

MBM  
D65

# MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, November 18, 1976

3:15 p.m.

Nicholson Auditorium—Twin Cities Campus  
520 Administration Building—Duluth Campus

13 Camden Hall—Morris Campus

305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus

B-17 Basement Learning Resource Center—Waseca Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 246, including the President, 162 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), 83 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (124) must be present. Amendments to the Constitution require advance notice and 164 affirmative votes at one meeting or 124 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which must be the next regular meeting. Amendments to the Bylaws require advance publication and 124 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 non-voting members of the University Senate.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for senators may be admitted to meetings of the University Senate and shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the University Senate. Only elected members of the University Senate, the members of 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 institute, 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. In accordance with a newly enacted constitutional amendment, each institute, college or school may either elect a pool of alternate representatives or define the pool to be those eligible to vote for senators.

Documents to be handed out at the Senate meeting should be given to the Clerk of the Senate by 1:00 p.m., two days before the meeting, to allow them to be sent to the coordinate campuses. A document that is less than one page long can be accepted by the Clerk before 10 a.m. the day of the meeting for transmission by computer; however, this practice is discouraged if the earlier deadline can be met. If any coordinate campus is linked to the meeting by telephone and the document is not in its hands, the Senate will not consider the document.

## ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the auditorium. Members, please check your name to indicate your presence.

A summary of the attendance of members elected for the current academic year will be included in the minutes for the last meeting of the year.

## RULES GOVERNING THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

(These may be changed by a majority vote at any meeting)

- A. Any member of the Senate, upon being recognized by the chair, may yield time in debate to a nonmember of the Senate.
- B. Senators and non-Senators will be limited to a maximum of 3 minutes time on each occasion they are recognized for participation in debate.

### Interpretations and Understandings

- 1. The traditional practice of alternating speakers pro and con a proposal will continue.
  - 2. The traditional practice of not recognizing members who have already participated so long as there are would-be speakers who have not will also continue.
  - 3. The usual rules of germaneness and decorum will apply both to Senators and non-Senators.
  - 4. In the event a Senator yields time in debate to a non-Senator, both shall be considered to have participated in the debate.
- C. Time limits (as specified on the agenda) will govern the maximum amount of time for debate of items for action.

### Interpretations and Understandings.

- 1. The time limits set only a maximum time for debate; a call for the question is in order before the expiration of the time limit.
  - 2. At the expiration of the maximum time for debate, the chairman will put the question to a vote.
- D. No amendment of an item on the printed docket shall be in order unless it has been submitted in writing to the Clerk of the Senate and to the chairperson of the committee submitting the report at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at which the report is to be considered. This rule may be suspended by majority vote.
- E. Items of new business presented at a meeting of the Senate by individual members shall be referred to the Committee on Business and Rules for consideration and presentation at the next regular meeting of the Senate; but such items of business may be considered and voted on at the meeting at which they are introduced by a two-thirds majority vote of the members of the Senate present and voting on a proposal for immediate consideration. An item on the agenda for information may be sent back to the committee reporting it, for presentation as an item for action at a later meeting, by a simple majority vote; it may be considered for action at the meeting at which it is reported for information by a two-thirds majority vote of the members of the Senate present and voting on a proposal for immediate consideration as an item for action.

## I. MINUTES FOR MAY 20, 1976 Reported for Action (5 minutes)

## II. OFFICERS OF THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY Reported for Action (5 minutes)

The chairman of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly has designated the following as officers for 1976-77:

Parliamentarian—James E. Connolly  
Abstractor and Clerk—Marilee Ward

## III. SCHEDULED MEETINGS DURING 1976-77 Reported for Information

UNIVERSITY SENATE	TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY
November 18, 1976	October 21, 1976
March 3, 1977	February 3, 1977
April 21, 1977	April 28, 1977
May 26, 1977	

All meetings are scheduled at 3:15 p.m. in Nicholson Hall auditorium.

## IV. SENATE AND UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES Reported for Action (15 minutes)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING & RELATIONS: Students: Michael Boosalis, Rick Casey, Keith Cook, Carl Grimsby. One to be appointed.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS: Add Vincent Bilotta (ex officio), and Edward Cowles. Students: Nancy Nimlos, John Weis, William Werb. Alumni: Gladys Sinclair Brooks, John Finnegan, Gerald Friedell, Viola Hoffman Hymes, James Shannon.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES: Add William Schofield (replaces Joseph Altholz who is on sabbatical). Students: Mark Bufkin, Linda Digby, Abdul Muana Ghandi, Dennis Hogan.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BIENNIAL REQUEST & BUDGET REVIEW: Add John Leppi (replaces Sandra Scarr-Salapatek), and John Chipman. Students: Charles Otto II, Frank Seidel, Edward Wegerson. One to be appointed.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY: Add Wilbert Ahern, Robert Brasted, Frank Hirschbach, Arnette Mace. Students: Kelly Dunn, Jacqueline Goodwin, Shelli Kari, Patricia Rieschi, Edward Wegerson.

COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION: James Wernitz (chr.), Frank Benson, Donald Berry, Betty Carruth, Shirley Clark (ex officio), Kendall Corbin, Allen Glenn, Nathaniel Hart, Gordon Kingston (executive secretary), K.S.P. Kumar, Jerrold Peterson, Roger Stuewer, Raymond Willis, Hernan Vidal. Students: Pat Dalquist, Julia Halberg, Peter Rosenbaum. Two to be appointed.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS: Students: Roger Fellows, Beth Kerr, Robert Boniello, Enrique Serra, Christine Steigerwalt. Alumni: Betty Ann Danielson.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING FACILITIES: Students: Carol Anndy, Thomas Carlson, Scott Costello, Paul Meyer.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS & MEDIA: Students: Michelle Matiski, Janice Olsen, Catherine Solheim, Bindiganavle Suresh, Joe Wagner.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SUMMER SESSIONS: Students: Kathryn Bauermeister, Karen Hawley, Tom Schwebach, Mark Spartz. One to be appointed.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Add Lewis Levang. Students: Daniel Callery, Michael Hamm, Louis Ling, Ed Wegerson. One to be appointed.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ROTC RELATIONSHIPS: Add Irving Gottesman. Students: Stephen Carlson, Joseph LaJeunesse, Shawn Maynihan, Richard Rydberg.

COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: Anne Krueger (chr.), Frank Barnwell, Donald Brown (ex officio), Albert Linck (ex officio), Benjamin Liu, Forrest Moore (ex officio), Rama Pandey, Philip Porter, Malcolm Purvis, Nicholas Spadaccini, Gordon Swanson, Homer Venters. One faculty and one ex officio to be appointed. Students: Jeanne Andre, Diane Conde, Gail Hughes, Greg Johnson, Shimon Dolan (Landau), Olga Stavrakas, Enrique Serra. Two to be appointed.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS: Add John S. Chipman, Ruth Hovde, Eloise Jaeger.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENTURE: Add Ronald Akehurst. Students: Robert Ariel, Philip Ryan.

UNIVERSITY APPEALS COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY: One faculty member to be appointed. Students: Daniel Callery, Sally Ferguson, Heidi Wurst. One to be appointed.

SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE: Students: Kathryn Bauermeister, Barbara Borske, Nancy Elder, Cynthia Hennekens, David Keller, Katherine MacEachern, Neil Raab, Corliss Rice.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH: Add J. Bruce Overmeier (chr.) (replaces Sandra Scarr-Salapatek who is on leave), Robert Gorlin. Students: Karen Hawley, Mark Labine, Charles Otto.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH: Jeralyn Plack (chr.), Charles Backstrom, David Berninghausen, Linda Budd, Thomas Clayton, Victoria Coifman, Roger DeRoos, John Dolan, Jessie Easton, Darrell Frohrib, Michael Graves, Robert Gibson, Frederick Goetz, Vernon Hendrix, Thomas Hummel, John Ingham, Richard Meisch, Charles Moldow, Elof Nelson, Takashi Okagaki, Evelyn Peterson, Richard Pierson, Robert Pozos, Paul Quie, Jay Roshal, Ivan Ross, John Sauk Jr., Brandon Smith, Karl Smith, Richard Sterne, Richard Sykes, Milton Trapold, Jack Vennes, W. Dixon Ward, Gloria Williams, Stanley Williams. Students: William Erickson, Helen Framm, Jim Haefemeyer, Carla Howery, Susan Knoblauch, Alice Larson, Michael Lougee, Jack Mandel, Eric Nordheim, James Richards, Fran Watson. Community representatives: Steve Grossman, William Hunt, Mary Meeker. Alternate community representatives: Richard Berquist, Vernon Devine.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL CARE: Mary Jayne Capps. Student: Cheryl Ann Champion.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES & PLANNING: Norine Odland. Students: Michael Donahue, Frank Seidel, Murray Walton, Gary Locke, Randall Volk.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL CONCERNS: Students: Pam Burkley, Tom Chapel, James Driscoll, Harold IronShield, Karen Olsen. Two to be appointed. Alumni: Angelo Cohn, William Hickey.

## V. REPORT OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Reported for Action (10 minutes)

Proposed amendment to the Handbook of Rules and Operational Procedures of the University Senate, Section U1.4.4, Consultative Committee, Duties and Responsibilities. Insert a new subsection i. to read: "The Faculty Consultative Committee is empowered to appoint faculty representatives to non-Senate bodies when requested to do so by those bodies or by the President of the University, when no other procedure for so doing is

provided for in these rules, and after consultation with the Committee on Senate Committees."

The present subsections i, j, k and l shall be redesignated j, k, l and m respectively.

