Minutes
College of Design Faculty Assembly
Thursday, December 16, 2010

Present:
Architecture: Lee Anderson, Renee Cheng, John Comazzi, Greg Donofrio, Tom Fisher, Benjamin Ibarra-Sevilla, Jim Lutz, Julia Robinson, Ozayr Saloojee
Apparel Design: Missy Bye, Lucy Dunne
Graphic Design: James Boyd Brent, Brad Hokanson, Barbara Martinson, Steven McCarthy, Carol Waldron
Housing: Bill Angell, Becky Yust
Interior Design: Caren Martin
Landscape Architecture: John Koepke, Kristine Miller
Retail Merchandising: Kim Johnson, Hye-Young Kim
Research & Outreach: Pat Hemmis

Regrets: Sue Chu, Daniel Jasper, Ann Ziebarth, Billy Weber, Tasoulla Hadjiyanni

Staff: Kathy Witherow

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

II. Approval of 10/15/2010 Minutes: Motion by Johnson, second by Robinson to approve minutes. Motion passed

III. Brief Report from Senators: Julia Robinson shared reports provided by Ann Ziebarth. See attached reports titled (a) UnivfacSenatePolicyonGrad Committees2010.doc and (b) Faculty Senate-CDes Respose-BenefitCost Increases.doc. Reports are also posted on the governance site.

IV. Brief Report from Standing Committees:

Promotion & Tenure: Bill Angell reported that seven dossiers are being reviewed. P&T committee is meeting this afternoon and all day tomorrow. Thanks to candidates, department heads and faculty from respective departments for all input. Comment from Bill: This was a massive project, but a joy because you see colleagues in the best and strongest light.

Centers Policy & Advisory: John Koepke reported that the annual report request will go out soon. It is a more streamlined process this year. The committee is also looking at how to decommission centers.

Faculty Leave: No report

Adjunct Faculty Consultative Committee: No report
Faculty Consultative Committee: Julia Robinson reported that the FCC had a productive discussion with dean about new policy on position reserve. Also discussed was the college calendar meeting announcement process, and voting and quorums for Faculty Assemblies.

FCC Recommendations to CDes Assembly regarding Governance

The committee identified three committee motions to be presented to the CDes Assembly:

A. Whereas, attendance at the CDes Assembly is low, often not reaching a quorum, the Faculty Consultative Committee proposes the following two motions for discussion. (See chart of attendance at CDes Assembly meetings)

(1) That the Assembly Chair identify standard meeting days and times of two meetings per semester. These will become standard in the College calendar and Assembly members can put them into their calendars and plan accordingly. For example, the first Friday of October and December from 9:30-11:30 am during Fall Semester and the first Friday of February and April during Spring Semester.

B. Whereas, it has been difficult to establish a quorum to conduct business either in person at meeting or via email voting,

(2) That the Assembly consider a ByLaw change that establishes that voting be based on the majority of those eligible members attending the meeting in which a vote is taken.

NOTE: This language is already in the Bylaws. See language below:

Bylaws (IV.4.6) Adoption of official policy shall pass by a majority vote at a meeting in which a quorum is present or a majority taken by mail or email vote by the noted deadline. Ordinary business of the assembly, including amendments to proposals may be ruled on by a majority of those attending the meeting.

Motion #2 was withdrawn. It was suggested that there be clarification of what “ordinary business” means.

C. Whereas, it is important that communication within the college be strengthened, the FCC proposes

(3) that the Assembly Chair (or his/her designee) be invited to participate at the CDes Council of Deans and Department Heads meetings. The purpose of this participation would be to provide a faculty voice in administrative deliberations.

Point of clarification: Assembly Chair would be ex-officio, non-voting at Deans & Department Head meetings.

Motions 1 & 3 passed.

Julia Also reported on the FCC’s priorities for the year:

(1) Policy changes and procedures (e.g. Policy on New Faculty Hires)
(2) Increasing grant support for research and creative scholarship
(3) Procedures for roll out and implementation of strategic plans
**Curriculum:** Kristine Miller reported on the high level of agreement within committee. One issue to discuss at Assembly is development of design minor. Pat Hemmis reported on the new version of design minor. Design minor summary: Changes were both pedagogical and financial. Survey of students was completed looking at strengths and weaknesses. Committee worked with advising team to implement changes. Pedagogical issue: lack of design courses. New minor will have an array of CDes courses -- theory, history, socio-cultural, hand-on courses. Financial issue: 85% of 100 students in minor are outside college. We get 75% tuition and don't pay head costs. In the new minor, more students and money will come into college.

Minor language change to information on governance site: change language from “2 courses may double dip with major” to “2 courses may double dip with major or other minor”. There is no change to # of credits to students.

Faculty voted on the entire slate of proposed curriculum changes (see governance site). Motion passed.

**IV. Report from the Deans:** Tom Fisher, Lee Anderson and Brad Hokanson presented information via PowerPoint, posted on the governance site.

