven years or so.

Professor Flaherty Manchester asked whether changes to the LE curriculum terminology/definitions requires a vote of the Senate or if updating these definitions falls more under housekeeping? Can the Council on Liberal Education (CLE) update these definitions? Vice Provost McMaster said if CLE has the authority, they could adopt the new definitions. Professor Pittenger said she was unsure whether CLE has that authority or not but would look into it.

In response to Professor Kohlstedt's earlier comment about getting faculty input and the feedback provided to Vice Provost McMaster by the associate vice provosts, said Professor Chomsky, it was also clear from the Senate meeting that students wanted more involvement in the LE curriculum redesign process in the future. On a different matter, she suggested that the FCC look into what authority the Senate Constitution gives CLE versus the Senate as it relates to curriculum changes. While it may not be entirely clear what authority CLE has, it may be possible to give CLE more authority to fine-tune the definitions, for example.

Regarding student input in the recent curriculum redesign, said Vice Provost McMaster, Professor Kohlstedt went out of her way to consult with students throughout the process. While student feedback/input was sought, it is important to remember that it is the faculty who are ultimately responsible for the curriculum; traditionally students have never been part of the redesign process. In response, Professor Chomsky said the FCC has been talking quite a bit this year about the fact that while the administration consults heavily on issues, it often fails to adequately communicate to the University community about how much consultation actually took place. As a result, people who have not been involved in these discussions presume no consultation occurred. Professor Kyba reiterated Professor Chomsky's comments, and suggested because students are only at the University for a short time that it may be worthwhile to solicit input from recent alumni when a curriculum redesign occurs again. Professor Kohlstedt said students were consulted throughout the process and those who were engaged provided a lot of valuable feedback.

At a minimum, said Professor Pittenger, it will be important to find out which body has the authority to adopt the definition changes, e.g., CLE, Senate. Professor Goodnough said University policy says that curriculum requirements must be approved by the Faculty Senate. That said, is changing the definitions, the same as changing the requirements? Are the definitions the same as the requirements? Additionally, University policy requires consultation with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) as it relates to curriculum changes, and so SCEP should be the starting point for this discussion. Professor Pittenger agreed that SCEP would be the best place to start this discussion. Once SCEP has an opportunity to weigh in, then the issue can be brought back to the FCC for further discussion. Professor Goodnough also suggested SCEP and CLE meet jointly to discuss this issue.

Regarding Professor Chomsky's earlier comment about giving CLE more power in making curriculum-related decisions, said Professor Buhlmann, he worries that this could perpetuate the lack of communication problem that already exists. Professor Chomsky clarified that her suggestion is more about avoiding the process versus avoiding communication.

Professor Flaherty Manchester asked whether the administration communicated to the University community broadly about the outcome of the December Senate meeting and the decision to maintain the existing curriculum requirements. According to Professor Kohlstedt a message was sent out to the community. Professor Flaherty Manchester suggested the FCC consider sending out a message about next steps given the uncertainty about what actually happened at the December Senate meeting. Professor Pittenger said that depending on SCEP's interpretation of whether CLE has the authority to update the definitions given they are simply contemporary versions of the existing definitions (not changing the LE requirements), this would definitely need to be communicated to the University community broadly. Professor Flaherty Manchester questioned the timing of the communication in order to give faculty, in general, the ability to weigh in during the deliberation process. Or, alternatively, said Professor Pittenger, once SCEP makes its decision, maybe there should be a 30-day comment period to give faculty a chance to provide input. Professor Buhlmann said that as he recalls the administration's communication following the December Senate meeting did not clearly say whether this was the end of this effort or not, and, in fact, the Senate did not indicate this should be the end. The administration's communication more or less said no new LE curriculum was adopted at the December meeting,

