

Minutes of the University Senate Meeting  
February 3, 2005

1.

The February meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, February 3, 2005 in Room 7, Gamble Hall. Jim Grijalva presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Berne, Jane	Hume, Wendelin	Petros, Tom
Bjerke, Elizabeth	Jeno, Sue	Picklo, Matthew
Blackburn, Royce	Jones, Arthur	Pierce, David
Boyd, Robert	Knittel, David	Poochigian, Donald
Braden, Chris	Krogh, Nancy	Potvin, Martha
Chen, Tar-Pin	Kupchella, Charles	Rakow, Lana
Crawford, Richard	Lane, Jason	Reese, Ty
Dearden, Bruce	LaPointe, Jennifer	Rex, Janet
DeMers, Judy	Lee, Randy	Rice, Daniel
Doze, Van	McBride, Rosanne	Robertson, Charles
Drewes, Mary	Melland, Helen	Ross, Vicki
Elbert, Danielle	Miller, Charles	Schuetzle, Jordan
Elbert, Dennis	Mochoruk, James	Schwartz, Rhonda
Elsinga, Lillian	Moen, Janet	Skramstad, Allan
Erickson, Daniel	Muggli, Darrin	Smart, Kathy
Gallager, Robert	Munski, Doug	Stanlake, Lowell
Grant, Emmanuel	Murphy, Eric	Stolt, Wilbur
Grijalva, Jim	Myrick, Matt	Thureen, Faythe
Haskins, Robert	Nelson, Susan	Watson, John
Heitkamp, Thomasine	Nies, Gerry	White, Daniel
Helgeson, Diane	Nutz, Amber	Yurkovich, Eleanor
Hikins, James	Patton, Greg	

3.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Alfonso, Peter	Foltz, Kenneth	Nowacki, Michael
Anderson, Christopher	Goodwin, Janice	Rankin, Libby
Benoit, Joseph	Kalbfleisch, Pamela	Remfert, Matt
Brown, Richard	Kenville, Kimberly	Sambor, Christina
Cooper, Chris	LaDuke, John	Shaeffer, James
Dever, Adam	LeBel, Paul	Smith, Bruce
El-Dweek, Daniel	Lovelace, Kent	Williams, Jim
Flower, Ann	Neuerburg, Linda	Wilson, H. David

4.

The following announcements were made:

A. Mr. Grijalva announced that the intellectual property policy approved by the Senate at the November, 2004 meeting was approved by the President and is now University policy.

B. Mr. Grijalva announced that the Department of Education Office of Civil

Rights has approved the University harassment policy with some suggested changes. The Senate Executive Committee will ask the ad hoc committee originally formed to draft this policy to review the changes and to give further consideration to the suggestions it made to the Senate in its final report.

C. Mr. Grijalva reported that Senate reports are past due from the Standing Committee on Faculty Rights and the ROTC committees. Mr. Murphy stated that the ROTC report will be submitted at the March meeting.

D. Ms. Jenó announced that she had the opportunity to attend the State Senate Legislative Appropriations Committee meeting in Bismarck and that she believed it went well. She also reported on the work of the University Planning and Budget Committee's continuing efforts on the University's strategic plan. Forums for comment will be held for Staff Senate, Student Senate, and the University Senate. The University Senate forum is scheduled on March 30 from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. in Swanson, Room 16-18.

E. Mr. Kupchella announced that ten students also accompanied them to the State Senate Legislative Appropriations Committee and he thanked all who attended. He also announced that the higher education budgets were considered first. He encouraged people to get involved in the legislative process, whatever our views.

F. Mr. Kupchella announced that today he hosted the President of the University of Minnesota, along with his delegation. They discussed areas of research in which we may collaborate, including: foods, bioterrorism, energy and the environment, addictions, and general areas of rural economic development.

G. The President reported on the opening of the Ina Mae Rude Entrepreneurial Center and encouraged the senators to see the building and what it will offer the state.

5.

The Chair asked for corrections or additions to the December 2, 2004 minutes. There being none, the minutes were approved as distributed.

6.

The Chair opened the question period at 4:17 p.m.

