

CONTINUATION OF UNIVERSITY SENATE FORUM ON THE UNIVERSITY'S FINANCIAL SITUATION WILL FOLLOW THE SENATE MEETING.

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, Dec. 3, 1981

3:15 p.m.

Nicholson Hall Auditorium—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
502 Administration Building—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
Learning Resources Center Conference Room—Waseca Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 200, including the president, 145 members of the faculty (including the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), and 54 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (101) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 134 affirmative votes at one meeting or 101 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which must be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 101 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting. The Members of the Council of Academic Officers are ex officio nonvoting members of the University Senate.

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

Any representative may designate any eligible alternate from his/her college, school, or student constituency as the alternate to serve in his/her place and stead by written notice to the clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the University Senate. Each college or school may either elect a pool of alternate representatives or define the pool to be those eligible to vote for senators.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room. Members, please check your name to indicate your presence. A summary of the attendance of members will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

RULES GOVERNING THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Rules are available at the door. Please leave them at the door after the meeting for future use.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ASSEMBLY Faculty: Benjamin Bayman, Glen Berryman, Victor Bloomfield, Joseph Gallian (UMD), Roger T. Johnson, Ruth Jones, Frederick Peterson (UMM), Robert Rathburn, Maynard Reynolds, Michael Root, Edwin Stueben, Gloria Williams. Students: 1 to be named.

FINANCE COMMITTEE Faculty: John Hart (Physical Plant & Space Allocation), Robert Hexter (Research), Stanford Lehmborg (Educational Policy), Irwin Rubenstein (Planning), Thomas Scott (at-large), Patricia Swan (SCC) (Chr.), C. Arthur Williams (Faculty Affairs). Students: Rick Linden (SCC), Gail Lorenz (Planning).

USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH COMMITTEE Faculty: Carol Austin, William Bart, Pauline Boss, G. Mary Bradley (Co-chair), Paul Cashman, Thomas Choi, Robin Crickman, Bruce Dalgaard, Alfred Dees, Ronald Ferguson, Judith Garrard, Robert Gibson (UMD) (Co-chair), Verona Gordon, Thomas Green, Megan Gunnar, William Hanson, Vernon Hendrix, Mark Herzberg, Jon Hopeman, R. Edward Howell, Ralph Katz, Judith Lambrecht, Kinley Lantz, Lawrence Lockman, Ruth Loewenson, Robert McCaa, Philip McGlave, Jack Mandel, James Mitchell, J. Ernesto Molina, Robert Patterson, Paul Reynolds, Sara Rode, John Rodman, Jay Roshal (UMM), William Rowe, John Sauk (Co-chair), Deborah Shatin, Jacqueline Shick, Karl Smith, Clark Starr, Richard Sykes (Co-chair), W. Dixon Ward, Stanley Wasserman. Community Representatives: Carol Clayman, Russell Frazier, Michael Steenson. Students: Peter Blaisdell, Durand Burns, James Fink, Anne Frundt, Robert Gardetto, Paige Johnson, Candace Kurth, Ann Mond, Jeffrey Moser, Judith Reisman, Leslie Robison.

INFORMATION:

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Faculty: W. Donald Spring (UMM), Marvin Mattson (UMC). Students: Beatrice Anderson (UMD), Jim Brewer (UMW), Keith Jacobson (UMM), Rick Linden, Dennis Sargeant (UMC).

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Faculty: Richard Eisenberg (UMD), James Gremmels (UMM).

V. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

INLOADING OF INSTRUCTION
(15 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following recommendations:

- (1) The University should maintain a strong commitment to outreach and service to the larger community.
- (2) The University should pursue a policy of integrating the curricular offerings of day school, Extension, and the Summer Session, with increasing responsibility lodged in the colleges and departments.
- (3) Since there is no necessary connection between outreach and inloading of instruction, the two issues should be separated.
- (4) The University should not make significant reductions in opportunities for faculty members to receive additional compensation for overload teaching, especially in a time of declining real income for the faculty.
- (5) The University should not implement a policy of uniform or mandatory inloading at this time. Because of the diversity of units within the University, a uniform policy may never be desirable.
- (6) In the event that a uniform system of inloading is eventually implemented, it should be on the full-cost model, which would be more expensive than the present system.
- (7) Academic units which perceive advantages in inloading should be encouraged to move in that direction during an experimental period of four years, with an evaluation of these experiments to be made by SCEP in the fifth year.

COMMENT:

I. Background

In November 1978 the Study Group on University Outreach, chaired by A. J. Linck, presented its report. At a meeting held November 1, 1979, the Senate endorsed the principles set out in this report but withheld approval of the operational proposals and in particular the recommendation that "over time, the University should incorporate instruction now on overload, e.g. CEE credit instruction and Summer Session, into the regular workload of the faculty, either by substituting any instruction now on overload for other current assignments or by employing additional faculty." The Senate then asked the Committee on Educational Policy to examine the impact of various methods of implementation on faculties, students, and programs.

Dr. F. T. Benson of the Center for Educational Development was assigned to assist SCEP in conducting this study. A pilot questionnaire was used during fall and winter quarters 1980-81 to elicit opinions from faculty in two sample units. During the spring quarter 1981 the questionnaire was sent to faculty members in fifteen units, chosen so as to be reasonably representative; to chairpersons of 143 academic departments; and to ten deans. Results of this survey have now been tabulated and analyzed in a report presented by SCEP by Dr. Benson and Darwin D. Hendel.

II. The Survey

Copies of this report, which runs to more than one hundred pages, have been deposited with the Clerk of the Senate and in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs so that interested faculty members may examine them. While a brief summary cannot represent the full range of information obtained and opinions expressed, it is possible to suggest some of the chief points which emerge.

Most faculty members surveyed do not believe that there is a present need for inloading, although a somewhat higher percentage think that it may become necessary in the future if enrollments decline. Faculty members are especially concerned at the prospect of losing the additional compensation now available for overload teaching in Extension and Summer Session. Many believe that their workload would increase and the overall quality of education would decline if all instruction were inloaded. Department chairpersons generally shared the views of other faculty members, although they were somewhat more enthusiastic about inloading and somewhat more frequently inclined to view it as needed. The six deans who responded expressed a unanimous belief that inloading was necessary and desirable. Five of them believed that it would be more expensive than the present system, however.

III. Recommendations

Following extended discussions and study of the survey, the Committee on Educational Policy makes the above recommendations.

I. MINUTES FOR MAY 14, 1981

Action (3 minutes)

II. OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Action (3 minutes)

The chairman of the University has designated the following as officers for 1981-82:
Parliamentarian—James E. Connolly
Abstractor and Clerk—Marilee Ward

III. SCHEDULED MEETINGS DURING 1981-82

Information

UNIVERSITY SENATE: December 3, February 18, April 15, and May 20.

IV. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1981-82

Action (5 minutes)