and, therefore, the status quo was being maintained. Professor Pittenger said the meeting was somewhat unusual in that the Senate did not adopt Plan D, but it didn't really reject it either. There were definitely aspects of the plans that people supported, so in that regard the effort is not really over. Professor Pittenger added that it does not seem reasonable that Provost-Designate Croson will resurrect this effort at least in the near future because she will have other bigger issues to deal with once she gets here. Provost Hanson noted that it is undeniably true that the LE requirements are the status quo and the faculty rejected/didn't accept Plan A or Plan D. While the idea of looking at the definitions seems promising, it is important to remember that the definitions outline what the requirements are. Provost Hanson said she feels strongly that this matter is squarely in the hands of the faculty, and, in her opinion, a change in the administration will do nothing to catalyze the issue, the faculty needs to do it. Vice Provost McMaster said to Provost Hanson's point, for CLE to update the definitions would put that body in a difficult position because they are using definitions to approve courses that were never fully approved by the Faculty Senate; doing so would likely come back to cause problems down the line. Provost Hanson said she would be interested in the history of the definitions and whether they were voted on by the Faculty Senate. Professor Kohlstedt recalled when the LE requirements and definitions were voted in in the 1990s and again in 2008, the requirements (LE framework) and definitions came as a package to the Senate. In her opinion, she does not think most people looked closely at the definitions back then because they were more interested in the framework. At the December 2019 Senate meeting, senators also seemed focused on the framework rather than the definitions, and, as a result, ultimately rejected the framework and process. She recalls some senators specifically commenting, however, that there were aspects in the plans that they liked and they requested that the good aspects not be thrown out with the bad (don't throw the baby out with the bathwater). She added that the whole point of updating the definitions was to give more people the opportunity to offer courses that meet the LE requirements. Professor Kohlstedt suggested bringing the definitions back to the Faculty Senate and explain why the definitions were updated and what updating them was intended to accomplish; there could be real buy-in from the entire Faculty Senate. Professor Pittenger said she likes the idea of bringing the updated definitions back to the Faculty Senate because then it will feel like something actually came out of all the work that was put into this effort.

Vice Provost McMaster noted that as CLE is being re-established and expanded that he has requested that there be at least two "experts" from the area/discipline that is asking for course approval. Additionally, he brought up the request that was raised several times at the Senate meeting about having the administration calculate the cost of changing the LE requirements. In his opinion, it is impossible to calculate the cost of implementing a new curriculum; it is simply a part of the University's job to periodically update its curriculum.

Amy Ma, chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), said while she understands the faculty own the curriculum, it is important to remember that curriculum decisions have a significant impact on students. She said the reason she asked to sit in on today's meeting was because she wanted to hear the conversation to better understand the curriculum review process in order to be able to provide future student leaders with information on what they can do to be more involved when the next review takes place. Her goal, she said, is to develop a document or toolkit of some sort that will guide future student leaders and help them to be more engaged in the curriculum review process in a more meaningful way.

Professor Flaherty Manchester asked what would qualify as “meaningful” engagement for students in the future. Ms. Ma said while some students were consulted this time around, the consultation was not broad enough. Professor Kohlstedt explained that she reached out numerous times to get on the Minnesota Student Association (MSA) agenda and was put off. Finally, MSA called a special meeting to discuss the topic. Professor Kohlstedt suggested that the document or toolkit that is being developed include information about the importance of student leaders responding to invitations and making room on agendas for important topics. Ms. Ma clarified that she is not writing the document on behalf of MSA, and, in fact, she is not affiliated with MSA. She added that she is not blaming anyone or the committee (LERC) about the lack of student involvement this time around, but going forward she would like to see more students involved earlier in the process. Professor Kohlstedt agreed and said it will be important to find out where in the student arena this conversation should best happen. Professor Pittenger encouraged Ms. Ma to include other suggestions/ideas such as how best to communicate with students in the document she is drafting to help facilitate more meaningful student involvement in future reviews. Professor Chomsky added that all governance representatives (faculty, staff and students) have a responsibility to communicate issues/topics back to their constituents.

Regarding the issue of calculating the cost of implementing a new curriculum, said Professor Buhlmann, while it might be complicated, there must be a way to assess this cost on average for individual students. Can the business school do this type of calculation? Vice Provost McMaster explained that Julie Tonneson, associate vice president, Office of the Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations, was a LERC member and monitored issues that were discussed that would have had a financial impact on the University. In terms of students, said Vice Provost McMaster, theoretically implementing a new curriculum would have no financial impact on them because it would be included in their 120 credits. In the end, it would be a wash in terms of the cost of tuition and attendance. Professor Gigler said if this were the case it should have been better communicated because there was the perception by a number of people that implementing a new curriculum would not have been budget neutral. Provost Hanson noted that cost-related issues were discussed throughout the LE curriculum review process.

Professor Pittenger said that she will look into the process for adopting the updated definitions, and she will talk with Professor Goodnough, chair, SCEP, about developing a plan to move this matter forward.

Professor Flaherty Manchester commented that she heard from LERC members that the size of the committee, at times, was a burden. Professor Kohlstedt noted that all the colleges with undergraduate students were represented proportionally on LERC. She said that approximately  $\frac{1}{3}$  of LERC members regularly attended meetings, another  $\frac{1}{3}$  usually attended, and  $\frac{1}{3}$  came occasionally, and added that this is probably not unusual for a committee that met over the course of two years on a bi-weekly basis. In terms of LERC’s size, said Vice Provost McMaster, when talking about the redesign of the LE curriculum, there has to be representation from the entire University community. While a smaller committee might have been more nimble, there would have been harsh criticism from the University community if all the colleges with undergraduate students were not represented proportionally.