**V. Old Business:** None

**VI. New Business:** None

Meeting adjourned at 10:26.

Minutes submitted 12/22/10
Kathy Witherow
Attachment: Information from CDes Senators:

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate approves the following new policy.

Policy on appointments to graduate examining committees

This policy governs appointments to the following graduate examination committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master's Examination Committees</th>
<th>Ph.D. Preliminary Oral Examination Committees</th>
<th>Ph.D. Final Oral Examination Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. Composition of master’s examination committees

a. Any University of Minnesota (University) tenured or tenure-track faculty member who holds an earned doctorate or designated equivalent in an appropriate field from an accredited institution may serve in any role on master’s committees.

b. i. Other University faculty (including adjunct faculty) or staff who hold an earned doctorate or designated equivalent in an appropriate field from an accredited institution but who do not hold a tenured or tenure-track appointment, may serve on master’s committees and act as an advisor.

ii. All such appointments must be reviewed individually at the collegiate level according to a review process and criteria specified by the collegiate unit.

c. Emeritus faculty and faculty, tenured or non-tenured, who have left the University may continue with committee assignments that were active at the time of their departure, including serving as advisor, if the faculty member and the student both agree to the continuation in writing.

d. Outside experts, whether or not they hold faculty appointments elsewhere, may serve on examining committees in any role except as advisor. All such appointments must be reviewed individually at the collegiate level according to a review process and criteria specified by the collegiate unit.

e. Individuals having a nonacademic relationship with the candidate may not serve on that candidate’s graduate examining committee, as it would create a conflict of interest.

f. Individuals working toward a graduate degree at the University may not serve on a graduate examining committee unless an exception has been granted by the Dean of Graduate Education.

g. Collegiate deans or their designated representatives at the collegiate level must review and approve all assignments as advisor.

II. Composition of doctoral examination committees

a. Any University tenured or track-track faculty member who holds an earned doctorate or designated equivalent in an appropriate field from an accredited institution may serve in any role on doctoral committees.

b. The chair of the Ph.D. final oral examination committee may not be the candidate’s advisor or co-advisor.

c. Every Ph.D. final oral examination committee must include at least two tenure-track or tenured University faculty members who hold earned doctorate degrees or designated equivalents in appropriate fields from an accredited institution. At least one of the faculty members must be tenured. There are no exceptions to this requirement.

d. Other University faculty (including adjunct faculty) or staff who hold an earned doctorate or designated equivalent in an appropriate field from an accredited institution may serve on doctoral committees. All such appointments must be reviewed individually at the collegiate level according to a review process and criteria specified by the collegiate unit.

e. Only a faculty member may serve as advisor.
f. Emeritus faculty and tenured or non-tenured faculty who have left the University may continue with committee assignments that were active at the time of their departure, including serving as advisor, if the faculty member and the student both agree to the continuation in writing.

g. Outside experts, with or without faculty appointments elsewhere, may serve on examining committees in any role except as advisor or chair of the Ph.D. final oral examination committee. All such appointments must be reviewed individually at the collegiate level according to a review process and criteria specified by the collegiate unit.

h. Individuals having a nonacademic relationship with the candidate may not serve on that candidate’s graduate examining committee, as it creates a conflict of interest.

i. Individuals working toward a graduate degree at the University may not serve on a graduate examining committee unless an exception has been granted by the Dean of Graduate Education.

j. Collegiate deans or their designated representatives at the collegiate level must review and approve all assignments as either advisor or chair of the Ph.D. final oral examination committee.

III. Exceptions

Collegiate deans or their designated representatives at the collegiate level may authorize assignments to master’s and doctoral committees that do not fully conform to policy statements Ia, Ibi, Ic, IIa, IIe, and IIf.

IV. Documentation

Each college must have a set of publicly available standards and processes for appointments to all roles on graduate examining committees, with special attention to requirements for advisors and for chairs of the Ph.D. final oral examination committee.

Collegiate units may develop more specific local policies so long as they conform to the policy statements listed above.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) last year commissioned a committee to assemble and review all policies related to graduate education, and to prepare them for approval through the University's normal policy-review process so they can be placed in the policy library. This is the first such policy, and has been reviewed by SCEP and by the Faculty Consultative Committee. A number of changes were made as a result of the discussions with the two committees, and they endorse it.
Faculty Senate request for input regarding benefit cost increases

College of Design Comments

1. If the University is unable fully to cover increasing health care costs in 2012, how should we respond?

Health care is an important benefit that is one of the reasons people stay at the University. College of Design faculty and staff responding to the request for input, were divided in their responses. A few suggested that it not be either/or decision of across-the-board or higher co-pays but a combination of the two.

Concerns included the impact of higher co-pays significantly impacting families with children and those with chronic health conditions.