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Faculty: Robert Beck. Students: 2 to be named.
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE Alumni: Priscilla Goldstein. Civil Service: Sharleen Goldberg, Patricia Williamson. Students: John Chaffee, 2 to be named.
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE Faculty: C. Arthur Williams (Chr.), Gordon Mork (ex officio), Benjamin Sexauer, Marvin Stein.
JUDICIAL COMMITTEE Faculty: Kathleen Price, Ray Siubl (UMM).
PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE ALLOCATION Faculty: Andrew Bailey, Fred Bohlen (ex officio), Lyle French (ex officio), Ken Keller (ex officio), Roy Thompson. Students: 1 to be named.
PLANNING COMMITTEE Faculty: David J. Berg (ex officio), Chet Grygar (ex officio), Nils Hasselmo (ex officio), Ken Keller (ex officio).
EXTENSION & COMMUNITY PROGRAMS COMMITTEE Alumni: William Bursch. Students: Phil Kashian, 2 to be named.
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE Faculty: James Butcher, Richard Christenson (UMC), Vincent Icke.
LIBRARY COMMITTEE Faculty: Wayland Noland (Chr.), Jay Goldman, Thomas Yuzer (ex officio) (UMW). Students: Dave Quist, 1 to be named.
COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION Faculty: C. Eugene Allen, Thomas Benson (Interim Chair), Paul Freed, Allen B. Johnson, James Joichi, James Mackey, Robert Owens (UMD), Roger Page, Robert Pepin, William Robbins, Betty Robinett (ex officio), Palmer Rogers, Peter Rosko, Richard Skaggs, Mariah Snyder, Arthur Walzer, Veronica Wood (UMM). Students: James Anderson, Kristen Olsen, John Paulson, Paul Schulte, 1 to be named.
SUMMER SESSIONS COMMITTEE Faculty: Bernard Bachrach. Students: Ryan Snyovec, 3 to be named.
TENURE COMMITTEE Faculty: Millard Gieske (UMM), John Parker. Students: 2 to be named.
ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY COMMITTEE Civil Service: Elizabeth Grundner, Lester Metz.
ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE Faculty: Stuart Fenton.
ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE Faculty: David Biesboer, Patrick Manning (ex officio). Students: Paige Johnson.
EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE Faculty: Willard Koukkari, Patrick Starr, M. Alison Stones. Students: Steve Ansolabehere, Patrick Gaughan, Daniel Rinn, Alan Rosenauer, 1 to be named.
STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES Faculty: Thomas Benson (ex officio), Stuart Fenton, Craig Harmon (UMC), Norman Kerr, Aloysius Quebbeman, Gail Thoen. Students: Dave Dahlgren, David Dockter, Sue Granquist, 2 to be named.

APPENDIX

Table 1

The need for inloading: Responses of department chairs, faculty, and deans compared. "The term 'inloading' describes the arrangement in which instruction now on overload, e.g. CEE credit instruction and Summer Session, would be incorporated into the regular workload of the faculty—either by substituting any instruction now on overload for other current assignments or by employing additional faculty."

Item	Department Chairs		Faculty		Deans	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
BELIEF IN NEED—PRESENT	61		185		6	
Yes	25	41.0	52	28.1	6	100
No	25	41.0	77	41.6	—	—
Uncertain	11	18.0	56	30.3	—	—
BELIEF IN NEED—FUTURE	62		186		6	
Yes	27	43.5	74	39.8	6	100
No	14	22.6	47	25.3	—	—
Uncertain	21	33.9	65	34.9	—	—
MODELS FOR INLOADING	45		141		6	
Full-Cost Inloading	20	44.4	52	36.3	4	66.7
Partial-Cost Inloading I	3	6.7	6	4.2	—	—
Partial-Cost Inloading II	4	8.9	18	12.7	1	16.7
Geography Department Arrangement	2	4.4	21	14.8	1	16.7
Redefinition Model	16	35.6	45	31.7	—	—

*Three deans indicated this model as a pre-condition for full-cost inloading.

Full-Cost Inloading: The full cost of inloading present overload CEE and Summer Session instruction is calculated at "day school" rates minus tuition income. Additional funds are sought from the Legislature and/or through internal reallocation.

Partial-Cost Inloading I: Faculty member teaches CEE or Summer Session courses as part of regular load and the department is compensated at CEE or Summer Session rates.

Partial-Cost Inloading II: CEE students register in "day school" classes and the department receives a portion of the tuition income and all of the Student Credit Hours.

Geography Department Arrangement: CEE and Summer Session provide position money in exchange for courses formerly on overload, e.g., six courses a year and an integrated curriculum.

Redefinition Model: Faculty member's load is defined in terms of total instructional and service activities, i.e., both credit and non-credit instruction and other forms of service rather than credit instruction only.

Table 2

Predicted effects of inloading: Responses of department chairs, faculty and deans compared

Item	Department Chairs		Faculty		Deans	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
FACULTY INCOME	55		166		6	
Would increase	1	1.8	7	4.2	—	—
Would decrease	31	56.4	114	68.7	2	33.3
No effect	23	41.8	45	27.1	4	66.7
TOTAL FACULTY WORKLOAD	58		166		6	
Would increase	26	44.8	84	50.6	1	16.7
Would decrease	6	10.3	22	13.3	—	—
No effect	26	44.8	60	36.1	5	83.3
SCHEDULING OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES	59		174		6	
Would be less difficult	7	11.9	16	9.2	3	50.0
Would be more difficult	41	69.5	116	66.7	2	33.3
No effect	11	18.6	42	24.1	1	16.7
INSTRUCTIONAL EXCHANGE	56		162		6	
Less difficult	5	8.9	19	11.7	—	—
More difficult	19	33.9	55	34.0	2	33.3
No effect	32	57.1	88	54.3	4	66.7
RELATIONSHIPS AMONG FACULTY AND STAFF IN DEPARTMENTS	54		164		5	
Would improve	5	9.3	10	6.1	1	20.0
Would deteriorate	21	38.9	54	32.9	1	20.0
No effect	28	51.9	100	61.0	3	60.0
OVERALL QUALITY OF DEPARTMENTAL INSTRUCTION	55		171		6	
Would improve	13	23.6	28	16.4	3	50.0
Would deteriorate	22	40.0	59	34.5	1	16.7
No effect	20	36.4	84	49.1	2	33.3
AVAILABILITY OF FACULTY ADVISING	52		171		5	
Would improve	7	13.5	20	11.7	2	40.0
Would deteriorate	23	44.2	81	47.4	1	20.0
No effect	22	42.3	70	40.9	2	40.0
AVAILABILITY OF COURSES TO STUDENTS	58		169		6	
Would improve	18	31.0	58	34.3	5	83.3
Would deteriorate	19	32.8	54	32.0	—	—
No effect	21	36.2	57	33.7	1	16.7
IMPACT ON TYPES AND LEVELS OF COURSES OFFERED	62		189		6	
Would change	15	24.2	62	32.8	2	33.3
Would not change	27	43.5	57	30.2	3	50.0
Would have positive effect on curriculum planning	14	22.6	42	22.2	4	66.7
Would have negative effect on curriculum planning	10	16.1	46	24.3	—	—
Would not effect curriculum planning	23	37.1	43	22.8	1	16.7
STUDENTS WHO WOULD BENEFIT	62		189		6	
Regular day students	4	6.5	18	9.5	1	16.7
CEE students	34	54.8	109	57.7	2	33.3
Summer Session students	23	37.1	60	31.7	1	16.7
No difference	13	21.0	44	23.3	2	33.3
WOULD SERVE STUDENT GROUPS NOT NOW BEING SERVED	55		168		5	
Yes	26	47.3	77	45.8	5	100
No	29	52.7	91	54.2	—	—
DIFFICULT TO OFFER INSTRUCTION ON CURRENT CEE/SS FORMAT	57		176		6	
Yes	32	56.1	70	39.8	4	66.7
No	25	43.9	106	60.2	2	33.3
RELATIONSHIPS AMONG DEPARTMENTS	55		164		5	
Improve	4	7.3	18	11.0	1	20.0
More difficult or unproductive	10	18.2	30	18.3	—	—
No change	41	74.5	116	70.7	4	80.0

STANFORD E. LEHMBERG
Chair

VI. AMENDMENTS, UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AND RULES
(5 minutes)

BYLAWS, Article I, Item 8, change to read (addition is underlined):

... provided these Rules are not in conflict with the Senate Constitution or Bylaws or Rules of the Senate.

BYLAWS, Article II, Item 6 becomes Item 7. New Item 6, which is moved from Rules for Committees of the University Senate, Procedures:

Committees of the Senate shall have a policy of open meetings. Closed or executive sessions may be held only after approval by a two-thirds majority of the committee members present and voting and only when personnel matters are discussed, when quasi-judicial functions are carried out, or when closed sessions are required to protect the rights of individuals. Under this rule, all regular sessions of the All-University Honors Committee shall be considered close or executive sessions. Meetings shall normally be listed in the Minnesota Daily and/or in the Daily Bulletin.

BYLAWS, Article IV. B. Committee on Committees, under Membership add a paragraph: The chair shall be elected by committee members from among their number for a one-year term of office. The chair is eligible for re-election to that position.