Professor Grier-Reed suggested that in addition to the students writing a “lessons-learned” document, LERC might want to do something similar. Wisdom LERC learned from the process would be useful for future efforts. Professor Kohlstedt said LERC did a lot of work over the course of two years, and maybe set an overly ambitious agenda for itself, which could have contributed to the outcome of the December Senate meeting. In hindsight, said Professor Kohlstedt, taking on so many aspects of the LE curriculum simultaneously turned out to be somewhat daunting, and proposed a different approach for future reviews. Provost Hanson commented that the issue of what the University should be teaching its students is an interesting question that warrants extensive discussion knowing that emotions will run high. She went on to make a point of defending LERC when it comes to the extensive amount of consulting the committee did. LERC deserves a lot of credit for their work.

Simply because the Senate decided to retain the existing LE curriculum requirements, said Professor Buhlmann, does not mean nothing was gained/learned from the process. In his opinion, in the end, the Faculty Senate chose what they felt to be the best option. Another thing that came out of the process, noted Professor Kohlstedt, is that faculty who had not been involved in talking about curriculum requirements started to do so, which was also a positive outcome.

Hearing no further discussion, Professor Pittenger thanked Provost Hanson, Professor Kohlstedt, and Vice Provost McMaster for a good discussion and promised to keep them informed as this discussion continues.

**2. Safe Transfer Legislation:** Professor Pittenger welcomed Gurtaran Johal and Aryka Klemme, Minnesota Student Association (MSA) representatives, and called for a round of introductions. Following introductions, Ms. Johal began with an overview of safe transfer legislation. To give this issue some context, Ms. Johal noted that survey results from the recent Association of American Universities (AAU) survey indicated that at the University of Minnesota one in four (25%) of undergraduate women will experience some sort of sexual assault during their time here. On the other hand, roughly only six percent of college-aged men will be convicted of sexual assault and of these six percent of men,  $\frac{2}{3}$  will recommit a sexual assault offense. This is a huge problem occurring on college campuses across the country. Ms. Johal then turned members’ attention to a draft safe transfer bill that MSA plans to bring to the legislature this year. Essentially, said Ms. Johal, safe transfer legislation puts a notation, distinct from an academic notation, on a student’s transcript indicating that the person had been suspended or expelled for a sexual assault conviction, which includes domestic violence, dating violence, stalking or sexual assault. For a student who was suspended for a sexual assault conviction, the bill provides that the transcription notation will be removed once their suspension has been completed, but for a student who was expelled, their notation will remain on their transcript. The draft MSA bill largely mirrors statutes in Virginia and New York.

Next, Ms. Klemme took a few minutes to talk about the legislative process. She began by noting that the legislative session begins in February 2020. MSA representatives have been working with both the DFL as well as the Republican chairs of the Higher Education Committee in an effort to get one of the parties to co-author the bill and to chief-author the bill in the House and Senate. MSA’s goal is to get an official reading on the floor in either February or March. MSA has been soliciting input regarding the bill from various stakeholder groups and plans to make a

few changes to the draft members received along with the agenda, which Ms. Johal proceeded to talk about. She added that MSA is hoping that Senator Paul Anderson, chair, Higher Education Finance and Policy, will chief-author the bill. That said, Senator Anderson wants the language in the bill revised to provide for a blind review process (if a student transfers to another university, that university will not be able to see the transcription notation initially, but later will be given the notation information to ensure a holistic admissions process).

Ms. Johal said that the purpose for coming to this meeting is to get feedback about the bill from the FCC and to also get a letter of support from the committee. She then opened up the floor for questions/comments from members, which included:

