

Minutes of the University Senate Meeting  
November 1, 2012

1.

The November meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, November 1, 2012 in Room 7, Gamble Hall. Jim Mochoruk presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Ames, Forrest	Gerbert, Shane	Mosher, Sarah
Anderson, Suzanne	Goodwin, Janice	Murphy, Eric
Bateman, Connie	Gorney, Kjiesta	Nelson, Christopher
Beck, Pamela	Halgren, Cara	Noghanian, Sima
Brekke, Alice	Harsell, Dana	Oommen, Abraham
Caine, Dennis	Heitkamp, Thomasine	Ozaki, Casey
Caraher, Bill	Hillebrand, Diane	Poochigian, Donald
Casler, James	Holland, Dixie	Ray, Linda
Cherry, Emily	Jonientz, Joel	Reesor, Lori
Combs, Barbara	Kitzes, Adam	Stofferahn, Curt
Dewar, Graeme	Koepke-Nelson, Yvette	Stone, Jan
Doze, Van	Korom, Scott	Sturges, Denyse
Drewes, Mary	LeBel, Paul	Sum, Paul
Elbert, Dennis	Liang, Lewis	Sun, Jeffrey
El-Rewini, Hesham	Malott, Daniel	Vetter, Jennifer
Ernst, Julia	McBride, Rosanne	Wang, Enru
Fazel-Rezai, Reza	McHenry, Laurie	Worley, Paul
Fletcher, Logan	Mikulak, Marcia	Zerr, Ryan
Gapp, Jacob	Mochoruk, James	

3.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Adams, Darla	Kelley, Robert	Smith, Bruce
Andersson, Julie A.	Korniewicz, Denise	Stolt, Wilbur
Bass, Gail	Kurtz, Sharley	Swisher, Wayne
Berg, Kate	Luber, Patrick	Tiemann, Kathleen
Bridewell, John	Mitzell, John	Towne, Gary
Dunlevy, Jane	Morrison, Steven	Walker, Anne
Eckmann, Lindsey	Petros, Thomas	Walton, Susan
Evanson, Tracy	Rand, Kathryn	Watne, Eric
Hommerding, Aaron	Schlosser, Isaac	Wynne, Joshua
Johnson, Phyllis	Schultz, Kasey	Young, Patricia
Keengwe, Sagini	Shanta, Linda	

4.

The following announcements were made:

- a. Alice Brekke, Paul LeBel and Lori Reesor reported on the "Pathways to Student Success" proposal from Chancellor Shirvani. Mr. LeBel reminded the senators that this proposal began as the 3-tier report. He stated that the Pathways to Student Success has supplanted the "Maximizing Efficiencies" document from the State Board of Higher Education with the information in the document being largely subsumed in this initiative. There are two portions that are currently most pressing: 1) tuition and fees; and 2) admissions standards/access. The Chancellor recognizes that research institutions are different. The Chancellor has requested proposals for the two portions from each tier.

Ms. Reesor spoke about the access/admission area. She indicated that this area has changed a lot since the first proposal. The current proposal has omitted high school rank. The formula for arriving at the student admissions score is ACT x 3, GPA x 20, core x 5, and 10 points if the student is a MN or ND resident. UND is working closely with NDSU and both institutions will have the same standards. She reported that they are looking at data for the last two years, sharing with deans and the enrollment management group to understand the impact of various possible proposals. The Chancellor has indicated there should be no impact on enrollment. Ms. Reesor indicated that they may increase standards to insure success. The freshmen number may decrease but retention should increase and counter that. The Chancellor wants the total score to increase five points each year until it reaches the goal in four years. This approach allows entering high school students to know the requirement so they can work toward that goal and have time to achieve it. Ms. Reesor and Mr. LeBel will present the final recommendation to the President for submission to the Chancellor. There was discussion on increasing the total admission score over the years and what that means. Ms. Reesor indicated that it is not clear what number will be increased. There is fluidity in the process and that is a result of feedback from the institutions. They are trying to anticipate the impact and reduce the consequences. There was a question on the item in the Maximizing Efficiencies document regarding low enrollment classes. Mr. LeBel indicated that the unfinished parts of the Maximizing Efficiencies document are now part of the Pathways to Student Success document. The decisions and policies on this and other matters will be made after the first portions are implemented. Ms. Reesor indicated that the decision regarding admissions is an academic decision; thus, the deans, Provost, etc., will be involved in the decision.

