Minutes
College of Design Faculty Assembly
Friday, December 2, 2011

Present:
Architecture:  Lee Anderson, Renee Cheng, John Comazzi, Gunter Dittmar, Jim Dozier, Tom Fisher, Mary Guzowski, Benjamin Ibarra-Sevilla, Cynthia Jara, Adam Marcus, Andrzej Piotrowski, Julia Robinson, Ozayr Saloojee, Ignacio San Martin,
Apparel Design: Missy Bye, Anna Carlson, Marilyn DeLong, Lucy Dunne, Karen LaBat
Graphic Design: James Boyd Brent, Brad Hokanson, Daniel Jasper, Barbara Martinson, Carol Waldron
Housing: Marilyn Bruin
Interior Design: Abimbola Asojo, Caren Martin, Stephanie Zollinger
Landscape Architecture: Brad Agee, Joe Favour, John Koepke, Kristine Miller, Lance Neckar, David Pitt
Product Design: Barry Kudrowitz
Retail Merchandising: Kim Johnson, Juanjuan Wu
Research & Outreach, Interdisciplinary: Jonee Brigham, Pat Hemmis, Lin Nelson Mayson, Virajita Singh, Billy Weber
Deans Group: Kate Maple, Trevor Miller, Kathy Witherow

On Leave: Steven McCarthy, Becky Yust, Hye Young Kim

I. Call to Order: Barbara Martinson called the meeting to order at 9:02

II. Approval of 10/7/2011 Minutes. Motion by Missy Bye, second by Stephanie Zollinger.
Minutes approved

III. Brief Report from Senators/Standing Committees: Daniel Jasper reported that the Senate met yesterday (December 1) with President Kaler, who remarked about the Penn State sexual abuse case and the UC Davis Occupy Movement. See attached written report.

Curriculum Committee: Proposed forwarded by committee requesting approval for changes (see governance site) in Product Design and the Design Minor were approved.

Interdisciplinary Design: Pat Hemmis read the following report:
The Interdisciplinary Design Committee last met on 10/28/11. The focus of the committee over the past 12 months has been the implementation of the new Design Minor.
- Last spring, approximately 95 Design Minor students were given the opportunity to continue with the old minor or switch into the new design minor.
- Procedures have been developed to allow Design Minor students to enroll in hands-on or studio courses.
• The list of design minor courses has been refined. Currently there are 74 approved courses, plus 7 courses in the approval process. Of the 81 total courses, 7 are Honors courses, 7 are Writing Intensive, and 19 fulfill some aspect of the LE requirements.

One item to note that might be of a more general interest: The design minor now has a small cohort of courses specifically relating to human experience and design.
• DES 3371: User Experience in Design or UX
• DES 5185: Human Factors in Design
• Kin 3505: Intro to Human-Centered Design

**General update on the implementation of the new Design Minor.**

**A. Numbers**
As of this morning, 130 students are enrolled in the Design Minor. Approximately two or three students add the minor every week.

**Stats Based on Enrollment of 125 Students in the Design Minor:**
• **CLA:** 71 students, approx. 57%
• **CSOM:** 17 students, approx. 14%—doubled from last year
• **CCE:** 13 students, approx. 10.5%
• **CSE:** 5 students, approx. 4%
• **EHD:** 1 student, approx. 1.25%
• **CDES:** 18 students, approx. 15%—this maintains our 85% non-CDES, 15% CDES ratio

**First Targeted Enrollment Goal: 150 students by end of Sp 2012:** We are on track to reach 150 students by the end of Spring Semester.

**Second Targeted Enrollment Goal: 200 students by end of Sp 2013.**

**B. Tracking new income generated by changes in the minor**
I have asked Kathy Witherow to track income generated by the design minor. Many more CDes courses are now available to design minor students. This will bring additional income into the College. Because of the extensive information collected by Julie Hillman through permission number requests, we will be able to track the number of design minor students taking specific courses in DHA. We hope to gather the same type of information from courses throughout the College, where permission number requests are not required.

