

# MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1997

11:30 a.m.

25 Law Building—Twin Cities Campus  
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus  
355/57 Kirby Student Center—Duluth Campus  
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus

The Senate Constitution provides that any student eligible to vote for senators may be admitted to Student Senate meetings and shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Student Senate. Only elected student members (or their designated alternates) shall be entitled to vote. For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (29) must be present. Amendments to motions in the printed agenda must be submitted to the Clerk of the Senate at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to allow for appropriate distribution. Consideration of amendments not received at least 48 hours in advance requires suspension of the rules by a majority of those members present and voting.

## I. CAMPUS ASSEMBLY REPORTS (10 minutes)

## II. TEACHING EVALUATIONS Discussion (10 minutes)

### Resolution Concerning the Addition of Student Evaluations of Faculty to the Agenda of the Student Legislative Coalition

- Whereas,** the ability of students to access summary data of quarterly student evaluations would assist in the course registration process, would provide a great service to students and would hold faculty more accountable to students;
- Whereas,** the Student Senate approved a resolution urging the faculty, administration, and the regents to provide a means for this student benefit without including the Legislature;
- Whereas,** the merits of available evaluations could benefit students, without allowing excessive consumerism that would negatively affect our University community morale, by working through the University Senate and circumventing further fracturing of an already fractious relationship with the faculty;
- Whereas,** the Senate Committee on Educational Policy is currently reviewing the most effective and beneficial process for implementing a policy making available, for student review, student evaluations of faculty, and has a subcommittee currently making progress towards this goal;
- Whereas,** the proposed change in law affects all the students of the University of Minnesota as well as the students of MnSCU;
- Whereas,** there has been no formal consultation of the Student Senate Consultative Committee and little consultation on the proposed changes to the data practices act outside of the Twin Cities undergraduate student association;
- Whereas,** the Student Senate Consultative Committee represents the students of the University at large and not the individual campuses, institutes, colleges, schools, or departments of the University;
- Whereas,** the Legislative Agenda is subject to the approval by the Student Senate Consultative Committee, as stated in Article I, Section 4, of the Student Legislative Coalition's Constitution;

**Therefore, be it resolved** that the Student Senate Consultative Committee supports the work being done in the University Senate and specifically what is being done in the subcommittee of the Senate Educational Policy Committee, and

**Be it further resolved** that the Student Senate Consultative Committee advises the Student Legislative Coalition not to add faculty evaluations to its legislative agenda at this time.

Approved by the Student Senate Consultative Committee on March 14, 1997

## III. WELCOMING RESOLUTION TO PRESIDENT-ELECT YUDOF Action (10 minutes)

### MOTION:

To approve the following Resolution:

#### Resolution

- Whereas,** the University of Minnesota Student Senate, representing students across all four campuses, welcomes Mark Yudof to the University. We offer our congratulations to President-Elect Yudof for his well deserving selection as the next President of our fine University. Students recognize the future President's vast experience and commitment to students as attributes that will make him an outstanding President for the University.
- Whereas,** the University has a long and proud history of student involvement in the governance of the University. In keeping with this tradition, we invite President-Elect Yudof to the first Student Senate meeting of the fall. To encourage continuous communication with students from all four campuses we encourage President-Elect Yudof to regularly attend Student Senate Consultative Committee meetings.
- Whereas,** students at the University are optimistic about President-Elect Yudof's presidency and we look forward to working with him. As is to be expected, students and administration will certainly not always see eye to eye. However, it is our hope that the relationship is an open and honest one and most importantly that it is a relationship based upon trust and respect. We, the students of the University of Minnesota, look forward to establishing a strong working relationship with President-Elect Yudof which will result in a stronger institution that benefits us all.

## IV. TUITION RESOLUTION Action (10)

The proposed resolution will be distributed prior to the meeting.

## V. RESTRUCTURING THE STUDENT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Action (10 minutes)

### MOTION:

To endorse the amendment of Article III, Section 2, of the University Senate Bylaws, as follows: [new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~]

### ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES

#### 2. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

##### SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Committee on Committees appoints members of certain committees of the Senate and advises the Senate Consultative Committee on the committee structure of the Senate.

##### Membership

The Committee on Committees shall be composed of 9 elected faculty/academic professional members, 6 elected undergraduate students, and one Twin Cities graduate/professional student.

Of the faculty/academic professional members, 6 shall be from the Twin Cities campus, and one member each from the Crookston, Duluth, and Morris campuses, all elected for three-year terms by the faculty/academic professional members of the Senate from these respective campuses. Faculty/academic professional members must have served as senators within the last five years.

~~Of the undergraduate student members, 3 shall be elected from the Twin Cities campus, and one each from the Crookston, Duluth, and Morris campuses, all elected by the Student Senate members from these campuses for one-year terms. The 6 undergraduate student members shall be comprised of 3 of the elected undergraduate Twin Cities representatives to the Student Senate Consultative Committee and the Crookston, Duluth, and Morris Student Senate Consultative Committee representatives. Any undergraduate student committee positions that cannot be filled by October 31 will become at-large positions and can be filled by an undergraduate student from any campus. The Twin Cities graduate/professional student shall be elected by the Student Senate members of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly from amongst the graduate/professional student representatives of the Student Senate Consultative Committee. The vice chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee shall serve on the committee filling one of the seven student positions. The term of service of student members shall be one year. Any graduate/professional student committee positions that cannot be filled by October 31 will become at-large positions and can be filled by any graduate or professional student.~~

##### STUDENT SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The vice chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee shall serve as the chair of the Student Committee on Committees for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position.

##### Duties and Responsibilities

- The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various campuses and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the undergraduate student or graduate/professional student member currently is serving; 3) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student, graduate/professional student members, and presidents of the respective student associations; and 4) expressions of interest in committee service offered by undergraduate students and graduate/professional students. In addition, the committee shall select student senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Student Senate and the committees. The committee also shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, gender, and class rank in constituting committees.
- The Student Committee on Committees members shall furnish the full committee a slate of student nominees for review and recommendations.
- To solicit annually from each newly elected member of the Student Senate a list of Senate committees on which the senator is serving or has an interest in serving.
- To request annually from student association presidents a list of students whom they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.
- To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- To submit to the Clerk of the Senate an annual budget request for the Student Committee on Committees.

## VI. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT (5 minutes)

### VII. OLD BUSINESS

### VIII. NEW BUSINESS

### IX. ADJOURNMENT

# MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1997

2:00 p.m.

25 Law Building—Twin Cities Campus  
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus  
355/57 Kirby Student Center—Duluth Campus  
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 212, including the President, 154 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), and 57 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (107) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 142 affirmative votes at one meeting or 107 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 107 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting. Amendments to motions in the printed agenda must be submitted to the Clerk of the Senate at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to allow for appropriate distribution. Consideration of amendments not received at least 48 hours in advance requires suspension of the rules by a majority of those members present and voting.

Any member of the faculty and any academic professional and student eligible to vote for senators shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Senate. Only elected members or alternates, the Senate Consultative Committee and, in case of a tie, the chair, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate any eligible alternates from their colleges, schools, or student constituencies as the alternates to serve in their places by written notice to the Senate Office prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Senate.

## ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room, and members are asked to sign in. A summary of attendance for the year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

## RULES

Rules will be available at the door.

## I. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Semester Conversion Standards Action (15 minutes)

### MOTION A:

To amend Section 1A of the Semester Conversion Standards, as follows: [new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~]

### Semester Conversion Standards

**SECTION 1A:** There shall be two semesters, each of which shall include a minimum of 70 days of instruction and a maximum of 75 days of instruction, at least one study day, and approximately one week of final examinations (including Saturdays but not Sundays).

For the fall semester, classes shall begin after Labor Day and the exam period shall end not later than December 23.

For the spring semester, classes shall begin on the third Tuesday of January and provide 74 or 75 class days of instruction.

Departments may schedule a short three-week intersession following the end of the spring semester and before the first summer term, using Summer Session compensation and tuition practices. No department shall be obligated to offer courses or academic work during this three-week term.

~~There shall be at least two summer terms, which may not begin before K-12 public school classes are completed.~~

There shall be a standard eight-week summer session, which may not begin before K-12 public school classes are completed. No department shall be obligated to offer courses or academic work during this eight week session. Departments and programs may also work with Summer Session to deliver courses over either shorter or longer periods of time and with different starting and ending dates.

### COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has been informed that a number of faculty worry that condensing a 15-week semester course into a 5-week summer session (the summer term the University has long used with quarters) may not be feasible; to do so would require tripling the teaching time each day of the summer session.

A more practical alternative, and the one used by Wisconsin, is to have an 8-week summer session. This allows approximately the same 2:1 ratio between semesters and summer terms that exists with the quarter system and the 5-week summer terms. Because the 8-week term is slightly more than half the length of a semester, the time for final examinations need not intrude on instructional time.

