

# MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, April 16, 1981

3:15 p.m.

25 Law Building, West Bank—Twin Cities Campus  
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus  
520 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 205, including the president, 147 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 (103) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 137 affirmative votes at one meeting or 103 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 103 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 chairman, 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 stand 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 and alternates, 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.

## I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 10

Action (5 minutes)

## II. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ELECTION

### INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill 1981-84 vacancies on the Assembly Steering Committee, M. Virginia Fredricks and John Howe were elected. Continuing Twin Cities campus members on the committee are Robert Brasted (1979-82), Marcia Eaton (1979-82), Douglas Pratt (1980-83), Paul Quie (1980-83), and Patricia Swan (1980-83).

MARILEE WARD  
Clerk

## III. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Action (10 minutes)

The constitution provides that a vice chairman shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring of the academic year from among its members for a term of one year starting July 1, 1981.

## IV. PROPOSED REVISION

### UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTION, BYLAWS, AND RULES

(5 minutes)

### MOTION:

To amend the present Constitution, Bylaws, and Handbook by substituting the proposed Revision (as amended) of the University Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules.

### INFORMATION:

At its February 19 meeting, the Senate approved by majority vote the proposed Revision of the University Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules (*Minnesota Daily*, January 6, 1981) and certain amendments (*Minnesota Daily*, February 9 and 12, 1981). The amendments included (1) continuing membership on the Consultative Committee and the Committee on Committees for Crookston and Waseca, (2) a change in registration requirements for Continuing Education and Extension senators, (3) notice in the *Daily* or the *Daily Bulletin* of committee meetings, (4) establishment of a Committee on Services for the Handicapped, and several editorial changes. The Constitution provides that a majority of the membership must approve amendments at each of two consecutive meetings.

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

## V. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

### SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

#### SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY & PROCEDURES

(20 minutes)

### MOTION:

That the Senate endorse the Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment and the Procedures for Handling Complaints of Sexual Harassment Against Academic Staff presented below. The Procedures statement lists three options concerning participation of student, civil service, and academic professional-administrative members of the Sexual Harassment Board in those cases in which the complainant is not a member of their own class. The Senate must choose among these options.

#### POLICY STATEMENT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Sexual harassment in any situation is reprehensible. It subverts the mission of the University, and threatens the careers of students, faculty, and staff. For the purposes of this policy, sexual harassment is defined as follows:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic advancement, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions or academic decisions affecting such individual, or (3) 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.

Sexual harassment is especially serious when it threatens the relationship between student and teacher or the relationship between a supervisor and his or her subordinates. Here sexual harassment exploits unfairly the power inherent in a faculty member's or supervisor's relationship to his or her students or subordinates. Through grades, wage increases, recommendations for graduate study, promotion, and the like, a teacher or a supervisor can have a decisive influence on a student's or staff member's success and future career at the University and beyond.

When a person is subjected to unwanted sexual attention, a situation is created that may have devastating implications for individual students and staff, and for the academic community as a whole. Through fear of reprisal, a student, staff, or faculty member may submit to unwanted sexual attention at the price of debilitating personal anguish or may withdraw from a course or position and thus be forced to change plans for a life's work.

Conversely, a teacher or supervisor may be inhibited from developing a close and professionally appropriate relationship through fear of initiating a misunderstanding as to sexual harassment. In some cases a person against whom a complaint is directed may be unaware that his or her behavior is inappropriate or coercive, or a person's actions or words may be misinterpreted by another. Such misunderstandings, if not resolved, can interfere with the educational and administrative process even when no actual harassment has taken place.

While sexual harassment most often takes place in a situation of power differential between the persons involved, this policy recognizes also that sexual harassment may occur between persons of the same University status, i.e. student-student; faculty-faculty; staff-staff.

Thus, in both obvious and subtle ways, the very possibility of sexual harassment may be deeply destructive to individual students and staff. Academic and career relationships may be poisoned by the subtle and destructive overtones of this problem. For all these reasons, the students, staff, and faculty of the University of Minnesota believe that reaffirmation of a firm stand against sexual harassment and the establishment of procedures specifically designed to resolve complaints of sexual harassment are critically important for this institution.

Just as the University is committed to securing for its students and staff a safe environment, one free of sexual harassment, it is equally committed to maintaining academic freedom, to protecting the personal beliefs of students and staff, and to protecting the expression of these beliefs. Conduct that falls within the protection of academic freedom does not constitute harassment. No student or staff member shall be punished or reprimanded because of his or her beliefs in matters of religion or public policy or because of expressions or conduct protected by the Constitution of the United States or the State of Minnesota, or by the principles of academic freedom.