**C. Committee work for Spring 2012**
Now that the new CDES website is operational, it is much easier to find information about the Design Minor (and all the minors). Expanding the website and creatively marketing the Design Minor will be a top priority during spring 2012. The Interdisciplinary Design Committee has decided to look at policy and procedures relating to DES course oversight in cases where oversight is held by the Interdisciplinary Design Committee and not by respective programs.

Barbara Martinson acknowledged the Interdisciplinary Design committee members: Pat Hemmis, Vice DeBritto, Daniel Jasper, Lucy Dunne and Kate Solomonson. Lee Anderson and Kate Maple are deans’ liaison and ex-officio.
Exhibitions: Lin Nelson Mayson reported that the second meeting of the semester will focus on evaluating and accepting end-of-year donations to the collection. Digital database project is viewed as having a positive impact on the increased number of donations. Faculty are reminded that exhibition proposal reviews occur in February. Please forward ideas for future exhibitions to Lin or committee members.

IV. Report from the Deans:

- Tom Fisher shared information on the following
  - CDes reached 46% participation in the 2011 Community Fund drive
  - Recent major gift for the Goldstein Museum of Design will fund an award recognizing up and coming designers from any of our fields.
  - Recent conversations with Target highlight the potential for ongoing collaboration and opportunities to jointly design the relationship
  - Innovation Zone idea utilizes creative spaces in the Weisman, Northrop Auditorium and Rapson Hall
  - Pulse Survey follow-up includes meeting with Jim Meland from the University’s Employee Assistance office. Jim’s report will be forthcoming, but faculty are encouraged to meet with him to discuss issues of concern. Primary message is that all faculty need to be mutually supportive of each other and each other’s disciplines
  - Recently presented space proposal to Central Administration that calls for CDes to assume control of the Armory. Central is very receptive to the idea because the various “dominoes” in the plan, including those from College of Education and Human Development could result in Peik Hall being torn down.
  - CDes has extra investment dollars. RFP will be forthcoming.
  - CDes has contracted with John Cary to conduct market research on public interest design. The goal is to have CDes positioned to be on the receiving end of what could be significant amounts of federal grant dollars.
  - GEO Design – Jack Dangermond of ESRI is very interested in CDes achieving the goal of being a national/international leader in this area.
  - Connections with Rochester & Mayo continue. Tom is moving forward with ideas on how this college can be part of a growing network of designers in the health area.
  - The challenge in all of the above connections is to find funding opportunities from non-traditional sources.
- Kathy Witherow gave a brief update on the College’s fiscal status. The College is waiting for information and instructions from Central re: FY12 surplus and FY13 budget. September PP presentation to Regents re: additional FY12 $25M legislative allocation was circulated.
• Brad Hokanson discussed the recent Research and Adjunct slams, and encouraged faculty to sign up for 3-day The Art of Participatory Leadership workshop scheduled for January 10-12, 2012.
• Trevor Miller presented information about a new fund-raising tactic, just-in-time giving. The College was successful in reaching its goal earlier this fall for the Haiti apparel project. Information about a second project, The Gift of Shelter is available on the website, http://blog.lib.umn.edu/cdescomm/cdes_memo/2011/12/shelter-update.html
• Lee Anderson reported that the Graduate School is continuing to make progress in its goal of getting various rules and regulations down on paper. He also spoke to the recent media coverage of the University’s policy on transfer students. The issue is not as controversial is the media has led the public to believe. Eric Kaler’s stance is that the issue is how transfer students can be appropriately prepared to be successful at the U, not the actual # of transfer students. This is a potential political issue because of various ties to MNSCU.
  o Karen LaBat urged faculty to pay attention to a ballot forthcoming from the Graduate Education Council. Karen is one of 15 on the slate for this election. More information to follow.
• Kate Maple gave an update on the declining number of undergraduate applications. Many factors are in play, including
  o Demographics
  o Current economy and level of financial support available to students
  o Confusion over continuing reciprocity with Wisconsin
  o Declining interest of high school ACT test takers in design professions

V. Old Business: Pulse Survey: See comments above in Dean’s Update

Meeting reminder: there are now standardized meeting times for the Faculty Assembly. Spring and fall 2012 dates are listed below. All meetings will be 9:00 – 10:30.