Departments would not be precluded from offering courses of other lengths, as long as the Senate policies on credits and instructional contact hours are observed.

### MOTION B:

To amend Section 7 of the Semester Conversion Standards, as follows: [new language is underlined; deleted language is ~~struck-out~~]

### Semester Conversion Standards

**SECTION 7:** Exemptions from these standards may be granted by the President's Office following review and recommendation by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. Any exemptions granted shall be reported to the Senate at its next meeting.

### COMMENT:

At the Senate meeting on February 20, 1997, a member of the Senate inquired why the President, rather than the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), was charged with deciding whether or not to grant exceptions to the Semester Conversion Standards.

SCEP debated this point at its meeting of February 26, and concluded that the point was well taken. SCEP concluded that it should have a role in the decision to grant exemptions, so provides that it must review all such requests and make a recommendation to the President.

SCEP assumes that exemptions will be only rarely granted.

Any exemptions granted pursuant to the existing Semester Conversion Standards will be honored.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair

## II. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE 1999-2000 University of Minnesota Calendar Action (5 minutes)

### MOTION:

To amend the following 1999-2000 University of Minnesota Calendar, as follows: [language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~; language to be added is underlined]

### 1999-2000 University of Minnesota Calendar

[The Fall and Spring semesters remain the same.]

#### Interession 2000 (14 class days)

May 22	Monday	3-week Interession begins
May 29	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 9	Friday	3-week Interession ends

#### Summer Session I 2000 (24 class days)

June 12	Monday	Summer Term I begins
July 4	Tuesday	Independence Day holiday
July 14	Friday	Summer Term I ends

#### Summer Session II 2000 (25 class days)

July 17	Monday	Summer Term II begins
August 18	Friday	Summer Term II ends

#### Summer Session 2000 (49 class days)

June 12	Monday	8-week Summer Term begins
July 4	Tuesday	Independence Day holiday
August 4	Friday	8-week Summer Term ends
August 18	Friday	Summer Session ends

### COMMENT:

This amends the 1999-2000 summer session calendar to conform to the proposed amendment to the Semester Conversion Standards that the Committee proposed. It establishes the 8-week general session, continues the intersession, and allows for an additional two weeks of instruction after the close of the 8-week session.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair

## III. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Bylaw Amendment Action (5 minutes)

### MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 6, Duties and Responsibilities (a) and (c), of the bylaws of the University Senate, as follows: [new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~]

### 6. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

The Educational Policy Committee is concerned. . . .

#### Duties and Responsibilities

- To consult with and advise the president and ~~vice-presidents~~ the senior officers it determines appropriate on all matters of educational policy and to recommend to the Senate such policies on educational issues as it deems appropriate and necessary.
- To recommend to the Senate policies on the extension of the research, teaching, and service resources. . . .
- To formulate policies governing calendars, and to set the calendar of the University with the approval of the Senate.

### COMMENT:

The first change is intended to be editorial. Rather than stipulate specific officers (other than the President) with whom the committee should consult, the language would refer to senior officers; at present, three of the most important academic officers are the provosts. The proposed language would allow SCEP to consult with whichever officers it determines advisable, no matter their title.

The second change is related to the Semester Conversion Standards. With the adoption of those Standards, and a common calendar for the University, the Twin Cities Campus Assembly should no longer be responsible for setting a specific Twin Cities calendar. These changes move the responsibility for setting the calendar from the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.

There will be a corresponding Twin Cities Campus Assembly bylaw amendment presented at the next meeting of the Assembly, but only if this amendment granting authority to the Senate to set the calendar is adopted. In the event the bylaws do not pass, Section 1 of the Semester Conversion Standards calling for a common calendar (with exemptions to be reviewed by SCEP, as proposed elsewhere in this docket) is invalid because it contradicts bylaw provisions, and each campus assembly must, each year, approve the "University" calendar.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair

## IV. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy Action (15 minutes)

### MOTION:

To amend the University of Minnesota Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy, as follows: [new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~]

- Reword the definition of the "D" grade to eliminate ambiguity in meaning:  
D 1.00 . . . . Represents achievement that is worthy of credit even though it fails fully to meet fully the course requirements.
- Eliminate the "D-" grade  
~~D- 0.67~~

III. Clarify that a grade of "F" carries 0 grade points and counts in the grade point average; for the purposes of the grade point average and credits awarded, distinguish more clearly between the meaning of the F and the N; eliminate the "0" grade points for the S, because it has no grade points associated with it, as does the F.

1. ~~There are five permanent grades given for a single course for which credit shall be awarded, which shall be acceptable for the completion of a single course which will be entered on a student's official transcript. A-B-C-D-F grades include pluses and minuses, as follows, and carry the indicated grade points. The S grade shall carry no not carry grade points but the credits shall count toward the student's degree program if allowed by the college, campus, or program.~~

These definitions apply to grades awarded to students who are not enrolled in graduate programs, but the grade points are the same no matter the level or, course of enrollment.

- A 4.00 . . . . Represents achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements.
- D 1.00 . . . . Represents achievement that is worthy of credit even though it fails to meet fully the course requirements.
- ~~D- 0.67~~
- S -0- Represents achievement that is **satisfactory**, i.e., is equivalent to a 2.00 and meets or exceeds the course requirements in every respect.

2. ~~There are two permanent grades given for a single course for which no credit shall be awarded and which will be entered on a student's official transcript.~~  
F (or) N

~~Represents failure (or) no credit and signifies that the work was either (1) completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit or (2) was not completed and there was no agreement between the instructor and the student that the student would be awarded an I (see Section V (1)). Academic dishonesty in any portion of the academic work for a course shall be grounds for awarding a grade of F or N for the entire course. Neither the F nor the N shall carry any grade points.~~

E -0- Represents **failure** and signifies that the work was either (1) completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit or (2) was not completed and there was no agreement between the instructor and the student that the student would be awarded an I (see Section V (1)).

The F carries 0 grade points and the credits for the course do not count toward any academic degree program. The credit hours for the course shall count in the grade point average.

N Represents **no credit** and signifies that the work was either (1) completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit or (2) was not completed and there was no agreement between the instructor and the student that the student would be awarded an I (see Section V (1)). The N carries no grade points and the credits for the course do not count toward any academic degree program. The credit hours for the course do not count in the grade point average.

Academic dishonesty in any portion of the academic work for a course shall be grounds for awarding a grade of F or N for the entire course.

Students who enroll for a course on the A-F grading system shall receive an F if such grade is warranted; students who enroll for a course on the S-N system shall receive an N if such grade is warranted.

4. Every student shall have calculated, both at the end of each grading period (quarter or semester) and cumulatively, a grade point average, which shall be the ratio of grade points earned divided by the number of credits attempted with grades of A-F (including pluses and minuses). Both the periodic and cumulative grade point average will appear on each student's record.

IV. 3. Repeating Courses

In those instances when a college or campus permits a student to repeat a course, (a) all grades for the course shall appear on the official transcript, (b) the course credits may not be counted more than once toward degree and program requirements, and (c) only the last enrollment for the course shall count in the student's grade point average. ~~Section (IV (1) (b))~~ The preceding sentence of this policy shall not apply to courses using the same number but where students study different content each term of enrollment; all such courses falling under this provision must be approved by the college.

COMMENT:

One of the changes (III) responds to comments that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy has heard repeatedly: that the D-grade should not be an option and should not be a grade awarded to a student permitting credit for a course to be earned. Elimination of the D- also makes the actual grades of the grading policy for the Twin Cities, Crookston, and Morris parallel that of the Duluth campus.

The other changes are intended to clarify points of misunderstanding that have arisen since the initial policy was adopted by the Senate.

Laura Coffin Koch, Chair

V. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
Policy on Classes, Schedules, and Final Examinations  
Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend Section 4 of the Policy on Classes, Schedules, and Final Examinations, as follows: [new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~]

Policy on Classes, Schedules, and Final Examinations

4. Final Examinations and Study Day

a) All classes that normally permit undergraduates to enroll shall follow a standard examination schedule. The final examination period for day school and University College, at the close of each session, shall be extended over a five or six-day period.

b) Each campus shall decide whether or not to have a study day. For those that choose to have one, the final examination period shall begin on the second day after classes end, with the day after classes designated as a study day. In the event classes end on a Friday, final examinations shall not start until the following Monday.

c) The requirement that the final examination schedule be five or six days shall not apply to units which have been granted an exemption from the University calendar, pursuant to the provisions of the Semester Conversion Standards.