Complaints of sexual harassment might be brought that have no merit. Students and staff must be protected against false and mischievous complaints. Justice requires that the rights and concerns of both complainant and respondent be fully assured. The University shall make every effort to assure and protect these rights, and shall undertake no action that threatens or compromises them.

This policy on sexual harassment applies to the entire University and to the conduct of students, civil service persons, and academic staff alike. The responsibility for administering the policy, however, varies with the status of the respondent. If the respondent is a student, the procedures for dealing with complaints will be found in A Statement of Standards of Student Conduct Enforceable by University Agencies, approved by the Board of Regents at its December, 1974, meeting. If the respondent is a civil service employee, the procedures are outlined in the Civil Service Rules as amended by the Board of Regents at its January, 1981, meeting. Finally, if the respondent is a member of the academic staff, the procedures are set forth in the document entitled, "Procedures for Handling Complaints of Sexual Harassment Against Academic Staff."

#### PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING COMPLAINTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AGAINST ACADEMIC STAFF

Scope: These procedures are applicable to complaints by students, civil service persons, and academic staff against academic staff and apply to the conduct of academic staff in their capacity as members of the academic staff of the University of Minnesota. In all proceedings regarding allegations of sexual harassment the provisions of Sections 10, 11, 13, and 14 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure shall be faithfully observed.

##### I. An Entry Level Office

This Office shall be separate and distinct from any other office in the institution.

This Office shall be staffed by persons who will have legal training and counseling skills and such other personnel as are necessary for the effective operation of this Office.

This Office shall be established in the chain of authority of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The function of this Office shall be to disseminate information on the University's policies and procedures for dealing with sexual harassment and to receive all complaints alleging sexual harassment against academic staff. Such complaints may be brought by students, civil service persons, and academic staff. It shall be a duty of this Office to design forms and to maintain fair and adequate procedures to process a complaint if a complainant wishes to formalize it. It is also a function of this Office to discuss specific incidents in an informal fashion and to draw on other support and counseling services to assist complainants. Advice shall also be given of the details and consequences of formalizing a complaint. Counseling and informal discussion shall be an integral part of the functioning of this Office.

If the complaint cannot be resolved informally, this Office shall ask the complainant to submit a formal written complaint, including a statement of the alleged incident and the remedy desired. This Office shall ask the respondent to reply to the written complaint within ten days of the receipt of the complaint. The filing of such response shall be mandatory and the person responding shall be required to indicate denial in whole or in part, agreement with the assertions in whole or in part. Failure to respond shall be deemed a breach of academic responsibility requiring notice of such failure to respond to be given to the Academic Vice President by this Office.

Upon receipt of the response, this Office may further investigate the complaint and may schedule a meeting of the parties. Each party may have an advisor present at this meeting. This Office shall settle the formal written complaint in one of the following three ways:

1. It may dismiss the complaint as being without merit.
2. It may arrange for the parties to sign a written statement of agreement in which the parties resolve the differences between them according to terms set out in writing.
3. It may judge that the respondent acted in violation of the University Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment; in this case, this Office shall describe the nature of the violation, the evidence that supports its judgment and the sanction, if any, that it recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs apply in response to the violation. The judgment of violation and recommendation of sanction by this Office are advisory to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and have no final official standing. It is only the Academic Vice President who can officially find a respondent in violation of the University Policy on Sexual Harassment and issue a sanction.

Both parties shall be notified immediately in writing of the action of this Office.

If this Office dismisses the complaint and the complainant does not appeal the dismissal or if the parties sign a written statement of agreement, the file shall be closed. The

material retained in the file shall include a copy of the formal written complaint, a copy of the respondent's reply, a statement of the action of this Office and a copy of any written agreements. This file shall be kept in a secure place and kept separate from the Academic Personnel Records.

If the complainant wishes to appeal the dismissal of the complaint, he or she may do so by filing a notice of appeal with the Sexual Harassment Board within ten days of written notification of the action of this Office. In the case of appeal, all materials shall be retained in the files and the files shall be forwarded to the Board.

If this Office finds that the respondent acted in violation of the University Policy or recommends a sanction, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be notified immediately. The Vice President may direct the Sexual Harassment Board to conduct a hearing. Any hearing shall be conducted in accordance with basic and traditional principles of fairness and in accordance with procedures that guarantee full procedural due process to complainant and respondent.