- One of the reasons people stay at the U is health care benefit. This benefit is in exchange for lesser pay than the private sector, not as many opportunities for career growth, or even lateral moves, and in some cases no 401K retirement. If premiums go up, the University should significantly reduce other U of M services that contribute to overall quality of life such as recreational memberships, fitpass costs, Northup Events and other opportunities that would improve an employee’s health.
- Option of same or similar coverage with increasing the co-pay seems better; those who use more health care would pay more without having to pay additional across the board costs.
- A combination of higher co-pays and higher premiums; not just one or the other.
- I wouldn’t mind paying for higher premiums/co-pays, but then get rid of monthly parking fees.
- Hope that an increase across-the-board would spread out the burden of premium costs.
- I believe that across-the board increases would most fairly distribute the pain.
- Agree with a moderate increase in co-pays in combinations with across-the-board increases. HOWEVER, this could significantly impact families that have chronic health conditions, children, etc.
- I’d like to see a combination of the two; our co-pays are really low right now.

2. If we impose higher employee premiums, should we cap the amount that an employee must pay for coverage as a percentage of salary, in order to avoid substantial federal financial penalties that would be imposed on the University beginning in 2014?

All respondents from the College of Design supported a cap on the amount employees pay for coverage as a percentage of salary.

- Yes, cap as a percentage of salary. Those who are on the lower end of the pay scale should not bear an undue burden for their insurance.
- Yes. I like limiting the amount that an employee must pay for coverage as a percentage of salary.
• Yes. If a higher employee premium is enforced, I strongly believe that it should be capped. I also feel that with a higher employee premium there should be a higher employee hourly wage/salary. Increasing premiums will create higher expectations of services provided, the quality of services received, and the timeliness/efficiency of the services given. Increase in premiums will have a serious ripple effect. If premiums go up, the University should be prepared to offer services like the recreational center, fit passes, and other U of M benefits at lower costs to keep moral up. If people feel cheated or dispensable, quality of work commonly goes down... this could affect the student population as well. If they feel they are not getting the kind of assistance, service, and education they are paying for, most students do have the option to pay tuition elsewhere.
• Yes. We need a cap.
• Yes. Unless the amount alters before 2014.

3. Should we substantially reduce the premiums or co-pays for employees who either (a) have satisfactory biometrics, or (b) are making real progress in improving their biometric results through health improvement activities?

There was no clear response to the use of biometrics as a means of lowering benefit costs for some employees.

Concerns included issues of privacy regarding medical records as well as situations in which a person may not have control of health outcomes.

A question was raised regarding the substantial reduction of costs—would that imply a substantial INCREASE of costs for other employees?

• Yes, incentives for “controllable” biometrics would be a fine thing
• Yes. Absolutely reduce premiums for employees that meet the criteria identified. I am an avid supporter of healthcare for everyone, but also feel that people who take extensive time to maintain their quality of health through the use of exercise, spend more money to buy healthy foods, and take home to prepare home-cooked meals should be rewarded for good health behavior and choices.
• No. Neither of these would be fair to those like me who have had transplants and other medical problems. I would not be in favor of this.
• No. I do NOT like the idea of the University probing into private medical data. That’s between the individual and their health care provider.
• No. I don’t know how this would be determined and it does not seem equitable. Other things are going to be more motivating toward good health.
• No. There are too many situations outside a person’s control and I would hate to see the institution penalize individuals.
• Maybe. There needs to be more information. It is not clear what is meant by “biometrics”. Is this the same as “health screenings”? Does substantially decreasing costs for some imply substantially increasing costs for others?
4. Should we offer, as an option, a network that consists only of providers who provide above-average quality of care at below average costs? Such a network might not be available in all locations.

Again, the response was divided on this suggestion. Among the concerns was the decision-making regarding which providers would and would-not be in the network. Also, questions regarding employee choice and pre-existing relationships were raised. As one person said, I really like Health Partners and would not like to have to change providers.

- Yes. A low-cost, high-effective network alternative sounds good. Though it might not be an option for non-metro participants (ie, coordinate campus or extension centers), it would likely to be easy to implement for metro folks.
- Yes. One of the reasons we all pay so much for health care is that a huge cost for average to poor quality care. As a very large employer, the University of Minnesota should be using it’s group buying power to push the health care market toward better quality care at lower cost.
- Yes. If one can be found, sure. But don’t cut out the lower income employees.
- Maybe. I really like Health Partners and would not like to have to switch.
- Maybe. This is worth considering. It seems a good options would also be able to provide more information about quality of care and cost of care of providers and networks.
- No. I do not feel the network should be limited. Who gets to decide which providers get to stay, go, or are added? By limiting the access to providers that employees have pre-existing relationships and healthcare history with, you would affect the consistency in patient care as well as someone’s potential ability to utilize their healthcare benefits. Who gets to decide who is in the network and who is no longer in the network.
- No.

Additional question:

- Can people who have other insurance decline the University’s insurance? Can employees DECLINE health benefits?

Submitted by Ann Ziebarth, Associate Professor

College of Design

December 2, 2010