COMMENT:

At the February 20 Senate meeting, when one Senator raised the question about the locus of authority to grant exemptions to the Semester Conversion Standards, his point was raised in connection with the proposed new language of this policy. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) has proposed changing the process for granting exemptions, elsewhere in this docket, but also wishes now to propose a change in the Semester Conversion Standards that was withdrawn at the last Senate meeting, in light of the discussion over who should have the authority to grant exemptions. This amendment to the policy on classes, schedules, and final examinations was held up because it referred to exemptions from the Semester Conversion Standards granted by the President. The language now provides for the different final examination periods if the exemption has been granted under the authority of the Semester Conversion Standards.

With respect to changes proposed in Section 4(b), SCEP listened to comments from its colleagues from Crookston and Morris, and was persuaded that while a study day makes sense for the Twin Cities campus, the same logic does not necessarily apply to other campuses. The timing of classes and examinations and the pattern of student academic behavior make it less important that there be a study day. SCEP concluded, therefore, that whether to have a study day should be optional with each campus.

With respect to the language of Section 4(c), SCEP notes that the President's Office, pursuant to authority granted under the original Semester Conversion Standards, had granted exemptions from the University calendar to Crookston, Morris, and the Law School. In all three cases, it allowed them to begin classes before Labor Day. This provision would allow deviations from the standard final examination schedule when a campus or unit has been granted an exemption from the standard calendar: Crookston and Morris, with their much smaller student bodies, do not need five or six days for final examinations; the Law School, for accreditation purposes, requires two weeks.

These seemed to SCEP to be reasonable accommodations to the needs of these units, and thus urges the Senate to accept them.

Laura Coffin Koch, Chair

VI. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
Policy on Transfer of Credit  
Action (15 minutes)

MOTION:

To adopt the following as Senate policy:

Policy on Transfer of Credit

Credit for course work taken at other institutions will be transferred subject to the following considerations:

- the mission of the institution from which credits would be transferred,
- the comparability of the course work with University of Minnesota course work, and
- the appropriateness of the course work for meeting baccalaureate degree requirements at the University of Minnesota.

Regional accreditation shall usually serve as the primary criterion for determining the transferability of course work from another institution. Credits from Minnesota Technical Colleges may be considered for transfer when appropriate to a student's degree program. Credit is not normally transferred from specialized or proprietary institutions, military schools, or industry-based education programs.

It shall be the responsibility of the Director of Admissions on each campus to identify those institutions from which credit can be transferred and to determine whether course work is college level. If questions arise with regard to transfer of specific courses, the Director of Admissions will confer with the appropriate college or departmental faculty. When transfer of credits from Minnesota Technical Colleges, from specialized or proprietary institutions, military schools, or industry-based education programs is sought, the request shall automatically be referred by the Director of Admissions to the appropriate college or departmental faculty.

Credit granted by another institution for non-traditional experiences (CLEP, AP, IB, military training) will be re-evaluated for content and comparability by the Office of Admissions. Religious studies courses transfer if they are not doctrinal, confessional, or sectarian in nature. Religious studies courses from public institutions transfer without special review; religious studies courses from all other institutions will be evaluated by appropriate college or departmental faculty.

The University Senate endorses formal articulation agreements with other post-secondary institutions, with the understanding that the agreements are consistent with Senate policy.

Appeals of decisions made under this transfer of credit policy shall be directed first to the Director of Admissions on each campus, who shall consult with the appropriate college or departmental faculty.

COMMENT:

This policy reaffirms and unifies previous Senate policies relation to transfer issues. The only change proposed is that this policy would permit the transfer of credit from Minnesota Technical Colleges, if the faculty of the appropriate academic unit—college or department—approve.

Laura Coffin Koch, Chair

VII. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
Award for Outstanding Contributions to Graduate and Professional Education  
Action (15 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Senate adopt the following new policy:

Policy on Award for Outstanding Contributions to Graduate and Professional Education

Preamble

The Award for Outstanding Contributions to Post-Baccalaureate Graduate and Professional Education will be given annually to faculty nominated by the colleges.

Criteria

In general, the award is to recognize faculty who engage post-baccalaureate, graduate, and professional students in a community of intellectual inquiry, who provide a model of how to fulfill the role for which the student is obtaining the education, and who develop and promote activities which help the student understand the larger context of his or her intended profession. The award will be made to exceptional candidates in recognize of outstanding performance in post-baccalaureate, graduate, and professional education in the following areas: excellence in instruction; involvement of students in research, scholarship and professional development; development of graduate or professional instructional programs; and advising and mentoring.

Policy

1. The Committee on Educational Policy shall appoint annually a nominating committee that shall (1) review nominees for both the award and for the Horace T. Morse-Alumni Association award and (2) recommend to the Committee on Educational Policy those individuals who should receive the awards. The number of recipients will be dependent on the funding available. No individual may receive both awards in the same year.

- All recipients of the award shall receive a continuous augmentation to their salary, the amount to be recommended by the Committee on Educational Policy and approved by the President.
- The department of each recipient of the award shall be provided funding for three years for the use of the award recipient for the development of teaching, advising, and program development materials and training in order to promote excellence in graduate and professional education among all of the faculty.
- The Committee on Educational Policy shall have the authority to establish operational details associated with the granting of the awards and shall report annually on those details to the Senate for information.

#### FOR INFORMATION:

##### Operational Guidelines

- Faculty are to be nominated for the award by colleges, in accord with procedures recommended by Academic Affairs and approved by the Committee on Educational Policy.
- The salary of each award winner shall be increased by a continuous augmentation. It is expected that as funding becomes available, the augmentation of the award winners will equal that of the Morse-Alumni award winners.
- The annual award ceremony shall be a large public event to which the students and colleagues of the winners will be invited. When appropriate, individuals from the winner's external professional community may also be invited. This event would be in addition to a smaller event with the President and the Alumni.
- At the discretion of the award winner, the award may include, for each winner, an appropriate, well-publicized lecture, seminar, or exhibition in the individual's specialty.
- At least every ten years, beginning with the tenth anniversary year, a special recognition event will be held for all of the winners over all of the years of the award and a special memento, such as a lapel pin, will be designed and given to the award winners.
- All faculty who have been awarded these awards shall be designated throughout their careers at the University of Minnesota as "Distinguished Teaching Professor of [field]." This title can be used in correspondence, on business cards, and wherever else appropriate.
- Any faculty member who has received the award shall be designated by an asterisk and accompanying footnote in the appropriate college catalogues and bulletins for the duration of the recipient's academic career at the University of Minnesota.

#### COMMENT

This policy establishes a new award, parallel to the Morse-Alumni award for contributions to undergraduate education, but directed at graduate and professional education. SCEP has received suggestions from a number of sources over the years, believes that recognition of efforts in graduate and professional education is both worthy and overdue, and thus recommends this policy to the Senate for action.

SCEP will, within the near future, identify a permanent name for the award, and will make a recommendation to the Senate.

Funding for award winners will have to be sought; this will be up to the administration, working with SCEP. It is the intention of SCEP, however, that the award be initiated once approved by the Senate, irrespective of whether funding is immediately available; the salary augmentation to be attached to the award will be provided when funding is obtained.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair

### VIII. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

#### Policy on Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships Discussion (30 minutes)

##### PREAMBLE:

The draft policy on Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships is the result of substantial efforts by the Sexual Harassment Board to develop a policy that is broadly supported by the University community. The Board has spent over a year consulting with a wide range of university committees, groups, and administrators in order to achieve this goal. The policy has been unanimously endorsed by several Senate Committees (including SCFA, EOWC, and SSCC), and University committees representing other groups on campus (Academic Staff Advisory Committee, Civil Service Committee). The Executive Committee of the Commission on Women also has unanimously endorsed the policy as has the CLA Council of Chairs. Finally, the Board has consulted with, and the policy has been endorsed by, appropriate administrators (including Marvin Marshak, Senior VP for Academic Affairs; Carol Carrier, Associate VP for Human Resources; and Stephanie Lieberman, Director of OEE/AA).

### UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA POLICY ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS (March 31, 1997)

#### SEXUAL HARASSMENT

##### Section 1: Introduction

Sexual harassment in any situation is reprehensible and will not be tolerated in this University. It subverts the mission of the University and threatens the careers and well-being of students, faculty and staff. In a university setting, a power differential is inherent in a faculty member's or supervisor's relationship to his or her students or subordinates. However, this policy takes into account all instances of sexual harassment irrespective of university status. It is viewed as a violation of Title VII, Title IX of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Minnesota Human Rights Act.

##### Section 2: Policy

Sexual harassment is prohibited. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and/or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:

- submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic advancement,
- submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or academic decisions affecting this individual, or
- such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

This policy applies to the conduct of all persons involved in the mission and/or services of the University, except those whose conduct may be covered under separate university collective bargaining contracts.

##### Section 3: Procedures and Guidelines

The law requires the University as employer and educator to take timely and appropriate action when it knows or should know of the existence of sexual harassment.