RULES OF THE SENATE, add footnote to that heading:

*As stated in several places, *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* governs the Senate and its committees and may be suspended only by a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting. However, in some few procedural matters, namely those listed under Standing Rules of the Senate and Rules for Committees of the University Senate, certain rules may be suspended by a simple majority vote of those present and voting. Where Standing Rules of the Senate or Rules for Committees of the University Senate simply repeat provisions of the Constitution or Bylaws, however, the Constitution and Bylaws will prevail.

RULES OF THE SENATE, under The Senate, Amendments to the Rules, add the following:

However, the Rules cannot be amended to contravene either the Constitution or the Bylaws, If such a situation presents itself, a constitutional or bylaws amendment motion must be undertaken.

RULES OF THE SENATE, under Rules for Committees of the University Senate, Procedures, 1st paragraph, change to read (addition is underlined):

... provided these Rules are not in conflict with the Senate Constitution or Bylaws or Rules of the Senate.

W. D. SPRING, Chr.
Joint Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization

VII. FINANCE COMMITTEE

FIRST INTERIM REPORT, 1981-82
(Discussion, 30 minutes)

1. CUTS IN STATE BUDGET

On October 21, the Governor requested the President to present plans for an 8-12% reduction in state funds during the current biennium. This was estimated to be from \$37-57 million. Prior to the special meeting of the Regents, the Finance Committee discussed the three types of examples that would be used to illustrate the effect of such cuts. The special meeting of the Board of Regents on October 26 resulted in a resolution stating that reductions of this magnitude would make it impossible for the University to continue to be a major contributor to the economic, cultural and intellectual vitality of the state. No plans for reductions of this magnitude have been made but the committee has consulted with the Academic V. P. as to how such a plan would be made, if required. An oral report will be made at the Senate meeting on events which have taken place since the writing of this report.

2. REALLOCATION TO SALARIES

In response to the Regents' resolution to augment salaries, each budgetary unit was asked to set aside the equivalent of 2% of the salary base. (As of this writing, no definite word had been received as to when salary increases will be made available). Discussion of this reallocation was held in July between V.P. Keller and this committee. The committee supported the principle of the primacy of salary needs, upon which this plan was based, and the general outline of the plan.

3. PLANS FOR 1982-84 BUDGET

Deans and other unit heads have had planning conferences with the appropriate vice presidents in October and November. The final planning memoranda will be sent to all units at the end of November. Budgeting conferences will be held under the chairmanship of the Vice President for Finance and Operations in December and January. The Regents will review the budget principles in January, including a list of programs receiving highest and lowest priorities. A draft of the two-year plan is scheduled to be completed by the end of February. The Finance Committee is meeting regularly with the V.P. to consult on budget principles and process. The Committee expects to consult on the budget plan as developed by the Budget Executive.

4. BIENNIAL REQUEST

The 1983-85 biennial request is scheduled to be completed in the summer of 1982.

PATRICIA SWAN
Chair

VIII. UNIVERSITY POLICY AGENDA, 1981-82, BY THE PRESIDENT
(15 minutes)

Copies will be given to Senators at the December 3 meeting and mailed to coordinate campuses; copies are available now in the office of the Clerk of the Senate, 424 Morrill Hall, Minneapolis campus.

IX. SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

This committee began the year under its previous name, the University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review. With adoption of a new Senate constitution during the year, the committee became the Senate Finance Committee. The committee consisted of representatives sent from several other Senate committees, who thus do double duty, as well as members selected at-large from faculty and students.

Members and alternates who served on the Senate Finance Committee during 1980-81 were: David Ballman, Robert Brasted, Fritz Herrmann, Robert Hexter, Kathy Hoelmer, Walter Johnson, Robert Lambert, Stanford Lehmer, Gail Lorenz, Jack Merwin, Harvey Sarles, John Snyder, Patricia Swan, Bruce Thorpe.

The committee held 9 meetings from August, 1980 through July, 1981. In addition, 7 joint meetings were held with the Senate Consultative Committee and other groups.

Major items for discussion included the retrenchment required by the state in August, 1980, the progress of the biennial request and the capital requests in the legislature, the relationship of planning to budgeting in academic and non-academic units, and consulting on items related to preparation of the 1981-82 budget plan.

1. RETRENCHMENT OF 1980-81 STATE FUNDS:

In August 1980 the University received notice that about 6% of the state allocation for 1980-81, or \$14.1 million, would be withheld due to anticipated shortfalls in state revenues. An additional \$2 million or so was required to cover costs of staff pay increases. In

response, the University administration developed a plan to adjust the budget. A tuition surcharge, calculated to yield about \$4 million in revenues, was added. Retrenchments included about \$2 million from collegiate units, \$2.2 from state specials, and \$2.7 million from centrally controlled budgets. The remaining \$5 million was planned to be recovered, if necessary, from land sales. This plan was presented for discussion in August at a joint meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee, the Council of Academic Officers, and this committee. The timing and the suddenness of the state's decision precluded more extensive consultation. Consultation on budget adjustments to meet emergency situations is providing to be a very difficult task. Everyone is reluctant to discuss potential threatening situations which conceivably will not have to be faced.

2. RELATIONSHIP OF PLANNING TO BUDGETING:

Unit planning accomplished in 1980-81 should serve as a basis for the 1982-84 budget plan and the 1983-85 biennial request, both of which will be developed in 1981-82. Therefore, the committee held several discussions on the progress of unit planning. The planning memorandum developed for each academic unit represents a significant improvement over the extent of planning in previous years. Some questions remain as to how clearly these documents will serve as a basis for budget development. For example, one problem is that the plans do not accommodate sizeable retrenchments and, should such be necessary, the unit plans would have to be greatly modified. The non-academic units are behind schedule in their planning efforts. The Vice President for Finance and Operations has assured this committee that he is pressing for timely evaluation and planning. However, the committee believes that there is much groundwork to be done if planning and evaluation are to be effective in non-academic units. The possible relationship of such efforts to budgeting is still largely a matter of conjecture.

3. REVIEW OF 1981-82 BUDGET PLAN:

The committee held several discussions with members of the budget executive as this plan evolved. It followed basic principles established the previous year, when the 1980-82 two-year budget plan was developed. However, a new element was introduced in the form of a tuition increase to raise funds to be used for library acquisitions and instructional equipment. Although the committee was reluctant to see the special tuition assessment, after extensive discussion the committee voted support of the entire budget plan. Certain attempts were made to budget more realistically for items such as legal costs and computing costs, and this trend in budgeting should be encouraged. There continue to be some problems in communication across budgetary units. In some cases, budget decisions made by one unit have precipitated budget problems in other units because of inadequate communication and planning.

PATRICIA SWAN
Chair

X. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING & RELATIONS

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The committee met once this year, on April 30, 1981. It had become clear that the duties of the committee had changed, and the responsibilities of the committee had declined substantially since its most active days in the 1960's. There are unmistakable signs of this change: earlier the committee required 3.5 staff; little or no staff assistance is necessary now. The committee's name and responsibilities are quite different under the new constitution. And during the past academic year very little substantial business came our way.

At the April 30 meeting, at the chairman's request, James Preus reviewed the committee's original responsibilities, the changes over the past decade, and the role of the committee under the new constitution. The next agenda item had to do with the authorizing signatures on final grade reports. Why is the department head's signature necessary once the instructor has signed? Does the department head have the authority to change a grade put on the form by the instructor without the latter's knowledge and permission? (Committee consensus: no, clearly.) The committee did not feel that further action was necessary on this matter.

Under new business, the committee looked again at the proposal from previous years to establish a 6xxx system of numbers for post-baccalaureate students; 6xxx courses would be offered in the professional colleges and would not be under the control of the Graduate School. Last year's committee determined that there was insufficient interest in 6xxx numbering; this year's committee did not carry the matter further.

Because I will be on leave in the fall quarter of 1981, I asked James Preus to serve as acting chairman for that one quarter; he agreed. The meeting was adjourned.

While I have been on the committee the past two years, it has become clear to me that its responsibilities, always broad, have now become so vague as to make substantive work difficult and progress unlikely. The new Student Academic Services Committee appears a more workable model.