Ms. Brekke spoke on the section on accountability. The information in that section addressed issues of tuition, non-mandatory fees and mandatory fees. She mentioned the performance audit on fees. She indicated that at the same time as the Pathways plan is being proposed and discussed, an action plan in response to the performance audit on fees is in progress. As for the Pathways plan, it indicates that the tiers will each develop a plan. Research institutions propose moving to a per credit model and will roll in non-mandatory fees to the greatest extent possible. There are some areas where it is not equitable and she indicated that aviation is the best example. As for mandatory fees, there should be consistency between UND and NDSU. Currently, there are some differences between the two institutions, e.g., wellness fee at UND. The goal is greater consistency and transparency and less complication. Additionally, the Chancellor wants consistency regarding residency. Chancellor Shirvani wants less differential between the resident and non-resident rate. He also wants a plan regarding waivers. The waiver issue is an area that we will be working through in the future. There are many implications to these decisions and we are being very deliberate. There will be many conversations and this is a work in progress. Discussion ensued. Ms. Brekke clarified that the Pathways plan currently states the tuition model will be for all instruction delivery methods. The implementation steps are unknown; also, the plan has changed and could still change. Mr. Mochoruk indicated that campus feedback has been shared and has made a big difference. He encouraged the senators to continue to provide feedback and he will share it with administration.

5.

Mr. Mochoruk called attention to the minutes of the October 4, 2012 meeting. He asked if there were any corrections. Hearing none, Mr. Mochoruk moved approval of the minutes and Mr. Zerr seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as distributed.

6.

The question period opened at 4:45 p.m.

1. Mr. Murphy asked how we recruit students at UND. He stated that many NDUS institutions send recruiting materials to his child as do institutions from all over the country but nothing comes from UND. He said this was the same experience for all his children that were looking at colleges in years past. He asked why we don't recruit in our local high schools. Ms. Reesor indicated that UND does recruit locally. She also indicated that when students take the ACT they list schools that they want the scores sent to and the scores are sent. UND recruits those students and also purchases names. Ms. Reesor indicated that her division is looking at all those areas and they are in the process of filling the leadership position for that area.

The question period closed at 4:51 p.m.

7.

Mr. Mochoruk called attention to the annual report from the Senate Essential Studies Committee. Mr. Stofferahn moved approval to accept and file the report. Mr. Zerr seconded the motion and the report was approved and filed.

8.

Ms. Goodwin presented the Curriculum Committee report for October and moved for approval. There was a second by Mr. Gerbert and the motion was approved unanimously.

9.

Ms. Ray, on behalf of the Committee on Committees, announced that there was a need for a special election to replace a member on the Senate Executive Committee who had resigned. Anne Walker was presented as the nominee by the Committee on Committees. Ms. Ray asked for nominations from the floor. There were none. Mr. Stofferahn moved nominations close and cast a unanimous ballot. There was a second by Mr. Zerr. The motion passed and Anne Walker was elected as a faculty representative on the Senate Executive Committee.

10.

Mr. Mochoruk called attention to the proposed amendment to the Bylaws of the University Senate. The changes would be under Committees, Section 1, Executive Committee. He explained that the change proposed would allow adding a staff senate representative to the Senate Executive Committee. Mr. Poochigian moved approval, Mr. Gerbert seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

11.

Mr. Stofferahn was called upon to present the change to the Faculty Handbook Language on 612 grievances. He described the process to clean up the 612 procedure. The language was convoluted and confusing and Mr. Stofferahn described the changes that were made. He indicated that the Senate Executive Committee recommends approval. Discussion ensued. The General Counsel was recognized to answer questions.

12.

Mr. Gapp moved to suspend the standing rules of the Senate in regards to the ending meeting time and extend the meeting to 5:45 p.m. The motion was approved.

13.

Discussion continued. Mr. Sum moved approval of the changes to the 612 grievance language in the Faculty Handbook under section III-2 Grievances. There was a second by Mr. Gerbert. Discussion continued. There was a vote and the motion was approved.

14.

Mr. Mochoruk presented a proposal for a new Senate Faculty Handbook Committee. He reported the Senate Executive Committee has recommended this. Discussion ensued. Mr. Gerbert moved approval. Mr. Gapp seconded the motion. Ms. Ray indicated that adding committees will create challenges for the Committee on Committees to find additional members to serve. The motion was approved.

15.

Ms. Goodwin presented a proposed change to the Curriculum Committee membership. The change was to add the Director of the Chester Fritz Library or designee as an additional member. She explained the reason for the request. Ms. Goodwin moved approval of the Curriculum Committee membership change. Ms. Stone seconded the motion and it was approved.

16.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Suzanne Anderson  
Secretary to the Senate