- It is the legal responsibility of department heads, supervisors, managers, deans, provosts, chancellors and vice presidents to respond to all instances of sexual harassment. Other persons who know of sexual harassment may report the harassment.

(2) Responsibility for administering the policy and procedures generally lies with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action with review by the Sexual Harassment Board.

(3) Each campus will develop procedures for investigating complaints of sexual harassment. These procedures will adhere to due process for all concerned. They must be approved by the Director of the University Equal Opportunity Office prior to implementation.

(4) Violations of this policy could lead to disciplinary action up to and including termination.

### CONSENSUAL SEXUAL OR ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

#### Section 1: Introduction

Decision-making responsibilities should not restrict individuals' rights of association and expression unless the exercise of those freedoms conflicts with the institutional necessity of impartiality in academic and employment decisions. As a consequence, the University's Nepotism Policy prohibits persons who are related through blood, marriage or other committed relationship to evaluate, supervise, or participate in employment decisions regarding the other person. The same rules should apply to sexual or romantic relationships between supervisors and their subordinates because these relationships may also call into question the ability of the supervisor to assess the performance of another solely on academic or professional merit. Similarly, the University Code of Conduct states that members of the University community must not abuse the authority they have been given and must take care to ensure that any personal relationships do not result in situations that might interfere with objective judgment.

The power disparity in supervisor/subordinate relationships make them vulnerable to exploitation as well as claims of exploitation. This is particularly true in faculty/student relationships. The respect and trust accorded a member of the faculty by a student as well as the power exercised by faculty in giving grades or recommendations for future study and employment make voluntary consent by the student suspect.

#### Section 2: Policy

Relationships of a sexual or romantic nature are prohibited between supervisors and their subordinates. For the purposes of this policy, the term supervisor refers to any employee, student, or other person in a position to hire, supervise, grade, advise, evaluate, or otherwise directly influence the academic progress or employment of another employee, student, or other person. The term subordinate refers to any employee, student, or other person who is hired, supervised, graded, advised, evaluated, or otherwise directly influenced by the supervisor.

Given the complexity of the University and the variety of relationships that can exist, different standards apply to different types of relationships that generally fall under the above category.

(1) Sexual or romantic relationships between instructors and advisors and their current students, and between supervisors and their immediate subordinates, are always prohibited whether or not the relationship is consensual.

(2) In other situations involving less direct supervisory relationships, it may be possible to eliminate the conflict of interest by ensuring that the individuals do not evaluate or otherwise directly influence each other's employment. In these cases, the individuals must consult an appropriate responsible administrator regarding the relationship so that such arrangements to eliminate the conflict can be made and documented. This could include a supervisor, Department head, human resources consultant, EEO officer, or Dean.

(3) Individuals should be aware that consensual sexual or romantic relationship can result in claims of sexual harassment because the voluntariness of the consent may be questioned when a power differential exists. If a sexual harassment claim subsequently is filed, the argument that the relationship was consensual will be evaluated in light of this power differential.

#### Section 3: Procedures and Guidelines

The Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action may be consulted with respect to the appropriate procedures to be used in making alternative arrangements to eliminate conflicts of interest. It is the responsibility of the supervisor(s) of the parties to address violations of this policy. Violations of this policy could lead to disciplinary action up to and including termination.

This policy should be reevaluated three years following its adoption.

DANIEL FEENEY, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee  
VIRGINIA GRAY, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

### IX. PRESIDENT'S REPORT (10 minutes)

### X. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT (5 minutes)

### XI. ANNUAL REPORTS 1995-96 Information

Annual reports will be distributed at the meeting and incorporated into the minutes.

### XII. OLD BUSINESS

### XIII. NEW BUSINESS

### XIV. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

#### FACULTY

Karen L. Brand  
1947-1997

Moy Fook Gum  
1924-1997

Keith I. Loken  
1929-1997

Richard L. Massmann  
1929-1997

#### STUDENTS

Keith Watts  
College of Education and Human Development

### XV. ADJOURNMENT

# MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1997

(Immediately following the University Senate Meeting—approx. 4:00 p.m.)

25 Law Building—Twin Cities Campus  
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus  
355-57 Kirby Student Center—Duluth Campus  
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus

The Senate constitution provides that eligible academic professionals and all members of the faculty who hold regular appointments as defined in the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure may be present at Faculty Senate meetings and shall be entitled to speak and to offer motions for Faculty Senate action. Only elected faculty members and academic professionals (or their designated alternates) shall be entitled to vote. For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (78) must be present. Actions require a simple majority of the members present and voting.

## I. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Academic Misconduct Policy Information

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), exercising its authority to act on behalf of the Faculty Senate when a decision is required prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate, unanimously approved the following amendments to the Academic Misconduct Policy at its March 6, 1997, meeting. The revisions are all additions to the present policy that were required by the Office of Research Integrity of the Public Health Service and the National Science Foundation in order to be in compliance with federal regulations. The main change is Section VI. It clarifies when the University will notify federal agencies, when it will take interim administrative action, and what is included in final reports to federal agencies. The few other changes include definitions in Section III and explicit guarantees of protection of people involved in Sections X and XIII.

As required by the Senate bylaws, the FCC is reporting its action to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate has the authority to overrule the Faculty Consultative Committee, if it so chooses.  
[Additions are underlined.]

### ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

#### SECTION III. DEFINITIONS.

**Subd. 4. National Science Foundation (NSF).** "NSF" shall mean the National Science Foundation.

**Subd. 5. Office of Research Integrity (ORI).** "ORI" shall mean the Office of Research Integrity, an independent entity within the United States Department of Health and Human Services reporting to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

**Subd. 6. Public Health Service (PHS).** "PHS" shall mean the United States Public Health Service.

#### SECTION VI. FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.

**Subd. 1. Communication with Federal Agencies.** All communication with federal agencies regarding the requirements in this policy shall be conducted by the vice president for research.

**Subd. 2. Application of Requirements.** Subdivisions 3-7 apply at any stage in the process of inquiry, investigation, formal finding, and disposition when allegations of misconduct involve activities being considered for funding or are funded by the NSF or PHS.

**Subd. 3. Notification Requirements.** The NSF and the PHS have published regulations regarding the inquiry and investigation of allegations of misconduct involving activities being considered for funding or funded by those agencies. These regulations contain requirements to report to these agencies under certain conditions and at specified stages in the process (see Section VI, subds. 5 and 6).

**Subd. 4. Interim Administrative Action.** At any stage in the process of inquiry, investigation, formal finding, and disposition, the University may take interim administrative action to protect federal funds.

**Subd. 5. Notification to ORI.** PHS regulations (42 CFR, part 50, subpart A) require that the director of the ORI shall be notified when, on the basis of the initial inquiry, the University determines that an investigation is warranted or prior to the decision to initiate an investigation under the following conditions:

- (1) there is an immediate health hazard involved;
  - (2) there is an immediate need to protect federal funds or equipment;
  - (3) there is an immediate need to protect the interests of the persons making the allegations or of the individuals who are the subject of the allegations, as well as the co-investigators and associates, if any;
  - (4) it is probable that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly; or
  - (5) there is a reasonable indication of possible criminal violation. In that instance, the University must inform ORI within 24 hours of obtaining that information. ORI will immediately notify the Office of the Inspector General.
- If the inquiry is to be terminated, the ORI shall be notified including a description of the reasons for termination.

**Subd. 6. Notification to NSF.** NSF regulations (45 CFR, part 689) require that NSF be notified or informed:

- (1) immediately if an initial inquiry supports a formal investigation;
- (2) during such an investigation; and
- (3) even before deciding to initiate an investigation or as required during an investigation if:
  - (i) the seriousness of apparent misconduct warrants;
  - (ii) immediate health hazards are involved;
  - (iii) NSF's resources, reputation, or other interests need protecting;
  - (iv) federal action may be needed to protect the interests of a subject of the investigation or of other potentially affected; or
  - (v) the scientific community or the public should be informed.

**Subd. 7. Final Report to Federal Agencies.** A final report must be submitted to the appropriate federal agency and include:

- (1) a description of the policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted;
- (2) how and from whom information was obtained relevant to the investigation;
- (3) the findings;
- (4) the basis for the findings;
- (5) the actual text or accurate summary of the views of any individuals found to have engaged in misconduct; and
- (6) a description of any sanctions taken by the institution.

#### SECTION X. DETERMINATION OF RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATOR.

**Subd. 2. Right to Privacy and Protection.** If the senior administrator decides not to conduct an investigation, no further formal action shall be taken other than informing all parties involved. The procedures shall preserve privacy consistent with law for all parties to these procedures and make diligent efforts to protect the positions and reputations of those, who in good faith, make allegations of academic misconduct. If privacy is breached, the senior administrator shall take reasonable steps to minimize the damage to reputations that may result from inaccurate reports.