THOMAS KRAABEL
Chairman

XI. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The Committee on All-University Honors met on November 10, 1980, February 9 and April 27, 1981. The committee recommended nine Outstanding Achievement Awards, one honorary degree, one Alumni Service Award, and the name of Vocational and Technical Education Building to President Magrath for forwarding to the Board of Regents.

EDWARD A. FLETCHER
Chairman

XII. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL CARE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The major effort of the committee this past year has been to complete the evaluation of all animal housing, care, and use programs throughout the University system. All units that are currently known to be using animals have submitted animal facility data forms to the committee and have been inspected. The inspections included facilities for both conventional laboratory animals, such as those in the biomedical research, and "food and fiber" animals that are used in agricultural research and education. Each facility was evaluated by an inspection team consisting of two members of the committee plus a research animal resource veterinarian with advanced training in laboratory medicine. Evaluation reports were sent to each facility and to other individuals having responsibilities for the inspected units.

In addition to the three scheduled meetings as a committee-of-a-whole and one special committee meeting, several days were spent in organizing and scheduling animal facility inspections, writing and reviewing the inspection reports, and consulting with the University staff and faculty on animal care problems of many kinds. Among some of the activities during the 1980-81, the committee:

1) Responded to two separate citizen complaints regarding a) inhumane animal care, and b) improper sanitation of animal facilities. Both complaints were investigated, resolved, and responses were given to the complainants.

2) Continued to monitor the progress of proposed state and federal legislation restrictive to animal availability and use in teaching and research activities. One member of the committee testified before the state legislature regarding the proposed state legislation.

3) Held a special animal care meeting to discuss the animal care (humane) practices of a University researcher.

4) Prepared the annual progress report from the University to the National Institutes of Health, based on the committee's program of inspection and evaluation of the University animal facilities as required by NIH policy.

5) Conducted inspections of 24 separate facilities in which each facility had numerous animal rooms or buildings. These 24 facilities provided housing for 36,346 animals.

There is no question that the activities of the University Committee on Animal Care

have increased the awareness of the faculty and staff to the standards for animal care which, in the opinion of the committee, has improved the overall quality of a large number of the facilities. As can be expected with any inspectional program, there have been both positive and negative responses to some of the committee's recommendations. When negative responses were received, additional explanations of the recommendations have resulted in an understanding of the intent and corrections have been initiated.

During the next two years, the committee's basic responsibility will be in reevaluating areas that were not in full compliance with the standards and submitting the annual progress reports in NIH. With the next complete assurance statement due in 1985, all facilities will need to be inspected, starting in 1983.

An enormous expenditure of time will be needed by committee members and research animal resource veterinarians who participate in the animal facilities inspection and writing of the evaluation reports. Inspection of all animal facilities within one academic year requires about the equivalent amount of time of one full-time person. In conjunction with the complete inspection of all facilities, it will also be necessary to have a budget which supports the necessary expenditures associated with this type of program.

An alternative to the committee's evaluation of the University's animal care and use program that is recognized and accepted by NIH is the accreditation of the animal facilities by the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC). The University of Minnesota, Duluth, has been accredited by AAALAC since about June 1980 and will not be included in future inspections by the University committee. If other animal facilities are accredited by this group, the overall work load of the committee could be markedly reduced. It is therefore recommended that collegiate units with animal use programs, and in particular the health science units that receive NIH grants, give strong consideration to applying for AAALAC accreditation and that the University administration provide support toward these efforts.

KENT A. REES
Chairman

XIII. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The Senate Committee on Committees held 5 meetings during the year. The Committee participated in the drafting of the revised Senate constitution, bylaws, and rules through membership of its co-chair on the Consultative Committee's joint subcommittee.

The principal work of the Committee was to make nominations for certain committees as specified in the new rules and to provide slates for Operating committees which were forwarded to the President. The Senate confirmed all committee appointments in May. The new appointments for faculty members by rank and sex, with comparable all-University proportions are as follows:

	Women		Men	
	Committees	All-University	Committees	All-University
Professor	15%	6%	85%	94%
Associate Professor	54	17	6	83
Assistant Professor	50	27	50	73
Instructor	100	44	—	56

JOHN HOWE
MARY CORCORAN
Co-Chairs

XIV. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

As an operations committee the Educational Development Committee has the following duties and responsibilities:

to develop guidelines and operating procedures for the Educational Development Program, consistent with policy established by the Senate;

to assist the vice president, academic affairs, in the review of departmental and collegiate recommendations concerning proposals for educational development projects;

to review and recommend action on proposals for educational development efforts submitted directly to the vice president, academic affairs, from any part or any level of the University;

to submit an annual report to the Senate through the Senate Consultative Committee on the status of plans for the Educational Development Program.

The Committee's activities in 1980-81 were focused in two areas. The first area was the Committee's responsibility for the Educational Development Program. Guidelines and deadlines were set up for the competition to support projects in 1981-82; the Committee reviewed 106 different proposals and recommended to the vice president, academic affairs, that 81 proposals be funded for a total amount of \$276,938. Projects were funded at both the college level and the all-University level of the program.

The second area of Committee activity was the completion of a comprehensive review of the Educational Development Program and the role of the Committee in this program. Results of this evaluation were summarized in the May 1981 issue of *COMMENT*. A limited number of copies of the complete findings are available in the Center for Educational Development.

KENNETH HOWEY
Chair

XV. COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN

ANNUAL REPORT, 1981

The University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, mandated by the Rajender consent decree, is composed of nine members, five selected through the regular procedures of the Senate Committee on Committees, two members (and alternates) selected by a procedure determined by the Special Masters, and two ex officio members representing the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Office of Equal Opportunity. The committee is advisory to the President, reports to the Senate through the Committee of Faculty Affairs, and has as its primary function, monitoring the implementation of the consent decree.

The committee had its first meeting on January 29, 1981, and has met 12 times since then. Meetings were held with Vice President Hasselmo, Attorney Joel Tierney, Assistant Vice President Betty Robinett, Lillian Williams and Patricia Mullen of the Office of Equal Opportunity, Law Clerk Sue Stingley, Special Master Viola Kanatz, and representatives of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Women. The agenda for these meetings included the charge to the committee; the role of the Special Masters in implementing the decree; the development of non-discriminatory policies for search, hiring, promotion, tenure, and salary review; procedures for the dissemination of information to claimants; the issue of financial support for the work of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Women; discussions of review procedures (especially burden of proof, disclosure, and open hearings); harassment of claimants; and a review of the August report on the computerization of availability data and applicant flow.

Specific actions were taken to recommend that the Judicial Committee become the official body responsible for constituting internal tribunal panels, to ask the Board of Regents not to appeal the May 19 Order of the Special Masters, and to support the funding of the FACW.

The committee also addressed four issues on behalf of individual claimants regarding alleged inappropriate actions or violations of consent decree procedures. In three of the four cases the committee (or the chair as a member of the committee) responded with

communications to University personnel regarding what was judged to be inappropriate actions. Consistent with its mission the committee prepared a document, in cooperation with Sue Stingley and the FACW, to inform claimants and potential claimants of their rights, to explicate the University policy against harassment, and to explain the availability of help and counsel in the preparation and processing of claims.

As of October 13, 194 sex-discrimination claims and petitions had been filed against the University under the consent decree. On July 16, Attorneys Joey Tierney and Joel Lavintman met with the committee to report on the progress being made in the processing of claims as of that date and to address allegations of "foot-dragging" by the University. The committee has examined monthly updates on the status of individual claims under the decree for September and October and will continue to monitor that progress.

During the year, committee members have also attended court hearings; reported to the Regents subcommittee on Faculty and Staff Affairs concerning the implementation of the decree; and visited the Senate Consultative Committee, the Social Concerns subcommittee on Equal Opportunity for Women, and the Faculty Advisory Committee for Women. In November three committee members will meet with claimants and faculty advisors on the Duluth campus.

At future meetings the committee will address the problem of release time for faculty members serving as hearing officers, and compensation (including possible legal fees) for hearing officers other than faculty members. We will also examine the December reports on departmental hiring goals and explanations for failures to meet those goals. Other topics for future consideration will be a perusal of position descriptions for their potential bias, an assessment of advertising strategies to find woman candidates, and the sponsorship or co-sponsorship of meetings with claimants and advisors.