Responsibility for reviewing the activities of the entry level Office shall be assumed by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, to which two students and one civil service person have been added. This subcommittee shall receive copies of all dispositions of cases and shall see that the University Policy on Sexual Harassment is administered properly and fairly by this Office. It is also the responsibility of this subcommittee to report to the University Senate at the end of three years when the term of these procedures expires.

## II. The Sexual Harassment Board

The main body for hearing appeals of the actions of the entry level Office is a nine-person Board to be appointed by the President. In order to achieve continuity, the Board members shall be appointed for staggered terms of service varying in length from one to three years. The membership of the Board shall consist of five faculty members, one academic professional-administrative person, one civil service person, and two students.

**OPTION 1:** Members of the Board who are not faculty members shall participate only in those appeals or hearings in which the complainant is a member of their own class (i.e., an academic professional-administrative person, a civil service person, or a student).

**OPTION 2:** Members of the Board shall determine by majority vote who shall participate in each case, but the Board shall always include those members belonging to the class of the complainant and the respondent.

**OPTION 3:** All members of the Board shall participate in all cases.

The office of the University Attorney shall serve to advise the Board on substantives or procedural issues that arise under the University Policy on Sexual Harassment.

The primary function of the Board is to hear appeals and conduct hearings. The Board shall hear appeals from complainants whose complaints have been dismissed by the Office. The Board, upon request from the Academic Vice President, shall also review the findings and recommendations of the Office when the Office has found a respondent in violation of the Policy on Sexual Harassment or has recommended a sanction. The Board shall conduct full hearings when in the judgment of the Board or the Academic Vice President that is appropriate.

In carrying out its appeal and hearing function, the Board shall adopt hearing procedures that accord due process to every party and are consistent with the Procedures for Committees of the Senate. At least two appropriate models for such procedures are the "Model Rules of Procedure for Collegiate Level Academic Freedom and Responsibility Grievance Committees" (Report of the ad hoc Committee on Grievances, September 28, 1978, pp. 22-30) and the "Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure" (#271, November 8, 1979).

In reviewing an action or recommendation of the entry level Office, the Board may be required to make up to three determinations. It may be required to determine the truth or falsity of the evidence considered. Secondly, the Board may be required to decide whether the factual allegation constitutes a violation of the University Policy on Sexual Harassment. Lastly, the Board may be required to decide what if any sanction is appropriate.

## III. Appeals

The Complainant may appeal the action of the Office to dismiss his or her complaint to the Sexual Harassment Board. The respondent may appeal the actions of the Vice President for Academic Affairs to the Senate Judicial Committee. The respondent may appeal a ruling by the Academic Vice President that the respondent acted in violation of the University Policy on Sexual Harassment or may appeal any sanction proposed by the Academic Vice President. The Senate Judicial Committee shall hear the issues *de novo*.

## IV. Sanctions

Violations of the University Policy on Sexual Harassment may be met with a variety of responses. The Academic Vice President may rule that a respondent acted in violation of the University Policy on Sexual Harassment and propose no further official action. If in the opinion of the Academic Vice President the violation is more serious and warrants more severe treatment, a number of sanctions may be imposed. Those could include a reprimand and suspension without compensation for a period of one quarter or longer. Acts of sexual harassment of an extremely serious nature may warrant criminal action and may warrant a recommendation of removal for cause.

## V. Standard of Proof

A violation of this policy on sexual harassment shall be found only where there is a preponderance of evidence that a violation occurred.

## VI. Limited Duration

We recommend that this policy and procedure be instituted for an initial three-year period and reviewed by the Senate at the end of that experience under these rules and procedures. We consider that such a provisional response to this problem is superior to constructing a permanent system at this time. We have come to this problem with a limited amount of factual information. Given the special nature of this problem, we believe that a provisional response such as we suggest will serve to supply the factual base and experience essential for a satisfactory long-term program for defining the problem with some accuracy and eliminating it.

## COMMENT:

The policy statement explains why the University needs to develop a set of procedures for handling complaints of sexual harassment against academic staff. In late fall, 1979, at the request of the Senate Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs appointed a subcommittee to develop such procedures. The faculty members were Leo Raskind, Law School (chr.); Dorothy Loeffler, Senate Committee on Educational Policy; Michael Root, University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility; Sharon Satterfield, Human Sexuality Program; and Timothy Dunnigan, Senate Judicial Committee. The student members were Katherine Hadley, Law School; Elizabeth Keller, CLA; and Robert Spelhaug, Law School. This subcommittee devoted many hours to this assignment and met with several groups to discuss its various drafts. Three Senate Committees made substantial contributions: Social Concerns, Judicial, and Tenure. Dr. Betty Robinett, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and a SCFA member, was also extremely helpful.