#### SECTION XIII. INVESTIGATION PROCESS.

**Subd. 3. Confidentiality.** All parties involved shall be afforded confidential treatment to the maximum extent possible.

#### II. OLD BUSINESS

#### III. NEW BUSINESS

#### IV. ADJOURNMENT

**Overheads for April 17, 1997 Senate meeting  
Sexual Harassment/Consensual Relationships Policy**

**I. BACKGROUND**

- o SHB appointed by President; consists of faculty, students, staff
- o Current sexual harassment (SH) policy passed by Senate in 1984
- o In 1994, Regents requested a report from SHB for the purpose of approving a SH policy
- o SHB took opportunity to review:
  - \* effectiveness of current policy
  - \* related policies (e.g., Nepotism)
  - \* federal/state laws on discrimination and SH
  - \* policies at other institutions
  - \* policies of other professions re: consensual relationships (e.g., psychology, law)
  - \* research on SH and consensual relationships (CR)
- o Based on this review, summarized in report, SHB concluded that some changes were needed in current policy, particularly regarding consensual relationships
- o Following extensive consultation (including General Counsel's Office), SHB drafted new policy that is consistent with other University policies as well as policies of other institutions and professions

**II. KEY ELEMENTS OF NEW POLICY**

- o Section 1: Sexual Harassment
  - \* Standard definition of SH from EEOC
- o Section 2: Consensual Relationships
  - \* Outlines two types of CR
    1. Narrow category of prohibited relationships (e.g., faculty member and student currently in class; supervisor and immediate subordinate)
    2. Broader category of less direct supervisory relationships (e.g., faculty member and graduate student in department) in which relationships aren't prohibited but conflicts of

interests need to be eliminated by ensuring that individuals do not evaluate or otherwise directly influence each others' employment.

### **III. UNANIMOUS ENDORSEMENTS**

#### **Senate Committees**

**SCFA  
SSCC  
EOWC**

#### **Committees Representing Other Campus Groups**

**Civil Service Committee  
Academic Staff Advisory Committee  
Commission on Women**

#### **Administrators**

**24 member SH/sexual violence ad hoc committee  
CLA Council of Chairs  
Marvin Marshak  
Carol Carrier**

#### **SH/HR specialists**

**Director of OEO/AA, EEO officers  
HR consultants**

Senate Committee on Finance and Planning

**STATEMENT ON FOOD SERVICE OPERATIONS**

The Committee has been informed about the process that has been established to consider alternatives for future management of food service operations on the Twin Cities campus. The Committee is concerned about this matter, believing that an adequate and appropriate food service operation is essential to providing and enhancing community and building a user-friendly university.

The Committee advises the administration that as the process goes forward, specific steps should be taken:

1. Identification of who will make decisions during negotiations with prospective vendors;
2. Advisory councils that include students, faculty, and staff should be established now, not after negotiations with a vendor have been completed; and
3. Required contract provisions should be identified now.

\* \* \*

**STATEMENT ON GRANTS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION ACCESS**

In connection with the redesigning of the grants management system, the Committee has received a report on the nature and costs of access to grants management information.

The Committee concurs with the recommendations from the administration that the existing system of filters is cumbersome, expensive, inappropriate, and unnecessary. The Committee favors granting access to all public information (as defined by statute) to all employees who need it, and to eliminate filtering except as required to protect information determined by statute to be private.

\* \* \*

Both statements adopted unanimously April 1, 1997



**For consideration by the University Senate on April 17, under Item I, Semester Conversion Standards**

**I. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
Semester Conversion Standards  
Action**

**MOTION C:**

To amend the Semester Conversion Standards, Section 1A, as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~)

For the spring semester, classes shall begin on the ~~third Tuesday~~  
Tuesday following the third Monday of January and provide 74 or  
75 class days of instruction.

**COMMENT:**

The intent of the Committee on Educational Policy, when reporting the Semester Conversion Standards to the Senate for action, was that spring semester would begin after the Martin Luther King holiday. The MLK holiday is the third Monday in January. As originally written, the Standards allow for the possibility of beginning the semester before the MLK holiday (if the first day of January is a Tuesday, the third Tuesday would fall the week before the MLK holiday).

**Laura Coffin Koch, Chair  
Educational Policy Committee**

For consideration by the University Senate on April 17, under Item XIII. New Business

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN COMMITTEE  
Resolution Regarding "Welfare Reform" and Students in Training  
Action**

**MOTION:**

To approve the following Resolution:

**Resolution Regarding "Welfare Reform" and Students in Training**

**Whereas**, the University of Minnesota is committed to ensuring that access to its programs is available to all who can benefit from and contribute to them; and

**Whereas**, a diverse student body and a wide range of educational opportunities are of benefit to individual students, to the student population as a whole, to the excellence of the University, and to the social and economic welfare of the state; and

**Whereas**, the University is committed to the value of race, class, and gender diversity in its programs and among its students; and

**Whereas**, impending changes in welfare programs jeopardize these commitments and benefits; and

**Whereas**, within the new federal guidelines, Minnesota has the opportunity to define college education as one of the acceptable work activities for AFDC/TANF recipients;

**Therefore, be it resolved that** the University Senate strongly supports the efforts of Minnesota state legislators to create programs and guidelines that enable AFDC/TANF recipients to pursue a college degree, following an approved educational and training plan, including work-study jobs and internships.

**Naomi Scheman, Chair  
Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee**

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA SEXUAL HARASSMENT BOARD REPORT ON  
REVISED SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS POLICY  
April 1997**

In 1989 the University of Minnesota conducted a sexual harassment survey of its faculty, staff, and students on all campuses. Of the 4,011 male and female respondents, 41% reported that they had experienced some form of unwanted sexual attention, although not all labeled the unwanted attention as "harassment." One question asked individuals to provide information on how they had responded to their worst experience. Of the 1,568 who responded to that question, only 2% made a formal report of their experience. This is consistent with studies on other campuses that have found that less than 5% make a formal complaint. One reason for such minimal reporting is confusion about the sexual harassment policy.

In 1994, the Regents of the University of Minnesota requested a report from the Sexual Harassment Board (Board) for the purpose of approving policies regarding sexual harassment. Patricia Mullen, then the Director of the University's Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (OEO), and Anne Truax, then the OEO sexual harassment investigator, urged the Board to make the policy revision its highest priority. The Board had just completed a thorough review and revision of the procedures for sexual harassment complaints. That review provided a sound foundation to reconsider sexual harassment policies. Therefore, and consistent with its charge, the Board took the opportunity to review current policies and recommend reforms. What follows is a description of the process and an explanation in support of the revisions the Board is proposing.

The members of the Board have met regularly since 1994, investing significant staff hours and energies in revising the policy. The Board's goal was to produce a policy that is clearly worded, legally defensible, fair and reasonable for all parties, and promotes the best interests of the University. The revision process included the following activities:

- reviewing the current policy;
- reviewing federal and state law on gender discrimination and sexual harassment;
- evaluating the current policy's effectiveness by reviewing OEO case reports and the sexual harassment survey, analyzing available data, and hearing reports presented by Board members and OEO representatives;
- researching policies at other universities and comparing their policies to the University's current policy;
- researching policies of those professions (e.g. law, psychology) whose effectiveness requires regulating the interpersonal activities of their members in the areas of professional responsibility, ethicality, and conflict of interest;

- reading literature on the prevalence and effect of sexual harassment in academia, especially as it relates to consensual relationships; identifying and analyzing policy options and debating over which options needed to be included as essential elements in a professionally responsible and ethical policy and which options were generally important in carrying out the University's legal obligation to promote a reasonably safe learning and working environment;
- submitting policy drafts for review by the University's General Counsel's Office and meeting periodically with Associate General Counsel Julie Sweitzer to discuss the legal significance of various options; and
- consulting with a wide range of committees, groups, and individuals on campus, including several Senate committees (e.g., SCFA, EEOWC, SSCC), University committees representing other groups on campus (e.g., Academic Staff Advisory Committee, Civil Service Committee, Commission on Women), a 24-member ad hoc group of administrators who deal with sexual violence/sexual harassment issues on campus, human resources consultants, and University administrators (e.g., CLA Council of Chairs; Marvin Marshak, Senior VP for Academic Affairs; Carol Carrier, Associate VP for Human Resources; Stephanie Lieberman, Director of OEE/AA). All of these groups and individuals have endorsed the proposed policy.

The consensus of the Board and OEO is that the University's current policy is ambiguous, particularly in the area of consensual relationships. These ambiguities create vulnerability for both complainants and respondents, generate confusion among those charged with investigating and resolving complaints, and increase the University's costs in staff time, lost productivity, and real dollars.