In defining the jurisdiction of the EEOW Committee, the consent decree stipulates that, in addition to monitoring the implementation of the decree, the committee may examine University policies to determine whether they would have a disparate impact on women, and make recommendations to University administrators or to the University Senate regarding such policies. Early in our deliberations committee members voted unanimously to incorporate into our agenda, examination of University policies in several major areas. Areas presently being studied or identified for future attention are the composition of Senate, University, and College grievance, judicial, and tenure committees; leave policies, including maternity leave; sex-biased salary discrepancies; and retirement/benefit policies, including the use of unisex retirement tables. With regard to salary discrepancies, the committee has examined the Duluth faculty salary equity study and has recommended that the study plan, with minor modifications, be extended to include all units of the University. The committee also urged the Regents to take early action with regard to improvements in the retirement benefits for women.

The work of the committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women is not without controversy. Our obligation to oversee the establishment and maintenance of due process under the consent decree, to monitor the progress being made in the processing of claims, and to protect the rights of claimants has led us to be assertive and critical at times. In responding to issues our concern has not been with the merits of individual Rajender cases but rather with policies and procedures in the proper implementation of the decree and the right of claimants to fair and reasonable treatment. Our committee, in turn, has made every effort to be informed, explicit, and fair in its criticism. We seek justice for women under the consent decree—no more and no less.

The implementation of the consent decree had a rocky beginning, in part due to the complexity of the task and the difficulties in establishing the review procedures to the satisfaction of all involved. There will continue to be difficult times ahead. We will have to cope with new problems as they arise. The consent decree is a unique document that is intrusive and that does usurp authority in aspects of faculty governance that are usually conducted without questions from outside the system. The decree is designed to produce changes that will serve the ends of justice; a good faith effort on the part of all concerned will make it possible to complete the task.

Committee members are Shirley Moore (chr.), Laura Cooper, Patricia Faunce, Jane Maddy, Murray Rosenberg, Geneva Southall, Janet Spector, and ex officio members Betty Robinett and Lillian Williams.

SHIRLEY MOORE
Chair

XVI. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION & COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

Activities of the committee were again dominated by our following of the saga of the Outreach Report (1978). Meetings were held December 2, 1980, and May 21, 1981. Issues identified for future consideration are (1) variations in subsidization of multifarious outreach activities and appropriate ways of handling internal competition for such funds; (2) countering political and economic temptations to inflate grades, devalue credits, and devalue wages for teaching and technical services in outreach programs; (3) inequities in cost/benefit or cost/value ratios for course credits and for student health and activities services; (4) questions of value involving credit versus non-credit courses and credit courses applicable to degree programs versus credit courses not applicable to degree programs; and (5) ways of obtaining sustained and effective student participation in committee functions.

W. E. RANZ
Chair

XVII. COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The all-University Council on Liberal Education was established by action of the Faculty Senate in June, 1962. The Council is responsible:

... for the formation of policy, subject to Senate ratification, establishing a "floor" requirement in liberal studies for all University curricula leading to the bachelor's degree. It shall maintain surveillance of the effects of this policy and shall propose to the Senate such extensions and modifications of this policy as seem warranted.

The Council shall initiate other policy proposals or actions designed to improve the quality of undergraduate education at the University. (Handbook: *A Compilation of Rules and Procedures*, University Senate, January, 1974, p.U-19.)

The Council is a standing committee of the University, reporting to the Senate and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP); it is chaired by an associate of the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a primary concern for undergraduate education. Selected according to a formula designed to gain perspective from all undergraduate programs of the University, members participate as individuals identified by their respective collegiate administration to represent the ideas—not the interest—of their units.

1980-81 Council Activities

Studies of the Liberal Education Requirement:

The basic charge of the Council on Liberal Education has been to design a liberal education standard for all University of Minnesota baccalaureate degrees. However, the responsibility for determining how the standard is implemented has always been vested in the colleges. (The Council has never identified a list of courses that would satisfy the liberal education requirement.) The means of satisfying the requirement in all baccalaureate degree programs (except the University Without Walls) has been a distribution requirement. Stimulated in part by Council discussions with the CLA Committee on Undergraduate Education, the Council over the past two years has been conducting studies of the liberal education requirement as implemented in the colleges. Preliminary surveys in the Council's investigation and discussion by an *ad hoc* subcommittee led to a focus on the manner in which undergraduates are choosing courses to fulfill their college's distribution requirement. The Council agreed last year to conduct two studies during the 1980-81 academic year: one, a compilation of the liberal education requirements as promulgated by the colleges, and the second, an analysis of the courses taken by a representative sample of graduates. At this writing, the compilation of the liberal education requirements in the colleges has been completed. The analysis of courses taken by the sample of graduates is still in progress.

Two purposes are to be served by these studies. On the one hand they will inform the discussions of the Council as it deals with possible modifications in the all-University liberal education requirement, and on the other hand the information from the studies will provide the individual colleges with a statement of the manner in which their graduates have in fact satisfied the liberal education requirement as each college has defined it.

Committee on Foreign Languages and International Studies:

This subcommittee of the Council was formed in the spring of 1980 as a result of interest stimulated in the University by the President's Commission Report on Foreign Languages and International Study. Members appointed to the subcommittee were Daniel Bryan (chair), Veronica Woods, Tom Benson, John Paulson (student), and Kathryn Murphy (student). The subcommittee was charged with identifying issues and presenting recommendations for Council discussions.

The subcommittee met regularly during the 1980-81 academic year and made periodic reports to the Council. Among its activities, the subcommittee held interviews with the chairs and coordinators of language instruction from six of the CLA departments offering such instruction and has been obtaining statistical data about the enrollment patterns of University students in language courses as well as information about the language study background of students entering the University from high school.

At year's end, the subcommittee presented an interim report to the Council with recommendations for the continuation of its work during the 1981-82 academic year.

University Senate Reorganization:

The Council responded to a request of the University Senate's Joint Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization that it review the draft of the revised Senate constitution, bylaws, and rules as it applied to the Council. One aspect of the Council's response was a letter from the chair of the Council to the chair of the Joint Subcommittee pointing out the need to continue the direct and formal relationship between CLE and the Senate because of the Council's charge to establish the University-wide "floor" requirement in liberal education and to "maintain surveillance" of the effects of that policy.

Another dimension of the Council's response was the action taken at its meeting on January 13, 1981, at which the Council (i) endorsed the provision of the proposed revision of the Senate constitution, bylaws, and rules applicable to the Committee on Liberal Education, its status as a Standing committee, charge, and membership composition; (ii) recommend that the Vice President for Academic Affairs be added as an *ex officio* member of the Committee on Liberal Education and that the Center for Educational Development be designated as the support unit for the committee; and (iii) indicated approval of the proposed study by the Educational Policy Committee on the issues surrounding the question of the establishment of a Council on Undergraduate Education. These motions were submitted to the Joint Subcommittee both in writing and by a CLE member at a hearing on January 15.

The Joint Subcommittee subsequently accepted the motion encouraging consultation with the Council on the establishment of a Council on Undergraduate Education and the motion requesting the addition of the Center for Educational Development as the support unit for the CLE. However, the Subcommittee did not accept the proposal that the Vice President for Academic Affairs be an *ex officio* member of the CLE, because of its impression that the director of the CED is a member of the Academic Affairs staff.

School of Management's Special Undergraduate Task Force:

In accordance with the all-University Policy on Liberal Education*, the Council reviewed "A Proposal for the Revision of the Undergraduate Programs in the College of Business Administration." While generally impressed by the intent and construction of the curricular modifications proposed by the College of Business Administration (now the School of Management), the Council detected a possible problem in the proposed implementation of the liberal education requirement in the Physical and Biological Sciences (Group B) category. The School of Management proposes to fulfill this category by requiring a "five-credit laboratory science" course and a course "dealing with the history and/or application of scientific findings."