Spring 2012:
Last Friday in February: February 24 – room 274 McNeal
Monday following commencement: May 14 – room 225 Rapson

Fall 2012:
First Friday in October: October 5 – room 274 McNeal
First Friday in December: December 7 – room 225 Rapson

Meeting adjourned at 10:25.
Minutes submitted December 5, 2011

Kathy Witherow
Report of the December 1st, 2011 Faculty Senate meeting.

Report compiled by CDes/DHA Faculty Senator Daniel Jasper: djasper@umn.edu

The three main items from the 12/01/11 Faculty Senate meeting are presented here with links to relevant documents. In my estimation those three items are the following:

1. Graduate and Professional Degrees Awarded at the University of Minnesota
2. Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion
   Proposed for Adoption (2011)
3. Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure White Paper Regarding academic freedom

President’s Remarks

Occupy Movement

In terms of university and police behavior: what happened at U. C. Davis and U. C. Berkeley will not happen here. While ‘Occupy’ tactic raises 'health & safety' concerns, peaceful protest on the University campus will be tolerated.

Sexual Abuse

Regarding abuse allegations at Syracuse and Penn State Universities; If you as a human being or employee see sexual abuse or assault—report it to the police—reporting to one’s superior is not enough.

Graduate Program Metrics of Evaluation

Quantitative Metrics are coming; we need to set-up our standards before someone does it for us.

1. Graduate and Professional Degrees Awarded at the University of Minnesota

-- The FCC and Senate Committee on Educational Policy continue to discuss metrics to be used for the evaluation of graduate programs and brought the discussion to the Faculty Senate; metrics are included in the recent report of the Size, Scope, and Mission Committee (originally called the Enrollment Management Committee), which also proposes categorization of graduate programs as "outstanding," "strong," "good," and "needs reassessment."

The full report is here:

A (perhaps over simplified) summary of the problem is as follows:

-- Compared to peer institutions, the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities Campus is at or near the top of the range of numbers of students enrolled in graduate and professional program.

-- The University of Minnesota currently ranks third in production of graduate and professional degrees among our peer institutions. Minnesota’s overall third place position in advanced degree production is slightly at odds with its second place position in graduate and professional enrollment.

-- Despite the strong performance of many of our Ph.D. programs, our overall program rankings place us lower than eight out of ten universities in our peer group.

**Are our Ph.D. programs overextended for available resources?**

A working hypothesis of this report is that the University of Minnesota has been admitting more Ph.D. students and/or has more programs than is affordable or wise for the promotion of high quality programs of excellence, given available resources. Simply put, we may be spread too thinly. If true, this reduces our ability to provide top quality graduate student experiences and to maintain our reputation as a source of the best Ph.D.s in a variety of academic fields.

Several factors support this hypothesis:

- Minnesota currently is at or near the top of our peer group in both numbers and proportions of post-baccalaureate students.
- Ph.D. program quality, as assessed by the recent NRC rankings, indicates that although we have highly-ranked programs, we also have programs that appear not to be competitive with peers in impact, performance and reputation.
- Student success rates, as measured by median time to degree and % completion rates, are also highly variable.
- Although it is difficult to get a handle on the numbers of programs at peer institutions and the relationship between size and quality, two indicators suggest that UMTC may have more postbaccalaureate programs than many of our peers:

  -- Minnesota ranked second in the total number of Ph.D. programs.
  -- An informal survey of webbased materials of our peers also seems to indicate Minnesota has a comparatively high number of graduate programs.
2. Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

Proposed for Adoption (2011)

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure brought forward a revised and clarified set of procedures for "Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty." Changes were approved by Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and the Provost and were presented to the Faculty Senate and Board of Regents for information.

The procedures were last revised in 2007, following changes in Faculty Tenure approved by the Board of Regents that year. After additional changes were made in Faculty Tenure in 2011, the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure charged a subcommittee with the task of drafting revised Procedures to reflect the 2011 changes to Faculty Tenure and to ensure that the Procedures are clear and complete.

With few exceptions, the changes reflect clarification or more detailed description of rules already in place, codification of practices already followed but not written, or implementation of provisions added to Faculty Tenure in 2011. The summary below highlights the changes from the 2007 Procedures. I’ve italicized points 1 and 4 as these represent more significant changes that may impact many of our faculty currently.