- Please talk about how other institutions deal with this issue, asked Professor Pittenger. Ms. Johal said most institutions do not use a distinct sexual assault transfer notation but simply put a non-distinct notation on a transferring student's transcript.
- Explain the difference between how a notation is handled for a student who has been suspended versus expelled, requested Professor Flaherty Manchester. Ms. Johal explained that if a student serves their suspension then the notation is removed from their transcript, but for students who have been expelled, the notation is not removed. She added that consideration is being given to revising this provision in the bill so that if an expelled student goes through a restorative justice process that they can get their notation removed from their transcript as well.
- What are the downsides of the bill, asked Professor Kyba? A downside is that victim survivors may decide not to report because they are fearful that they will ruin the individual's life. The rationale for using a distinct notation is not to have it be a scarlet letter, per se, but to allow for a more holistic admissions process to ensure that institutions are looking at the backgrounds of the students they are admitting.
- Has the Aurora Center and the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA) provided feedback about the bill, asked Professor Kyba? Yes, said Ms. Johal, both offices have been consulted. Tina Marisam, director, EOAA, is a strong supporter of having a restorative process for students who are expelled because she worries about victim survivors not reporting. Katie Eichele, director, Aurora Center, agrees with Ms. Marisam.
- The verbiage "safe transfer," said Professor Kyba, implies the University will not accept students with sexual assault convictions on their transcripts. Is this really the desired outcome? Ms. Johal said it would ultimately be up to the institution whether or not to admit or reject a student. The purpose of this bill is to make sure that admissions' offices are conducting a holistic review of a student's application so they know who they are and are not admitting. Another downside to the bill, added Professor Kyba, involves students who have been unfairly convicted. He said it is his understanding that the hearing process used to decide these cases uses a preponderance of the evidence rule as opposed to beyond a reasonable doubt rule. Using preponderance of evidence in conjunction with the possible magnitude of the outcome, will likely dissuade victim survivors from reporting.
- Professor Breen commented that while problems could arise from instituting this type of bill such as victim survivors not reporting, the flipside is that for students who are found guilty are allowed to transfer to another school that will not have access to this important background information. Professor Breen said she does not believe most schools will have a blanket rule about not admitting students with a sexual assault notation on their

transcript, but it will likely be viewed as a red flag. Whether or not this bill passes the legislature, this is an important issue that needs further discussion.

- Professor Chomsky voiced concern over the two-step, blind review process that was mentioned earlier, and wondered how that process would actually work. She also questioned what is private student data versus public student data. In her opinion, she does not believe suspension information, for example, is allowed on a transcript. Lastly, Professor Chomsky said the verbiage in lines 2.12, 2.13 and 2.14 (“... found not to have committed ...”) needs further clarification in terms of what it means.
- Professor Goodnough said she believes that when a student is suspended from the University of Minnesota, the student is suspended from the University of Minnesota system, and that only the originating campus can remove a suspension notation; this should be clarified in the bill.
- Professor Goodnough wondered whether the bill would result in reduced sanctions. A bill like this could potentially have an impact on hearing determinations. For example, this bill could possibly tip the balance away from suspension in favor of a lesser sanction. There could be unintended consequences of fewer suspensions and expulsions.
- Professor Flaherty Manchester said the unintended consequences of this bill are really important to take into account, and that the implementation of the bill, as written, would be difficult. She added that she wonders what can be learned from the research and evidence on the effect of Ban the Box.
- Regarding the preponderance of the evidence issue, said Professor Buhlmann, it exists for not only transferring students but for students who are currently on campus and who will never transfer. The preponderance of the evidence issue, in his opinion, is not relevant for this bill. Also, regarding the concern about reduced victim survivor reporting, said Professor Buhlmann, this is a different issue altogether. It is up to EOAA and the University as a whole to better communicate what notations on a transcript mean because there are different levels of offenses. A transcript notation does not bar someone from transferring. He encouraged Ms. Johal and Ms. Klemme to continue pursuing getting this bill passed and said he was enthusiastic about it.
- The idea of a holistic review, said Professor Chomsky, but not allowing it from the beginning of the admissions process, makes it secondary. She wonders about potential legal concerns resulting from internal processes where information is later disclosed and a student is not admitted and that person later sues, etc. Professor Chomsky noted that while she is in support of the bill in general she just has concerns about what information can be put on a transcript.
- Professor Grier-Reed asked about the process for putting a notation on a transcript. Ms. Johal explained that a notation would go on a transcript once the person was convicted, or, in the case of a student deciding to withdraw while under investigation, the notation would be put on the transcript as well. Professor Grier-Reed voiced some concern about the process for adding and removing notations, particularly because the hearing body is not a court of law. What if it turns out the accused was innocent? Ms. Johal said this is an issue that has not yet been fully discussed, but deserves further consideration.
- Professor Gigler commented that a notation on a transcript could have severe, long-term consequences, e.g., applying for a job.
- Who is being consulted with on the safe transfer legislation, asked Professor Patterson? Also, is MSA as a student organization bringing this legislation forward? Ms. Johal

explained that the legislation is being brought forward by MSA's Government and Legislative Affairs team. Groups consulted with include the Aurora Center, EOAA, various President's Initiative to Prevent Sexual Misconduct (PIPSM) committees, the Office of the General Counsel, the Office for Community Standards and legislators.