The Council appointed a subcommittee consisting of Robert Pepin (chair), Robert Owens, and Roger Page, to review the proposed Group B requirement. The report of the subcommittee determined that the School of Management proposal, while giving appropriate emphasis to the humanistic aspects of science, also had the effect of requiring only one course in a science, thereby reducing the study of science, the basic purpose of the all-University requirement, below the minimum specified by current Senate policy. The subcommittee suggested four alternative solutions to resolve this apparent difficulty and its report was forwarded to the School of Management's Special Undergraduate Task Force, chaired by Peter Rosko, who also serves on the Council. The Task Force has responded to the Council's report and we anticipate further discussion and a resolution to this matter early in the 1981-82 academic year.

Horace T. Morse-Amoco Foundation Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education:

Since 1965 the Council has awarded 102 certificates and honoraria to faculty members selected for their outstanding contributions to undergraduate education. From its inception the program has been supported by an annual grant to the University from the Amoco Foundation. In 1977-78, the Amoco Foundation increased its grant from \$5,000 to \$7,500 enabling the Council each year to make seven awards of \$1,000 each rather than eight awards of \$500.

Selection criteria include demonstrated excellence in three areas (listed in diminishing order of importance): the full range of activities associated with undergraduate teaching and advising; planning, design, and creation of alternatives intended to improve existing education practice (innovation and academic program development); and educational leadership, both within and outside the University, associated with improving the undergraduate experience.

Procedures were similar to those followed in recent years. Early in 1981 those colleges of the University offering undergraduate instruction were invited to submit nominations (accompanied by a dossier for each nominee). Dossiers were reviewed and judged by a subcommittee appointed by the chairman, and awards were made by the Council on the recommendation of the subcommittee.

The 1980-81 subcommittee, formed according to general CLE guidelines, included: Shirley Clark (associate professor, social, psychological, and philosophical foundations of education and non-CLE member), Forrest Harris (professor, social and behavioral sciences division, General College, previous award recipient and CLE member), Samuel Kirkwood (professor of biochemistry and previous award winner), Kristen Olsen (CLA student and CLE student member), and Robert Owens (professor of English, UMD, and CLE member). This year 19 nominations were received from 12 colleges, with the award and a \$1,000 honorarium presented to:

Vernon B. Cardwell, professor of agronomy and plant genetics, College of Agriculture
James C. Cloyd, assistant professor of pharmacy, College of Pharmacy

Daniel F. Detzner, assistant professor, Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences, General College

Charles L. Matsch, associate professor of geology, College of Letters and Science, University of Minnesota, Duluth

Peter Rosko, associate professor of finance and insurance, School of Management

Everett Lavern Sutton, associate professor of music, College of Liberal Arts

Gerhard H. Weiss, professor of German, College of Liberal Arts:

An award certificate and the honorarium were presented to each recipient at the appropriate college commencement ceremony. The awardees and their guests were honored at a luncheon of the Board of Regents in the spring.

Small Grants Program:

In 1967, the Council established the Small Grants Program in order to stimulate the improvement of the undergraduate experience by providing financial and organizational support of the ideas of faculty-student groups. Each year proposals for support of

*The all-University Policy on Liberal Education, approved by the University Senate, 1970, provides "The All-University Council on Liberal Education will review proposals from colleges. Proposals will become operative when approved by the Council. The Council reserves the right to review standards for validating fulfillment of the liberal education requirements."

educational development efforts are reviewed and evaluated by a faculty-student subcommittee of the CLE.

In the fall round of the 1980-81 Small Grants Program, 55 proposals totaling \$106,707 were received and 31 proposals totaling \$39,883 were funded. In the spring round, the Council received 76 proposals totaling \$145,586 and funded 35 proposals totaling \$47,849.

The subcommittee for the fall 1980 and spring 1981 rounds of the Small Grant Program included: Richard Skaggs (chair), Lawrence Merriam, Veronica Woods, and John Paulson (student member).

JAMES H. WERNTZ
Chairman

XVIII. SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The Senate Library Committee met five times during the 1980-81 academic year. The last meeting of the year was held at the UM-Waseca campus. As is commonly the case with the Senate Library Committee, attendance and participation in the work of the committee was performed in large part by three subcommittees. These were: (1) Subcommittee on Library Communication with Faculty and Students (Wendy Lee Treadwell, chair); (2) Subcommittee on Collections (Wayland Noland, chair); and (3) Subcommittee on Facilities (Mark Brenner, chair).

Those matters dealt with extensively included lending policy, communications, acquisitions, strengths and weaknesses in the collection, machine-readable data, finances, collection development, automation, study space, I.T. library facilities, membership in the Research Libraries Group, and cooperation with the State Universities.

The committee communicated two major recommendations to the faculty in general. First, it advised the faculty of problems with the prompt return of recalled books, and of the action which it planned to recommend to the University Senate. On motion of the committee, the Senate adopted a resolution providing for the suspension of privileges of faculty members failing to respond to a second recall notice. Second, the committee communicated to the faculty the urgency of the University's budget request for acquisitions and asked faculty members to contact their legislators in support of this request.

It became increasingly clear to the committee over the course of the year that the needs of the library for additional funding for acquisitions are quite compelling. The collection is threatened with permanent damage if adequate funding levels fail to be provided. This is a problem which will require continuing attention over a number of years. The enthusiastic support of faculty organizations as well as individual faculty members will be required to protect this vital University resource.

The committee considered the question of whether machine-readable data should be collected, or at least indexed, by the libraries. This matter, being rather complex, bears further investigation. It is an area where research could be facilitated in a new way at the libraries.

A major development in the libraries is the University's joining the Research Libraries Group (RLG), a consortium of 26 major research libraries. A main feature of this membership is access to the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), an automation program. Automation of the libraries is proceeding, and its progress was followed by the committee.

The Library Review Committee, which conducted a major review of library operations and structure, was in contact with the committee during the year. Its report should form the basis for constructive major reforms of the libraries.

In the area of communication between the libraries and users, the committee continued discussions of ways to make improvements. The committee agreed to sponsor and give advice on a student survey of library users which will deal with library-user communication.

Needs for study space were discussed by the committee. The committee resolved to suggest to the appropriate University office that a list of non-library study areas be drawn up and published in the *Minnesota Daily*.

A new lending code was presented to the committee for its advice and recommendations. With a few suggested revisions, the committee recommended adoption of the new code.

I.T. library facilities were considered by the committee. The committee concluded that substantial progress had been made in the development of policies regarding a centralized I.T. library. The committee requested that the appropriate internal plans be completed during the next year for improving I.T. library facilities so that planning money could be requested from the legislature in 1982.

HOYT N. WHEELER
Chair

XIX. SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The committee studied the state and federal purchasing set-aside programs. It was agreed that Mr. A. R. Potami, Mr. Robert James and Dr. R. A. Oriani would work together in developing a library of possible vendors for scientific instrumentation.

The academic staff policies and procedures document was discussed, though no action was called for.

Mr. Potami informed the committee of changes made in federal cost policies regarding documentation of effort, the charging of indirect costs, and the acquisition of equipment.

The Office of Research Administration will be drafting a statement concerning the University's conflict of interest policy to deal with the purchase of equipment, consulting arrangements, etc.

The committee was asked by Vice President Keller and Dean Ibele to study the question of ranking requests for funds for large and expensive equipment for scientific research. The committee studied the subject at length and named a subcommittee to make recommendations. These are shown below as Appendix A.

The committee also addressed the issue of University funding of Shops. The committee called for re-evaluation of the current practice of subsidizing certain shops.

The committee worked with the Office of Research Administration in preparing the Research Facilities Handbook which is being distributed to current and past principal investigators, new faculty, deans, and department heads.

A joint proposal by the Minnesota Cooperation Office, the University of Minnesota, and the Control Data Corporation was discussed. The proposal, which was submitted to the National Science Foundation, was concerned with technology transfer of University-based research and development of new technologies and technology-based industry.

The committee reviewed a proposal made by the Graduate School to use \$100,000 of the funds currently allocated to the support of research officers for the purpose of increasing the number of faculty summer research appointments. This proposal would double the budget for these summer appointments. The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0, with one abstention.