For personal reasons not related to the subcommittee work, in December, 1980, Professor Raskind asked to be relieved of his chair position. Professor Root agreed to serve as chair to complete the assignment.

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs received periodic progress reports from the subcommittee. In March, 1981, SCFA approved the final subcommittee report subject to a few amendments accepted by Professor Root and further discussion between the SCFA chair and the Senate Consultative Committee. The SCC has also been following closely the work of the subcommittee.

Two points deserve special comment. According to the Procedures statement, the standard of proof is a preponderance of evidence. This is the standard which the courts have applied in Title VII, Sex Discrimination in Employment.

Three options are presented on the membership of the Board because both SCFA and SCC prefer to leave this decision to the Senate. SCFA leans toward Option 1, SCC toward Option 3. Option 2 is a compromise position. The principal arguments in favor of having all members participate in all cases are that (1) all complainants will receive equal treatment, (2) members will become more experienced if they participate in all cases, and (3) the handling of these cases requires no special expertise. The principal arguments in favor of limiting participation to those members whose classes are involved in the case are that (1)

either the complainant or the respondent may prefer to have only members of their class involved, and (2) the workload of the other members will be reduced. The first argument is strongest when both the complainant and the respondent are faculty members.

Both SCFA and SCC are deeply indebted to the subcommittee and to the many other persons who have worked on this extremely important and difficult issue.

**C. ARTHUR WILLIAMS, Chair**  
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

**MARCIA M. EATON, Chair**  
Senate Consultative Committee

## VI. SENATE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

### CONFIDENTIALITY RULE

#### INFORMATION:

At its February 19, 1981, meeting, the Faculty Senate voted without dissent to amend the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure to allow the Judicial Committee to provide in its rules for a system of making its hearings and findings public. Unless any such proposed rule or amendment is deferred by majority vote of the Faculty Senate, it shall become effective ten days after a meeting of the Faculty Senate in which it appeared in the published agenda. The Regents approved this measure at their meeting of March 16, 1981. In anticipation of this action, the Judicial Committee, on March 5, 1981, amended several sections of its Rules of Procedure to provide for open hearings and for publication of its findings and recommendations as follows: (underlined words added)

#### Rule 6. Representation and Attendance at Hearings

(d) ~~Faculty Organization Observers.~~ Upon request of either party, or at its own initiative, the panel may permit designated representatives of education associations, organizations of faculty members, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, or other interested groups, to present their views on the issues before the panel, if any, that transcend the particular case. The panel may require these views to be presented in writing only, with a copy to each panel member. ~~In addition, designated representatives of such interested groups may be permitted by the panel to attend the hearing in the case on the understanding that such representative agrees to abide by the restrictions on publicity stated in Rule 17. Faculty, students, administrators, and members of the public at large may be permitted to attend the hearing in the case, except as provided in Rule 17, and on the condition that the proceedings can be conducted in a decorous manner consistent with due process.~~

~~(e) With the permission of the panel, other members of the Judicial Committee may be observers.~~

#### Rule 15. Procedures at Hearing

~~(j) Attendance at Hearings. Attendance of persons other than the parties and witnesses shall be limited to those persons accorded status of participant under Rule 6.~~

#### Rule 17. Principle of Confidentiality. Public Nature of Findings and Recommendations and of Hearings

(a) **General Goals.** Public discussion or publicity about a case before the Judicial Committee might result in the loss of the privacy of faculty members, students, administrators, and others who appear as parties or witnesses in evidentiary hearings and might create pressure on potential witnesses and Committee members to testify or decide matters in ways that would not otherwise occur. On the other hand, it may be necessary or desirable to acquaint a broader audience with the fact of the filing of a complaint or to discuss ~~broad~~ broadly matters of policy that are raised by individual cases. In any event, the overriding principle to be applied, concerning openness of hearings, is that a fair and just resolution of the case be reached through due process.