The Board chose to address the ambiguities in two ways, by 1) improving wording and 2) revising policy. Most of the recommended policy revisions involve a change in wording intended to make the policy clearer for all parties and consistent with federal and state law. However, in the section currently titled "Consensual Relationships" the Board decided that merely changing the wording would not correct the problems that the current policy creates and chose instead to recommend a revision in policy. The current University policy, established in 1984, already strongly discourages relationships of a sexual nature between individuals in disparate power positions and limits "consent" as a defense, but the policy is ambiguous and thus problems brought upon the University by this behavior continue to exist.

A review of the literature shows that seemingly consensual relationships of a sexual nature between individuals in disparate power positions are inherently problematic. Such relationships increase the potential for abuse of power both by providing an unfair advantage for the student/subordinate over his/her peers when the relationship is thriving and by causing disproportionate damage to the student/subordinate when relationship problems arise. Such relationships create a professional conflict of interest. They are often among the most complex to investigate and among the most costly for the University to resolve when allegations of sexual harassment are made. The resulting breakdown in professional relationships interferes

with the University's ability to accomplish its academic, research, and service missions.

In an article in the *American Psychologist*, two researchers reported their findings on the prevalence of faculty-graduate student sexual relationships and the effect those relationships had on the students. They reported that "sexual contact (between psychology educators and students) is quite prevalent overall" and that even those relationships which were perceived as neutral at the time were generally viewed as harmful in retrospect. When asked to respond to a hypothetical sexual relationship between an educator and a student, "over 95% of all respondents judged such conduct as unethical, coercive, and harmful to the working relationship to a considerable degree. These judgments were made by respondents who had experienced such contact as well as by those who had not." The authors also reported that, "the majority of students who received advances declined them, and many reported not only significant subsequent harm to the working relationship but also punitive damage from educators." Some respondents indicated that they had considered leaving school because of their situation. The authors concluded in part that, "(t)he profession needs to acknowledge and address the reality of a population of women of unknown numbers who, after gaining keenly competitive admission to doctoral studies in psychology, take leave of that effort and goal not through lack of ability or diligence but through disgust, dissuasion, and misuse."

The Board noted similar findings at the University. Between 1984 and 1994, nineteen (18%) of the 105 formal sexual harassment complaints filed with the OEO involved "consensual" relationships between individuals of disparate power positions. Of those cases, thirteen (68%) resulted in the complainant leaving school/work or having the situation significantly interfere with their school/work progress.

As stated above, the Board reviewed policies of numerous other universities. Many other institutions now prohibit consensual relationships between persons in positions of disparate power. For example, the University of Iowa policy prohibits amorous relationships between faculty and students enrolled in their classes or subject to their supervision...even when the relationship appears to be consensual. Further, amorous relationships outside the instructional context are discouraged because they also present the potential for conflicts of interest. The University of North Carolina, University of Alabama, University of Washington, and Ohio University all have similar policies. Other schools state that such relationships must be reported to supervisors and so that the conflict of interest can be eliminated. For example, the University of Michigan policy states that consensual romantic or sexual relationships between faculty or staff and students require disclosure to the appropriate supervisor so that arrangements can be made for objective evaluation and decision-making. However, the policy also states that, because of the asymmetry of the relationship, they are potentially exploitative and should be avoided.

The Board agrees with the categorization of consensual relationships of a sexual nature between individuals of disparate power positions as constituting a professional conflict of interest, but believes that the scope should not be limited to the faculty-student relationship. Some of the University's colleges and departments already have a per se ban on "consensual relationships" between teaching assistants and students (e.g., Institute of

Technology, Composition, Ecology and Behavioral Biology) but have not yet extended the ban to their faculty and staff in similar disparate power positions.

In addition, the Board reviewed policies of other professions. For example, the Minnesota Supreme Court's Rules of Professional Responsibility prohibit sexual relationships between lawyers and their current clients. The professional code for psychologists not only prohibits sexual relationships with current clients, but extends the ban for two years beyond termination of the therapist-client professional relationship. The Board recognizes similarities in the trust relationship between those in disparate power positions at the University and recommends endorsing similar policies here.

Considering all of the information presented above, the Board believes that it is in the best interests of the University to provide clearer guidelines regarding consensual relationships at this institution. After careful review of all the relevant factors and extensive consultation, it has become clear that, given the complexity of the University and the variety of relationships that can exist, different standards should apply to different types of consensual relationships. Therefore, the proposed policy prohibits sexual or romantic relationships between instructors and advisors and their current students, and between supervisors and their immediate subordinates. However, we recognize that in other situations involving less direct supervisory relationships, it may be possible to eliminate the conflict of interest by ensuring that the individuals do not evaluate or otherwise directly influence each other's employment. In arriving at this conclusion, the Board also debated whether this would constitute an unreasonable invasion of privacy. In this regard, the proposed policy can be considered a logical extension of the principles set forth in the University Nepotism Policy adopted by the Board of Regents in its present form in September, 1993. The nepotism policy expressly forbids individuals in any committed or blood relationship from holding positions at the University that would involve a mutual conflict of interest. The proposed policy also is consistent with the University Code of Conduct which states that members of the University community must not abuse the authority they have been given and must take care to ensure that any personal relationships do not result in situations that might interfere with objective judgment. Further, the report of the Working Group on Human Resources to the Regents on October 10, 1996 states that changes in the sexual harassment policy should be made regarding consensual relationships between faculty and students and supervisors and their employees.

The proposed policy recommendations are therefore consistent with current policies directed at preventing conflicts of interest and also with ethical principles involving professional-client and employer-employee relationships. The Board unanimously endorses the recommended policy revisions and urges strong support and prompt approval.

## STATEMENT

### Senate Committee on Finance and Planning

March 4, 1997

Following lengthy discussions with senior officers of the University over the last several months, in light of information available to it, the Committee makes the following statements.

1. The faculty salary increases that have been proposed in the four-year budget plan (increases sufficient to reach the mean of the top 30 research universities within the next two to three years) should not be reduced, nor should the schedule for achieving the goal be extended. Given the events of the recent past, the vulnerability of the University to "raiding" by other institutions because of both morale and salary problems, and the significant number of retirements that are expected in the near future, it is critical that the faculty salary increases be delivered as planned. This means that salary increases should be taken "off the top" of state appropriations.
2. The proposed tuition increases, in the aggregate, should not in general be more than the rate of inflation, and perhaps slightly less, given the accelerated rate of increases in the past several years. The University should continue to seek external funding to bolster student financial aid.
3. Retrenchments at all levels should be based on judgmental decisions and not on an across-the-board basis. The Committee expects to be consulted about budget plans made by the senior vice presidents, provosts, and deans before they are approved by the central officers. The Committee is prepared to comment publicly on any budget plan, at any level, that appears to do no more than impose across-the-board reductions.
4. There should be no further expenditures on administrative process redesign (for new computing systems in human resources, student systems, grants management, and financial management) until (a) there are plans, budgets, and SPECIFIC expected outcomes/performance measures for each of the new systems, and (b) those plans are oriented toward simplification of processes and enhancement of accountability and efficiency. The Committee on Finance and Planning expects to be given an opportunity to review those plans, budgets, and performance measures. The administration should go on record agreeing that no additional funding will be provided for these projects until it is shown that the improvements will benefit the faculty, staff, and students in proportion to their costs.

The Committee is not calling for a moratorium on systems improvements. Systems are not now functioning and must be made effective. The Committee is calling for serious scrutiny of how the needed improvements will be accomplished and how it will be KNOWN that the improvements have been made.

With respect to administrative process redesign, the Committee wishes to emphasize that advanced systems must not simply continue practices that are outdated, inefficient, or result in a diffusion of authority and responsibility, and insists that there be more thought about what parts of processes are essential and what parts are mere historical relics. The Committee also underscores the importance of ensuring that new systems are understandable and usable at all levels. The Committee requests the Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations to report regularly on how procedures and processes will be streamlined and shortened.

5. The Committee emphasizes that the University should not support development of separate or duplicative administrative computing systems in different provostries or colleges; new systems and procedures should be university-wide, with useful interfaces at all departmental, collegiate, and other levels. For example, the Committee has been informed of plans for introduction of a new human resources system in one of the major units that is separate and different from the central system being implemented. The Committee requests the administration to explain the basis for the development of such a system and for its cost and budget implications for the University as a whole.
6. The Committee notes that over the past four years, the charge for parking contracts for faculty and staff has risen by over 9 percent per year while faculty salaries have risen by about 3 percent per year. The Committee is also annoyed at the minimal consultation in recent years about proposed parking rate increases.

The Committee requests the administration to produce a budget for the parking operations of the University for 1997-98 with no increase in general parking fees.

7. The Committee is troubled by the significant discrepancy between long distance telephone rates charged departments at the University (23 to 30 cents a minute) and several other benchmarks:
  - Widely advertised and generally available rates of 15 cents a minute, anytime, anywhere, and
  - rates charged to departments at other Big Ten public universities.