APPENDIX A

1. The University should choose a definite date for the submission of all requests for funds for major equipment. The optimal time for this date is on or about October 15 of each year.
2. Evaluation of all requests for funds for major equipment should be the function of the General Research Advisory Committee.
3. Requests for funds should be presented on a new form, which should be used for all such requests, independent of the sources or kinds of funds applied for. The new form should be designed by the GRAC, and it should provide space for the following information:
 - (a) Identification of equipment the proposed new equipment will replace.
 - (b) Indication of cooperativity—who will be using the equipment and the extent to which the group is interdisciplinary.
 - (c) Where the equipment will be located.
 - (d) Cost, including installation and site preparation.
 - (e) A description of the proposed matching formula—that is, what agency will provide funding over and above what is being requested from the University. (A copy of the proposal to that agency should be attached to the form.)

- (f) An indication of when a decision from the outside agency will be made.
- (g) Any statements of understandings or matching fund requirements from the outside agencies should be identified in a space on the form. Copies of correspondence with the outside agency confirming these understandings or requirements should be attached to the form.
- (h) A description of how the continuing costs of operating the new equipment will be provided. These should include repairs and maintenance, spare parts, and operators' salaries. If these costs are to be provided by users' fees, a business plan should accompany the request form. The business plan should follow definite guidelines. We suggest that these be defined by Ed Tichner of ORA.

4. Upon acquisition of the equipment, a copy of the form should be transmitted to ORA for announcement in its Newsletter. The announcement should include information concerning what the equipment can do, where it is located, how it can be accessed, and what its users' fees are to be.

5. Following the award of a grant under this program, the principal investigator(s) should be required to file an annual activity report to the GRAC (together with a copy to be sent to the Senate Committee on Research), in which the utilization of the equipment is detailed, with an indication of the extent of cooperative, or interdisciplinary, utilization.

ROBERT M. HEXTER
Chairman

XX. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENURE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The University Committee on Tenure has completed its eighth year since the adoption by the Faculty Senate of the "new" Tenure Code. Little can be reported of significance; the "cease and desist" condition imposed on faculty/administration governance left few opportunities during the year for consideration of concrete action. The new Tenure Code still awaits consideration by the Board of Regents.

The Committee at several meetings considered questions relating to the new Tenure Code. No conclusions were reached. But extensive conversations with drafters of the 1973 document, with individuals now in central administration, and with others, and the Committee's own study of the 1973 document, revealed several reasons to recommend to subsequent Tenure Committees that, when the time seems propitious for action, a significantly different document might be proposed to the Faculty Senate. Concern with the 1973 document related to two principal areas. First, a great deal has occurred in the intervening years that casts considerable doubt upon many provisions of that document—Rajender, open files and open meetings laws and policies, experience under a more active Judicial Committee, experience with financial retrenchment, and the like. Second, the 1973 document itself is, in the view of many, unwieldy and complex over-regulation in an area that would better be dealt with in more generality. Any tenure code will be very difficult to amend. It might be preferable to leave matters of detail to more flexible development through established consultative processes.

The most significant action item on the Committee's agenda was a proposal, enacted by the Senate and the Regents, to enable open hearing in Judicial Committee cases. Through a series of Tenure Committee meetings, including a joint meeting with the Judicial Committee membership, the concept was evolved of amending the present Tenure Code to empower the Judicial Committee to adopt a rule permitting open meetings. (After adoption of the Tenure Code amendment, the Judicial Committee adopted a rule providing for open hearings.)

The Tenure Committee has followed closely the development of the "Academic Staff" concept. Two issues recurred in discussions. First, concern was expressed that the staff subject to the concept were being given titles without content—very little had been done before the concept was put into operation to define job security procedures, grievance mechanisms, the question of possible participation in University governance, etc. Second, concern was expressed that the vagueness of the definition of those staff who will be subject to the classification presented the danger of erosion of tenure protection through inappropriate inclusion of tenure-worthy positions. Arrangements were made at the beginning of the academic year for Tenure Committee "mail" review of new Academic Staff position classifications. The first batch were subjected to searching review that revealed several defects. Thereafter, and we have no doubt, inadvertently, no further documents were sent around, although several new classifications were reportedly created. Next year's committee will need to reestablish communications.

The Tenure Committee studied and concurred in the recommendation of the Spring committee on Senate reorganization to restructure the Tenure Committee. In the future it will become, in effect, a standing and semi-autonomous subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The Committee also studied and consulted with central administration on a range of policy and personnel matters. Included were policies on nepotism in the case of spouses and informal living partnerships, review of implementation of the Rajender consent decree, participation of Duluth Campus members in University committees, work of the Spring committee on reorganization of faculty governance, the extent to which Judicial Committee panel findings are accepted by the President and how these are dealt with within central administration, operation of the seven-year rule limiting the length of probationary appointments, the matter of application of the "prior service" requirement of Section 6(c) and (d) of the Tenure Code, and possible abuse of the "T" appointment for virtual tenure-track appointments.

CHARLES W. WOLFRAM
Chair

XXI. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS

ANNUAL REPORT, 1980-81

The University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships met seven times during the academic year.

One of the principal responsibilities of the Committee is to review nominations for appointment to the faculties of the several ROTC programs and make recommendations concerning those nominations to the vice president for academic affairs. During this year there were seven nominees who came under review and the Committee recommended six of them for appointment. One of the senior officers to be appointed is Col. Robert B. Patrick, who will succeed Col. Robert H. Binish when he retires as head of the Air Force ROTC program. In September 1981 Col. Frank Topley will be succeeded by Cdr. D. K. Menikheim as head of the Naval ROTC program. The number of nominations for appointment to the ROTC programs is evidence of the considerable renewal of teaching staff in the ROTC programs of the University of Minnesota.

Professor Poppele reported during the meeting of 11 December 1980 that a long-sought program in Naval ROTC is now to be instituted. Under this program the Naval ROTC will accept majors from almost all disciplines and requires only that those majors complete a "core curriculum" in Naval ROTC and allied sciences.

Another responsibility of the Committee is to review the curriculum for the ROTC programs and to make recommendations concerning proposed additions, deletions, or changes. In the past year, the Committee has recommended only very minor changes in course numbers, titles, or a change in credit-hours.

Early during the academic year, the Committee received a communication from the Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization in which it was proposed that, along with the general reorganization of Senate committees, the All-University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships be disestablished as an all-University committee and be reconstituted as a Twin Cities Campus Assembly committee. The proposal suggested that functions of ROTC, like those of the Athletic Department, were of significance only on the Twin Cities campus of the University and that ROTC-University relationships could best be addressed within the narrower representative body of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. Members of the All-University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships objected that the presence of ROTC on the campus of the University, unlike the presence of intercollegiate athletics, was of far broader significance throughout the whole University and the society of our state, and the Committee instructed the chairman to request that the Subcommittee on

Senate Reorganization reconsider its proposal and delete its recommendation for a change in the status of the ROTC Committee. The Subcommittee declined to meet the request of the ROTC Committee and the Senate acted to reconstitute the ROTC Committee as a committee of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

At the meeting of 18 March 1981, the Committee heard a review from Professor Harold Chase, who had recently returned from his post as assistant secretary for defense for manpower, reserves, and logistics, in which he reviewed the training of personnel of the armed forces. He stated that the several Reserve Officers Training Corps play a significant role in educating officers to the high standards for service in the armed forces.

The heads of each of the ROTC units on campus reported that there have been increases in ROTC enrollments and that the scholarly achievement of the students has been increasing, with larger numbers of them earning scholarships to support their study at the University of Minnesota.

This year the Committee was able to put into effect a new procedure to enhance the effectiveness of the process by which it reviews nominations for appointment of the ROTC faculties. The Committee not only reviews transcripts, personnel records, and other written evidences of the candidates' qualifications for appointment, as it has in the past, but it also has been able to invite at least one of the nominees to visit with the Committee and to be interviewed before recommendations are made. Where such a procedure is reasonably feasible, it will be continued as another one of the processes whereby the Committee reviews in preparing to make recommendations.

At its final meeting of the year the University Committee on University-ROTC relationships recognized with appreciation the superior service of two retiring officers, Col. Frank Topley, USMC, and Col. Robert Binish, USAF. By acclamation the Committee adopted a resolution expressing gratitude to the two officers and wishing them godspeed in their retirement.