(b) **Implementation.** ~~In order to accommodate these goals, the following should guide the conduct of persons having information derived from any Judicial Committee proceeding. In a manner consistent with these goals, the following should guide the conduct of hearings and persons participating in or observing such hearings before panels of the Judicial Committee.~~

~~(1) Members of the Judicial Committee should avoid any discussion of individual cases outside of the normal Committee and panel processes, unless prior approval has been obtained from the full Committee. Hearings shall be open to faculty, students, administrators, and the public unless the hearing Panel finds compelling cause to close the hearings in whole or in part.~~

~~(2) Parties to a Judicial Committee proceeding should avoid any statement outside the proceeding that would tend to create prejudice in the minds of potential witnesses or Committee members. Parties may, of course, discuss the case with necessary persons in the course of gathering evidence and preparing for the hearing. In reaching a decision to close a hearing, the panel shall consider the arguments of both parties and may seek the advice of the Judicial Committee. However, the decision of the panel in this matter shall be final.~~

~~(3) Any person including parties, attorneys, advisers, Committee members, observers, witnesses and others who are present at the hearings of a case or have available any copy of a transcript or report of the hearings in a case shall not divulge the contents of any testimony, documents, or other evidence brought forward at the hearing except as provided in these Rules or in the Tenure Regulations. The provisions of this rule notwithstanding, the witness rule, Rule 15(f), shall apply.~~

~~(4) Transmittal of the findings in a case to the Senate is governed by Section 16 of the Tenure Regulations. Distribution of findings in a case, as provided by Section 16 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, is governed by Rules 18(d).~~

~~(5) The confidentiality provisions of this rule do not apply to hearings that have been opened to the public under Rule 6(f).~~

#### Rule 18. Findings and Recommendations

(b) **Proposed Findings; Comments and Objections.** A proposed set of Findings and Recommendations shall be prepared and submitted to the parties, to each member of the Judicial Committee who did not sit as a member of the hearing panel, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and to observers invited under Rule 6(d) designated by groups invited under Rule 6(d) to present their views on the issues, present at the hearings. Recipients may submit written comment or objections within a time stated by the hearing officer for the submission of such views. Comments should be delivered to the recipients of the proposed findings by the deadline set by the panel. Any written response to the comments should be received within five days after the deadline set for comments. At the option of the panel, oral argument may be presented on the tentative findings.

(d) **Submission to President and Publication.** The Findings and Recommendations of the panel, signed by each concurring member of the hearing panel, shall be submitted to the President by the hearing officer. Copies shall be sent to the parties, to each member of the Judicial Committee, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, to the Chairman of the University Committee on Tenure, and to observers invited under Rule 6(d) designated by groups invited under Rule 6(d) to present their views on the issues, present at the hearings. Copies of the final Findings and Recommendations shall also be sent by the Hearing Officer to the Clerk of the Faculty Senate, and to various University Libraries, for immediate access by library users, as follows: two copies to Wilson Library, Twin Cities Campus, and one copy to the main library of each coordinate campus of the University.

**EDWARD G. RIPPKE**  
Chairman

## VII. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

### ACADEMIC STAFF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

#### INFORMATION:

The University Committee on Business and Rules met several times during winter quarter to consider the issue of representation in the Senate and its committee structure for persons who will be included in the new personnel appointment category called Academic

Staff Professional Personnel. We also sponsored an open forum on the subject on April 2, 1981, in order to provide an opportunity to the larger University community to comment on the matter and offer suggestions of various ways by which the academic staff professional personnel might be represented.

A new appointment category was approved by the Board of Regents at its meeting on December 12, 1980, and is described in the proposal prepared by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs ("Academic Staff Professional and Administrative Personnel Policies and Procedures"). Section IX.B of that document requests of Business and Rules and the Senate Consultative Committee that both committees undertake development of "a recommendation to the Senate on the question of representation and participation of the Academic Staff in the University, and on Senate and University Committees and councils, as appropriate."

Business and Rules understands that Academic Staff, in Section IX.B, refers only to academic staff professional personnel and not to administrative personnel. We have not yet been able to resolve other questions, such as the kind of representation, or the areas or degree of representation for the new professional category, because we lack information on the numbers of people involved and the units to which they are or will be appointed. Until this information is available, Business and Rules faces difficulties in determining specific methods and proportions of Senate representation for these personnel.

There remains, too, the larger question of the effect that representation of a sizable number of non-student, non-faculty staff personnel will have on the Senate.

The Committee on Business and Rules will pursue this matter this year and perhaps next year. We solicit further comments and suggestions from senators and all members of the University.

**CONSTANCE SULLIVAN**  
Chair

**VIII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT**  
(15 minutes)

**IX. OLD BUSINESS**

**X. 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 not 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.

**XI. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS**

Carl Goossen, 1909-1980

Philip Jordan, 1903-1980

Richard Lillehei, 1927-1981

Mabelle McCullough, 1914-1980

Samuel Monk, 1902-1981

Gregory Stone, 1921-1981

Stanley Wenberg, 1918-1981

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**