Mr. Lane commented that the UND summer school faculty salary was lower than other institutions, and asked whether there were any plans in place to increase summer school salaries. Ms. Varnson was recognized and answered that there are plans to increase salaries. Previous studies indicated that the University may not be able to afford it. She is looking at a model of revenue sharing.

Mr. Picklo asked about the faculty seed money program. Mr. Kupchella answered that in previous years there were matching funds available from the city, but it does not appear that the city will match it this year. The original proposal did not use University funds, but rather a mix of foundation, city, and University funds. He has conferred with the Vice President of Research and stated that the applications for grants will be available to the campus soon. The University has supported this because it has been such a success in increasing funding for the University.

Mr. Lee asked Ms. Potvin for an explanation about recent statements made by her regarding the skills she brings to issues relating to tenure and promotion review and about increasing campus expectations for this review. Ms. Potvin responded that there was no link between the two statements cited. One statement was about her qualifications and the other was in response to a question from the audience. Mr. Lee asked what role board policy should play in the review, specifically the policy which specifies that evaluation systems include a tenure plan. Ms. Potvin responded that page two of the contract should be the basis upon which a review takes place. Mr. Lee questioned whether this was always happening, and he questioned whether fairness was included in the system. He also wondered if research had become so important that everyone must be involved; and if so, he stated that this must be included in the documentation and that there needs to be formal process of the expectations for faculty in their tenure plans. He asked if the Senate Executive Committee would be willing to undertake a more detailed discussion of these issues and he thanked Ms. Potvin and the Senate for taking these questions. Ms. Potvin responded that she agreed that tenure plans should be in place and be specific, and that faculty should be evaluated fairly according to the plans. It is the department's responsibility to review these plans and evaluate them and there is evidence that some departments are not meeting this responsibility. She agreed that discussion on the topic should continue.

Mr. Poochigian moved to extend the question period until 4:47. The motion was approved.

Mr. Murphy asked what happens to faculty who do not have tenure plans. He stated he thought there were issues about procedures and procedural violations. Mr. Lee responded that in many cases the medical school is on another track but that the State Board of Higher Education policies still apply.

Mr. Chen stated that hiring is very important and it was difficult for the physics department to hire a preferred candidate. He voiced concern that the physics department has been rejected by the college tenure committee and it is affecting retention of physics faculty.

Mr. Petros stated that one of the things that needs to be corrected is that departments should have plans and perhaps administration should mandate that departments have written policies of what is expected for promotion and tenure.

Mr. Grijalva stated that the money issue is getting attention in the legislative session but there is also the morale issue of faculty being recognized for meeting and exceeding standards.

Ms. DeMers commented that she sits on the promotion and tenure committee in the medical school and there were very specific criteria developed and perhaps some of the comments about the medical school were too broad.

Mr. Blackburn asked how departments would be held accountable for their plans. Mr. Grijalva suggested that this may be addressed in Mr. Lee's last question about whether the Provost and President will require a level of research as part of the plans.

Mr. Petros stated that there should be a constant dialogue between levels of administration for clear standards and expectations.

The question period closed at 4:46 p.m.

7.

Mr. Lee moved that the annual reports of the Senate Summer Sessions Committee, the Senate Academic Policies and Admissions Committee and the Senate Compensation Committee be received and filed. The motion was approved unanimously.

8.

The report from the Senate Curriculum Committee was considered. The report was approved unanimously.

9.

Ms. Helgeson presented the recommendations for three candidates for honorary degrees. A report for the candidates was distributed to the Senate. The Senate discussed. The recommendation for honorary degrees was approved.

10.

The Senate considered a proposal from the Senate Admissions and Academic Policies Committee for a provisional admission policy. The Senate discussed. Mr. Rice recognized Alice Hoffert, associate vice president, to address the Senate. The Senate discussion continued.

11.

Mr. Munski moved to extend the meeting until 5:40 p.m. The motion was approved.

12.

The Senate continued discussion on the provisional admission policy. The motion was approved on a vote of 44 in favor, 6 against, and 2 abstaining.

13.

The Senate considered a proposal for a non-degree admission policy. The motion was approved on a vote of 49 in favor and 1 against.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Nancy Krogh,  
Secretary to the Senate