Summary of the Changes in the Proposed Tenure Procedures (2011)

1. To help regularize the process for faculty who do interdisciplinary work or who have joint appointments, new language is added specifying that each such faculty member should enter a memorandum of understanding (developed with his/her unit head, dean or chancellor, and the provost) specifying how the faculty member will be evaluated, including who other than the tenured faculty of the unit will participate in the tenure consideration. Such an MOU is mandated within one year for those with dual appointments and suggested by the fourth year of the appointment for those with interdisciplinary commitments. See Section II.B.

2. The questions to be voted upon in the P&T meeting are clarified, to ensure that a single vote is taken for both tenure and promotion of an assistant professor and to make clear that a termination vote may be taken in any year of a probationary appointment. See Section II.C.4.

3. In several spots, it is clarified that a candidate may withdraw his/her candidacy for tenure (not just “request” that the file not be reviewed) at any time in the tenure review process, until the provost makes his or her decision. See Section I.F and II.C.8

4. The procedures for reviewing tenured associate professors progress toward promotion are
clarified, and a requirement is added that a unit must review each tenured associate professor’s progress toward promotion at least once every four years. See Section III.

5. Extensions of the probationary period under section 5.5 of the tenure code are clarified (Section IV).
   a. Extending the probationary period for birth or adoption of a child is triggered by written notice of the circumstances and is described as automatic. The written notice must be signed by the unit head and collegiate dean or chancellor to acknowledge that they know the candidate has extended the probationary period.
   b. Extending the probationary period for illness or major caregiver responsibilities is triggered by filing a written request, which must be signed by the unit head and collegiate dean or chancellor to ensure they are aware of the request. The administrator designated by the provost to decide whether the circumstances justify an extension will consult with the candidate before deciding and may ask for documentation. The administrator may also, with the concurrence of the candidate, share information about the reason for the extension with the candidate’s unit head.

6. Procedures for appointing faculty members with tenure (external hires) are included in Section V. The procedures describe an expedited tenure procedure (because full review usually cannot be carried out in the time frames applicable to tenured hires of faculty from other institutions). They also mandate a process to ensure that the individual receiving tenure at the University does not continue to maintain a tenured position elsewhere.

7. The procedures for annual and special peer reviews are clarified in section VI, implementing section 7a of the tenure code. The provisions specify a requirement that a memorandum of understanding be entered if a faculty member’s allocation of responsibility is to be different than otherwise expected in the unit.

8. Makes clear that only tenured faculty members may attend the meeting at which probationary faculty members are reviewed for tenure, and that only tenured faculty members may listen to or participate in the discussions of probationary faculty members. See Section II.C(1). Clarifies that only those senior in rank to the candidate may participate and vote in the consideration of a candidate’s promotion. See Section III.

9. Clarifies aspects of the annual review when a candidate has extended the probationary period under section 5.5. See Sections II.E(3) and II.F(4). Specifies that during the continuation year, an annual review will be conducted but no additional progress toward tenure is to be expected.
3. Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure

2011 the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure discussions addressed current thought about aspects of academic freedom in University work. These discussions came about because of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the case of *Garcetti v. Ceballos* and because of the controversy surrounding the release of the film *Troubled Waters*, led to the preparation of this White Paper. A final white paper on academic freedom from the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure was brought to the U Senate on December 1; the report discusses who has academic freedom, its limits, academic freedom for administrators, etc.

The white paper can be found on page 16 of the 12/01/11 Faculty Senate Agenda:

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usenate/agendas/111201agenda.pdf

There were concerns raised by senators regarding the paper’s suggestion that one needs to provide a disclaimer, when speaking publicly and in the press, that your views do not represent those of the U of M, etc. Also there were concerns about the protections graduate students may or may not have given their dual roles as seemingly protected scholars but otherwise not protected University employees. There is still time to comment on the paper and make your concerns known to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The committee chair and co-chair are listed below:

Chair: Professor Barbara Elliott: belliott@d.umn.edu

Co-Chair: Associate Professor Christine Marran: marran@umn.edu