The Committee has been told that current charges are "being studied." It is the strong presumption of the Committee that current charges cannot be justified and that they should be adjusted before the beginning of the 1997-98 fiscal year. The Committee requests that the appropriate administrators inform the Committee of the results of that study so that action can be taken before the beginning of the next fiscal year.

The Faculty Consultative Committee previewed these statements before they were adopted by the Committee on Finance and Planning, and unanimously endorsed them in principle.



Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
A Report of the 1995-96 Activities

Included on the committee were faculty members: D. Feeney (Chair), C. Bland, C. Chomsky, M. Dempsey, R. Goldstein, R. Guyotte, K. Larntz, W. Manning, R. McGehee, C. Miller, S. Myers, G. Seltzer, B. Selzler, J. Stone, J. Gaston, K. O'Laughlin, C. Coryea, R. Fahnhorst, R. Paschke, C. Carrier, and Y. Wang. In order to facilitate its business, SCFA used the following subcommittees: Faculty Retirement Subcommittee (SCFA Standing Subcommittee), Health Care Subcommittee (SCFA Standing Subcommittee), Tenure Subcommittee (SCFA Standing Subcommittee), Subcommittee on Administrative Review & The Minnesota Data Practices Act, and Faculty Benefits other than Retirement Subcommittee (SCFA Standing Subcommittee). In addition SCFA was represented on both the Academic Staff Advisory Committee and the Faculty Consultative Committee.

The 1995-96 academic year for the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs was dominated by the tenure code revision process. The process of tenure code discussion and tenure code revision occurred in two phases. Between October, 1995 and late March, 1996, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) as a whole plus its Tenure subcommittee and a Faculty Consultative Committee-designated "Tenure Working Group" held joint meetings among themselves and at least four major tenure forums across the Twin Cities campus. In addition to the tenure forums wherein faculty discussed the various issues posed by the Board of Regents and the administration, the provisions in tenure codes from other institutions of equivalent research stature were compared. The issues discussed centered around

- 1) post tenure review,
- 2) flexibility of appointment [including the option for long term contract appointments],
- 3) tenure guaranteed based salary versus other flexible salary augmentations [including clinically generated income],
- 4) the possibility of flexibility in the probationary period [either across the institution or based on individual discussions within colleges], and
- 5) how to foster public understanding of the background and meaning of tenure and the process of achieving it.

After a discussion among the administration and various members of the involved faculty, a so-called "worst case scenario" tenure code was drafted by four attorneys (two from the U of M faculty, one from the U of M General Council's Office, and one from the law firm retained by the Academic Health Center (Hogan and Hartson). When this was disclosed for faculty discussion and modification, there was extreme anger and anxiety which culminated in a Faculty Senate vote to disband the Tenure Working Group. While in the opinions of the Chair of Faculty Affairs and the Chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, this was not necessary and things had not gotten out of hand, the Senate resolution forced to become an exclusive activity for Faculty Affairs and its Tenure Subcommittee.

Between early April and early June of 1996, the second phase of the tenure review process began. This was limited to joint meetings of the Tenure Subcommittee with Faculty Affairs and occasional independent meetings of the Tenure Subcommittee. The meetings were held biweekly and led to modifications in the tenure code presented to the Faculty Senate for final vote on June 6, 1996. After faculty approval with a follow-up discussion with the Administration, the tenure code revisions were presented to the Board of Regents at their June, 1996 meeting. No response was received by the time the July, 1996 Board of Regents meeting occurred. Faculty representatives on the tenure issue were at the July meeting, but the topic was tabled.

The revisions of the tenure code included a broader definition and increased flexibility for nonregular faculty; an option that the probationary period for tenure track faculty would be six years with a decision in the seventh year, or using a secret ballot voting option, the faculty in a given college could extend it to nine years; streamlining of the removal for cause procedures; a clarification of the tenure related guarantee of base salary; and a preamble for public and legislative understanding was added. The most controversial discussion centered around the post tenure review clause. However, a functional post tenure review clause was put in place eliminating most concerns about the inability to eliminate tenured faculty viewed by their peers as deadwood. Unfortunately, as the summer of 1996 unfolded, the Board of Regents hired an outside consultant, Professor Richard Chait, and retained the services of the Law Firm of Hogan and Hartson. Based

on small group meetings within the Board of Regents, input and discussion with Consultant Chait, the representative from the Hogan and Hartson law firm drafted another version of the tenure code without any formal dialogue with the faculty. This was presented to the faculty in a meeting wherein no commentary was allowed. This presentation occurred just prior to the beginning of fall quarter, 1996.

When not occupied with the tenure issue and the overall tenure controversy, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs discussed a number of issues. These included the delayed biweekly payroll [the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs came out firmly against the idea of A (12 month) or B (9 month) appointment faculty being on delayed biweekly payroll]. An ongoing process by the Nonretirement Benefits Subcommittee was to explore the possibility of flexible benefits for faculty and staff which unfortunately turned out to be, administratively difficult. In addition, this group explored the possibility of a faculty/staff discount program for items such as tickets to various entertainment options in the Twin Cities. This was to be a morale booster, if/when implemented. There is a reasonable likelihood that something will be worked out, but not until the end of the 1996-97 academic year. The Health Care Subcommittee was relatively quiet because this was not a year wherein health plan negotiations were occurring. However, concerns were raised that the possibility of changes in the health care plan available to the University through the State of Minnesota were on the horizon. A Subcommittee on Administrative Review & The Minnesota Data Practices Act was charged. The first concern was the limitations imposed on administrative reviews and general faculty discussion of issues as they may relate to interpretation of the Minnesota Data Practices Act. The committee drafted a summary of faculty guidelines for approach to the Minnesota Data Practices Act. This is currently undergoing modification and will be distributed with the administrative review to follow. A joint administrative and faculty affairs group developed an administrative review protocol. This was intended to involve senior administrators through deans. This was to be piloted for "debugging" during the summer and fall of 1996 and a follow-up report on the process, the strong and weak points, and a timetable for future implementation would be presented to the Faculty Affairs Committee in winter quarter of 1997. The Retirement Subcommittee was quite active in that there was an enhanced settlement made for the retirees with pre-1963 U-MN service. These were individuals who were employed as faculty prior to the initiation of the current U of M faculty retirement plan. In addition to the settlement, the committee monitored the utilization and performance of all retirement options with particular concern about the new options in the basic plan from Fidelity. Plans were made for in-depth analyses and presentations by the various brokerage houses providing services to the basic and optional faculty retirement plans. These were being scheduled by the office of the University Treasurer and would take place during the 1996-97 academic year.

The 1995-96 academic year was a challenging one for the Faculty Affairs Committee and its tenure subcommittee. Unfortunately, there are numerous loose ends. The strong hope that there would be an approved tenure code and general agreement among the administration, the faculty, and the Board of Regents regarding the tenure issue by mid-summer were dashed by the action of the Board of Regents. The 1996-97 academic year is approached with trepidation because of the tenure issue and the concern that faculty are perceived as the problem rather than an appropriate route through which to arrive at the solution. The Faculty Affairs Committee will continue its service and vigilance, but with concern that the seeming disengagement between the Board of Regents and the faculty governance system is a serious hindrance to progress.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel A. Feeney, 1995-96 Chair

## **Groups<sup>1</sup> and Individuals Endorsing the Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationship Policies**

### **Senate Cte. on Faculty Affairs**

Daniel Feeney, Chair  
Josef Alholz  
Gary Balas  
Carol Chomsky  
Mary Dempsey  
Judith Gaston  
Richard Goldstein  
Roland Guyotte  
Richard McGehee  
Carol Miller  
Samuel Myers  
Anne Pick  
Richard Purple  
Bernard Selzler  
Ex-Officio:  
Carol Carrier  
Jack Merwin  
Cheryl Coryea  
Naomi Scheman  
Robert Fahnhorst

### **EEOWC**

Naomi Scheman, Chair  
Jessica Bailey  
Stephanie Lieberman  
Janet Ahern  
Rose Brewer  
Ann Burkhart  
Marcia Odom  
Beverly Stewart  
Delane Welsch

### **Student Senate Consultative Cte.**

Jesse Berglund  
Susan Giovengo  
Stephanie Kjonaas  
Amy Mertl  
Don Ness  
Jarad Niemi  
Jeannine Pluhar  
Mary Jane Sommerville  
Rob Vanasek

### **Civil Service Committee**

Susan Carlson Weinberg, Chair  
Mary Berg  
Maureen Brown  
Don Cavalier  
John Felipe  
Peggy Hamlin  
Richard Haney  
Robert Lundquist  
Anne Mockovak  
Michael Nelson  
Barbara Nesheim  
George Ogbonna  
Jeffrey Schaub  
Lynn Schulz  
Mary Jane Towle  
Wendy Williamson  
Mary Yamashita  
Ellen Downing  
Linda Smith  
Richard Straumann

### **Academic Staff Advisory Cte.**

Gerald Rinehart, Chair  
Larry Bjorkland  
Karen Brand  
Bruce Bruemer  
Raul Caretta  
Cheryl Coryea  
Deborah Cran  
Linda Fisher  
Judy Gaston  
Peter Hannan  
Craig Johnson  
Karla Klinger  
Karen Lilley  
Soo Yen Lim-Thompson  
Russell Mathison  
Cynthia Scott  
Mary Ellen Shaw  
Jeff Tate  
Kyla Wahlstrom  
Janny Walker  
Nan Wilhelmson  
Karen Wolterstorff

---

<sup>1</sup> The individuals listed for each group include the full membership. While some members may not have been present at the meeting during which the policy was discussed, all members were provided a copy of the policy and an opportunity to comment on it.