- Professor Bee commented that he is concerned about the permanence of the transcript notation and wondered what it would take to get a notation removed. Who would have the authority to remove a transcript notation? Ms. Johal reiterated her earlier comment that if a person goes through the restorative justice process it is possible to have a notation removed. Also, when a person completes their suspension, the transcript notation is fully removed. Where it gets tricky is if the person has been expelled. According to Ms. Johal, the University would have to create a process for removing transcript notations. Professor Bee suggested outlining this process in the proposed bill. A different approach, mentioned Professor Flaherty Manchester, could be to have the notation come off after a specified period of time, which would not require a special process to be created for removing notations, and it would also mean the notation would not last forever.
- Professor Bee also wondered what would happen if an admission's committee admitted someone with a sexual misconduct notation on their transcript and they offend again. Has any thought been given to creating guidelines for admission's committees? There is liability associated with not admitting a student with a sexual misconduct notation on their transcript and there is liability associated with admitting someone who has such a notation. Professor Olson said the School of Dentistry uses a holistic admissions process and has admitted students who have been found guilty of misdemeanors, for example. She explained that these students are asked to explain what happened and if they went through a restorative process, etc. Next, Professor Bee asked what an admission committee is supposed to do with the notation information. Ms. Johal said the hope is that the admission committee would discuss and decide how they wanted to handle an applicant who has a notation on their transcript.
- More thought should be given to how much and how specific the information included on a transcript should be, suggested Professor Chomsky. The bill, as currently written, said Ms. Johal, would specifically state why a person was expelled or suspended - domestic violence, dating violence, stalking or sexual assault.
- Would the actual notation be part of the legislative language, asked Professor Grier-Reed? Also, suppose someone graduates and there is still an open case - what happens then? Ms. Johal said she would talk with her colleague about making the bill more specific as it relates to these questions. Professor Grier-Reed suggested giving careful consideration to the transcript notation because it is different from fraud, for example, in that the behavior is predatory and violent, which raises liability concerns. Regarding implications for employment, Professor Grier-Reed suggested thinking about whether there should be a statute of limitations as it relates to a transcript notation.
- What has been learned from the two states (Virginia and New York) that have enacted similar legislation, asked Professor Pittenger? Ms. Johal said she is not able to answer this question, but volunteered to look into it and report back.

In light of time, Professor Pittenger thanked Ms. Johal and Ms. Klemme for bringing this proposed bill to the FCC for consultation. She said that she and Professor Buhlmann will be in touch after today's meeting as to whether the FCC is willing to provide a letter of support.

3. **2020 - 2021 FCC leadership election:** Professor Pittenger said there has been a change in today's agenda and only the 2020 - 2021 chair will be elected, not the vice chair. She then turned to Professor Buhlmann to ask him to say a few words about why he was interested in being elected the next FCC chair. Following his remarks, Professor Pittenger announced that the official vote would be conducted electronically following the meeting.

4. **Announcements:** Before adjourning the meeting, Professor Pittenger provided the following updates:

- The P & A Consultative Committee (PACC) is tracking miscommunications and mistakes that have occurred related to the [Parental Leave for Employees policy](#) in terms of who is eligible for leave, etc. Professor Pittenger encouraged members to check with their units to make sure the policy is being implemented correctly and if there are any cases that may need to be retroactively corrected.
- The University of Minnesota is putting forward a change to allow the "block M" on alcohol products, which previously had not been allowed. Based on what she has heard, said Professor Pittenger, the logo would mostly be used on products such as craft beer, for example, where University hops are used. The president has the ultimate authority to decide which products will be allowed to display the "block M."
- The new Major Events policy will be coming to the FCC (February 6) and other committees/groups for consultation this spring. This policy is intended to create a standard process for major events scheduling and to clarify that speech is not restricted at University of Minnesota.
- Previously EOAA findings regarding sexual misconduct allegations against faculty and staff were advisory to the department head/dean. Now, however, if a department head/dean decides not to follow the EOAA recommendations, they will be required to identify an alternative path to the provost. President Gabel has asked that the Office of Internal Audit track whether EOAA recommendations are being followed or not.
- The student mental health environmental scan has been completed and President Gabel will present the findings to the Board of Regents at their February meeting. It is likely President Gabel will also bring this information to the FCC in February. Additionally, at the February 6 FCC meeting, President Gabel will roll out additional detail with regard to the Systemwide Strategic Plan to get the FCC's input before bringing it to the Board.
- The Office of the Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations has hired a consulting firm to conduct a comparison between administrative costs at the University of Minnesota and administrative costs at other peer institutions.

5. **Adjournment:** Hearing no further business, Professor Pittenger adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate Office