WILLIAM E. WRIGHT
Chairman

XXII. TENURE COMMITTEE

Information

The Tenure Committee is reviewing the proposed new tenure code that was passed by the Senate in 1973. Faculty members who have comments on the code are invited to contact members of the Tenure Committee. They are Stephen Gasiorowicz (chr.), Allen Glenn, Gloria Leon, Millard Gieske, John Parker, Christopher Quinn, and Verna Rausch.

STEPHEN GASIOROWICZ
Chair

XXIII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

XXIV. OLD BUSINESS

XXV. NEW BUSINESS

(10 minutes)

Please feel free to use this agenda item to comment on a topic you believe is of general interest to the Senate.

The Senate is reminded that this entry in the agenda (not to be confused with the Senate's "Questions to the President") may be used to raise specific issues, concerns and/or ideas of general interest. A motion is not required. As much as anything, the Business and Rules Committee wishes to remind the Senate that all ideas presented to the body need not flow from a committee.

XXVI. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

John M. Higbee, 1917-1981

Hedda Kafka, 1896-1981

John MacGregor, 1908-1981

Grover Maxwell, 1918-1981

XXVII. ADJOURNMENT

UNIVERSITY POLICY AGENDA 1981-82

The President, upon the recommendation of the University Senate, is called upon to submit an annual policy agenda for the institution. This report seeks to respond to the Senate's request by outlining those major policy issues that, in the President's opinion, warrant particularly close scrutiny during the 1981-82 academic year.

In reviewing the issues that follow, three points should be kept in mind. First, the list of specific items included here is intentionally limited; it attempts to concentrate upon those issues that have systemwide implications and that should receive systemwide attention. Second, not all of the issues contained in this agenda can, will, or even should be resolved during the current academic year. Some of the items simply resist quick and easy solutions and, instead, will demand continuous attention throughout the foreseeable future. Third, the University Senate, both as a body and through its committee structure, will participate in the review and recommendation processes that pertain to the issues outlined below.

1. UNIVERSITY SALARIES

On November 19, the Legislative Commission on Employee Relations approved a 20.3 percent compensation package, including 9.1 percent cash increases for the first year of the biennium, and 8.8 percent for the second year for State University and Community College faculty. Those systems will achieve these figures only through internal retrenchments that they are making. It is anticipated that at the December meeting the Regents will approve a salary and compensation package for University of Minnesota faculty. Our State salary appropriation will be augmented further by 2.16 percent as a result of University reallocation, providing approximate salary increases of 10 percent for 1981-82 plus fringe benefit increases.

The President has conferred with the Senate Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the Senate Finance Committee and they presented their views and recommendations on the distribution of faculty salary increases. Their recommendations will be taken into account in the salary recommendations made to the Regents.

It is currently impossible to determine when the salary adjustments will be reflected in faculty paychecks. The adjustments, however, will be made as quickly as possible and will include a two stage process: increases in monthly checks and single retroactive check back to July 1, 1981.

2. POSSIBLE UNIVERSITY RETRENCHMENT

In late October, the University was asked to prepare plans for budget reductions of \$37 million, \$47 million, and \$57 million over the biennium. Subsequently, the Board of Regents passed a unanimous resolution stating that 1) the proposed reductions would make it impossible for the University to continue serving the State as a major contributor to its economy and to its cultural and intellectual vitality, 2) the University could absorb, despite a negative impact, a reduction of up to \$10 million, and 3) if reductions of \$37 million or more were required, the Regents would have to

declare a state of fiscal exigency, with potential termination of University personnel and students.

A few days ago the Governor recommended 11.8 percent reductions for the University of Minnesota. This level of reduction is regarded by us as disastrous to the University's performance of its mission to the State, and the President and the Budget Executive have been and will continue to be in consultation and communication with the SCC and the Senate Finance Committee to discuss methods for addressing the situation. Periodic reports will also be provided at each of the Senate meetings during the academic year. Whatever programmatic decisions are ultimately made will be made within the University and by its faculty, administrators, and Regents.

3. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

The first cycle of institutional planning will be completed by the beginning of Winter Quarter. The products of that process, which began in the Spring of 1979 include:

- A revised mission statement for the University approved by the Regents in July of 1980.
- An institutional planning statement which suggests broad goals and objectives.
- Planning statements for each college and major support unit suggesting goals, objectives, and priorities over a three to five year period.
- Presidential planning memoranda which specify the President's views regarding unit plans.
- A planning data base which consists of a periodically updated set of historical and projected figures useful for planning and decision making is maintained by the Office of Management Planning and Information Services.
- The development of a general architecture for planning and decision making.
- Advice to the President on selected issues. An administrative working group is preparing a study of communication, computation, and information systems; a preliminary report has been presented to the Senate Consultative Committee and the chairs of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Planning Committee. In addition, a joint study by the Senate and the administration of selected policy questions is under way. (The 1981-82 study will focus on policies which would help facilitate the scholarly activities of the faculty.)

The second cycle of institutional planning will begin in the Spring of 1982, and will include:

- further refinement of an integrated decision cycle emphasizing planning and budgeting in alternate years.
- highlighting selected issues such as outreach, implications of changing patterns of research funding, program duplication, enrollment management, the development of an integrated system of computation, communication, and information technology, an integrated system of unit reviews, the use of incentives in program development, and the development of stronger links between academic planning and support service, and physical facility planning.

We expect the second cycle of institutional planning to build on the first and to improve on it (a) by focusing on selected issues which will be highlighted, (b) by strengthening our ability to analyze external social, economic, and political constraints, and (c) by incorporating resource acquisition and assignment as an explicit part of the planning framework.

4. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Contract discussions among representatives from the University and from the UMDEA, which represents the collective bargaining faculty groups on the Duluth and Waseca Campuses, will continue until there is an agreement upon a final contract. The University's negotiating team has given UMDEA representatives a draft of a complete contract and tentative agreement has been reached on several contract sections. Upon completion of the negotiations, the contract will be voted upon by the Regents and by the faculty represented by the collective bargaining agents.

Faculty on the Twin Cities Campus, with the exception of the faculty in the Law School and the Health Sciences, are currently voting on collective bargaining. That vote will be completed at the end of December.

5. RAJENDER CONSENT DECREE

The Offices of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Administration and Planning, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and the University Attorney, will continue to review claims and petitions arising out of the Rajender Consent Decree. The current status of claims and petitions is as follows:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| I. Settled (2), dismissed (14), or withdrawn (6)
(claims and petitions) | 22* |
| II. Trial Completed | 2 |

III. Currently being handled internally	153
A. Under settlement	13
B. Under investigation	138
180 day period expires by 1/1/82	
8 of 138	
180 day period expires after 1/2/82	
123 of 138	
180 day period expires after 3/14/82	
7 of 138	
IV. Currently external to the University	21
A. Internal review completed and claim returned to Special Masters for hearing (One is also still in settlement)	10
B. Claimant has filed notice to proceed (two are also still in settlement; one has been referred to internal tribunal)	11
V. Status of intervenors	5
-- Trial held, findings remanded to Special Masters	1
-- Out of court settlement reached	1
-- Trial scheduled (December 1)	1
-- Awaiting trial	2

* Six of the persons who had petitions dismissed still have claims and are also counted in the claims under investigation. (November 16, 1981)

6. REORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Vice President Keller will undertake a review and reorganization of his office and selected support units that report to his office. Included in the review will be University College, the Center for Educational Development, and University Outreach activities.

7. REVIEWS OF GRADUATE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Food Science	Fluid Mechanics
Nutrition	Family Practice
Entomology	Family Planning Administration
Fisheries	Obstetrics
Wildlife	Gynecology
History of Medicine	Psychiatry
Neurology	Pathobiology
Urology	Aeronautical Engineering
Therapeutic	Mechanics

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs is the Chief Academic Officer of the University under the President.
2. The Vice President for Health Sciences reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on academic matters.
3. When a new Vice President for Health Sciences is appointed, this officer shall not be a member of the Budget Executive.
4. Any plans to create a new vice presidency at the University shall be submitted to the Senate for its recommendation before the post is established.

Respectfully submitted,

John E. Turner
CLA Senator