### **CLA Council of Chairs**

Shirley Garner, Chair  
Rose Brewer  
David Roediger  
Stephen Gudeman  
Wayne Poltratz  
Frederick Asher  
Guillermo Rojas  
William Malandra  
Charles Speaks  
Richard Leppert  
Joel Weinsheimer  
Craig Swan  
Maria Paganini  
Mei-Ling Hsu  
Jack Zipes  
Kinley Brauer  
Michael Metcalf  
Robert Scott  
James Parente  
Everett Sutton  
Marcia Eaton  
Ed Fogelman  
Gene Borgida  
William Brustein  
Carol Klee  
Donald Browne  
Seymour Geisser  
Lance Brockman  
Jacquelyn Zita

### **Sexual Harrassment/Sexual Violence Working Group**

Nancy Barcelo, VP for Academic  
Affairs with Special Responsibility for  
Minority Affairs & Diversity  
Joel Bergstrom, Chair, Student Senate  
Consultative Committee  
Jane Canney, Assistant VP for Student  
Development & Athletics  
Edward Ehlinger, Director, Boynton  
Health Services  
Sara Evans, Professor, Department of  
History  
Betty Hackett, Director, Student Judicial  
Affairs  
Harriet Haynes, Director, Counseling &  
Consulting Service  
Pat Frazier, Chair, Sexual Harassment  
Board  
David Johnson, Director, Employee  
Assistance Program  
Stephanie Lieberman, Director, Equal  
Opportunity & Affirmative Action

Kris Lockhart, Associate to the Director,  
Office of Equal Opportunity &  
Affirmative Action  
James Meland, Director, Faculty &  
Academic Staff Assistance Program  
Jessica Morgan, Coordinator, Minnesota  
Women's Center  
Jan Morse, Director, Student Dispute  
Resolution Center  
Joy Rikala, Captain of Police  
Mary Ann Ryan, Director, Housing  
Services  
Julie Sweitzer, Associate General  
Counsel  
Jamie Tiedemann, Director, Program  
Against Sexual Violence  
Claudia Wallace-Gardner, Director,  
Training Program for the Prevention of  
Violence & Harassment  
Beth Zemsky, Director, Gay, Lesbian,  
Bisexual, Transgender Programs Office

### **Commission on Women Executive Council**

Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Chair  
Jean Allman  
Betty Jo Johnson  
Susan Ellis Marino  
Jessica Bailey  
Amy Kaminsky  
Jeanne Markell  
Jaki Cottingham-Zierdt  
Raleigh Kaminky  
Pamela Marsh-Williams  
Mary Louise Fellows  
June Nobbe  
Marti Gonzales  
Stephanie Lieberman, ex-officio  
Barbara Robertson  
Beverly Stewart  
Julie Ulrich

### **Coordinate Campus EEO Officers**

Rita Meyer  
Dean McCleary  
Les Johnson  
Judith Karon  
Deborah Petersen-Perlman  
Sarah Mattson  
Cathleen Brannen

**Human Resources Consultant**

**Groups**

Andrea Baysoy  
Sharon Beckes  
Deb Cran  
Sheryl Grover  
Lisa Hartwig  
Debra Karner  
Ann Mayhew  
Peggy Samuelson  
Leslee Mason  
Nancy Walsh  
DeeDee Roberts  
Lauri Rockne  
Donna Saathoff  
April Narcisse

Francine Morgan  
Lauri Rockne  
Mary Hess  
Nancy Arneson  
Norma Peterson  
Ella Fort  
Michael McGlynn  
Jeanette Loudon  
Patrica Snodgrass  
Jean Hicks  
Donna Saathoff  
Roger Forrester  
Carol Carrier  
Miriam Ward  
John Erickson  
Margaret Klein  
Julie Sweitzer  
Terry Teachout  
David Berg  
Kathryn Brown  
Patti Dion  
John Felipe  
Robert Fahnhorst  
Nancy Wilhelmson  
Alvin Hagen  
Linda Inman  
Kristin Lundberg  
Ann Durushia  
Janet Aucoin  
Judith Karon  
Karen Eliseuson  
Laureen Larson  
Nick Barbatsis  
Susan Jackson  
Dave Fuecker  
Jean Pooch  
Mardi Pearson

James Meland  
David Johnson  
Marna Gerke  
Melvin Dario  
Rodney Johnson  
Stephanie Lieberman  
Marilyn Trettel  
April Narcisse

**Sexual Harassment Board**

Patricia Frazier, Chair  
David Born, Co-Chair  
Mindy Kurzer  
Jooinn Lee  
William Wilcke  
Jaki Cottingham-Zierdt  
Ellen Downing  
Steven Lensing

**Consultation with Additional Administrators**

Marvin Marshak, Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Carol Carrier, Associate Vice President for Human Resources

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

*Making the University of Minnesota Connection*

501 Coffman Memorial Union  
300 Washington Avenue SE  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0396  
612-624-2323  
Fax 612-626-8167

**MEMO**

**TO:** Deans, Directors, Department Heads  
Alumni and Outreach Officers  
Past Exhibitors

**FR:** Bob Burgett, Director of Outreach

**DT:** April 28, 1997

**RE: Program displays and exhibits at the UMAA Annual Meeting**

The 1997 University of Minnesota Alumni Association's Annual Meeting & Celebration is on Wednesday, June 4. Once again, the beginning portion of the evening is devoted to showcasing University programs and activities. We invite you to include your college, department, unit, or program in this year's event. Displays or interactive exhibits which represent the variety of University programs are welcome, and provide an excellent outreach opportunity to event attendees.

A larger than usual crowd is expected this year. Garrison Keillor is presenting a show entitled "Our University -- Our Times", and the evening also features a tribute to President Nils Hasselmo upon his retirement. The prefunction component is from 5:30 p.m. - 7:00 p.m., and the show follows.

There are two changes that I would like to bring to your attention. First, the venue has changed. The meeting and show will be in Northrop Auditorium, and the prefunction component is on the plaza and mall in front of the auditorium. The second change is that dinner is being served during the prefunction period. Attendees will be encouraged to eat and mingle, as well as visit the displays during this time. Although eating tables will be provided, the menu and format allow guests to move about. The show begins at 7:00 p.m. and guests will be guided into the auditorium to their seats.

This is the official tribute party for President Hasselmo, and displays and exhibits including a special tribute to him are especially welcome. Skirted display tables (eight feet long) will be provided for your display, and any special needs to accommodate your display can be discussed. If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at 625-9173 or via e-mail at [burge001@maroon.tc.umn.edu](mailto:burge001@maroon.tc.umn.edu).

I hope you will be able to join us with a display or exhibit at this year's UMAA Annual Meeting & Celebration. It promises to be a great event.

# UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

---

Office of the Dean  
Graduate School

322 Johnston Hall  
101 Pleasant Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0421

14 February 1997

To: Directors of Graduate Studies, Selected  
University Departments/Faculty/Staff, Selected

From: Wendy Larson, Editor, 302-A Johnston Hall, 5-3574, larso065@tc.umn.edu

Re: *Graduate Faculty and Limited Teaching Status Roster, 1997*

Enclosed is the 1997 paper edition of the annual *Graduate Faculty and Limited Teaching Status Roster*. The field index is organized by Policy and Review Council and by field within each Council. The alphabetical faculty index, is useful for identifying the graduate faculty appointment(s) of individual faculty members.

The *Roster* currently appears under the Graduate School's Web home page (<http://www.grad.umn.edu/grad.html>) under "Graduate Faculty Roster," where you may search by faculty name or by program.

If you do not have access to the Web and would like information about changes that occur between editions of the printed *Roster*, please call Elaine Sprute at 5-4572 or Genny Rosing at 5-9839. If you have questions about appointment procedures or P&R Council criteria, please call Vicki Field at 5-6532. All other inquiries regarding the *Roster* should be directed to Wendy Larson at 5-3574 or larso065@tc.umn.edu.

For those of you who reviewed program listings for this *Roster*, thank you for your timely responses.

Encs.