**KENNETH KELLER**  
Chairman

## VI. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

Reported for Action (15 minutes)

*ARTICLE III, SECTION 4(c), LINE 7: STRIKE THE WORD "DULUTH."*

The amendment would change the rules for electing student representatives to the Senate from Duluth. It gives recognition to the fact that UMD has been organized into six Colleges and Schools, each of which has a student constituency, and it provides for election of representatives using the same formula as that applicable to the Twin Cities Campus, i.e. one student member for each initial 1000 full-time students or fraction thereof in each student constituency plus one additional student senator for each additional 1000 full-time students or major fraction thereof in such constituency.

Reported for Information

The Business and Rules Committee interprets the Constitution to intend that each graduate student at UMD should be considered part of one of the 6 colleges or schools at UMD and that each should be instructed to vote with the appropriate unit.

**MARIO F. BOGNANNO**  
Chairman

## VII. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Reported for Information (10 minutes)

The Recent Relationship of University College to the University Senate

In the Spring of 1970 the Senate recommended that University College be given a responsibility for curricular experimentation. The Senate provided a mechanism whereby any regular full-time member of the faculty could request that part of his/her salary be cross-charged to University College in order to allow this faculty member to participate in an approved experimental program.

The Senate also said that all regular full-time members of the University of Minnesota faculty were to be considered members of the faculty of University College.

It was provided that the University faculty would be represented by the University College Governing Council. This Council was to be widely representative of regular undergraduate degree programs, was to be appointed through normal procedures for All-University Committees and was to report annually to the Senate through SCEP. It was to be constituted of 10 faculty members, 5 student members and to have *ex officio* representation from the academic vice-president and the dean of the college.

In May 1973, it was reported to the Senate that the University College Governing Council "realized that to govern through a surrogate faculty council was no longer effective." The Senate then passed a resolution "to disestablish the UCGC as a University Committee" on the date when the University College Constitution was approved by the Board of Regents. The University College Constitution provided for a College Assembly which would include 5 faculty members and 3 student members appointed through the regular means for appointment of an All-University Committee. The Senate resolution included the statement that "the effect of this resolution will be to change the Governance of University College, but not to diminish the present relationship of University College to this Senate and to SCEP."

Currently, we are studying the question as to whether or not the University College structure has been effective in fulfilling its charge from the Senate with regard to curriculum experimentation.

We hope to be able to take to the Senate at its winter quarter meeting recommendations as to a mechanism or mechanisms for involving regular faculty members in curricular experimentation and for continuing the provision for encouraging curricular experimentation within the University.

## VIII. ANNUAL REPORT, 1975-76 SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Reported for Information (5 minutes)

The Committee met 15 times during the year. One meeting was convened as the Twin Cities Assembly Committee and one meeting was held jointly with the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning. All meetings were held on the Twin Cities Campus of the University.

Action was taken on the following items:

- A Sub-Committee of SCEP recommended a policy on the merger of radio facilities and the coordination of academic and broadcasting activities in radio. This was approved by the Senate November 20, 1975.
- A statement to serve as a guide in negotiation of cooperative arrangements in the area of radio broadcasting was approved by the Senate on March 4, 1976.
- An agreement of cooperation between the University of Besancon (France) and the University of Minnesota was approved by the Council on International Education and taken to the Senate by this committee on April 15, 1976. The agreement was approved.
- An agreement of cooperation between the University of Turku (Finland) and the University of Minnesota was approved by the Council on International Education and taken to the Senate by this Committee on May 20, 1976. The agreement was approved.
- A revised policy on University-Sponsored Educational Materials was approved by the University Committee on Instructional Materials and Media and by this Committee. It was taken to the Senate and approved by that body on May 20, 1976.
- A resolution to establish a Task Force on Grading Practices was passed by the Assembly Committee, transmitted to President Magrath, and reported for information to the Twin Cities Assembly on February 5, 1976. However, the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations has agreed to take on this task during 1976-77.

Items for information:

- During Fall Quarter the Committee participated heavily in the preparation of a self-evaluation report for the North Central Association Accreditation Review.
- The Committee discussed policy to govern proposed agreements of cooperation with Universities in other countries. The Council on International Education will bring to the Senate recommendations on such policy during 1976-77 and will review all such agreements in effect at that time.
- The Committee discussed the University's possible participation in the University of Mid-America with representatives from the central administration and other interested units.
- The Committee continued to discuss the report of a Senate Task Force on Developing and Encouraging Excellence in Teaching. It is hoped by the Committee that this Task Force Report can be forwarded to the Senate during 1976-77.
- The Committee discussed summer session operations and the quarter system for division of the academic calendar.

The Committee sent a representative to the Senate Budget Committee, to the Senate

Committee on Resources and Planning, and to the University's Planning Council. Certain items of business in those committees were also discussed by this committee and information, ideas, and concerns were shared with our representatives.

**PATRICIA B. Swan**  
Chairman

## IX. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Reported for Information

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The Report is divided into two parts: Part A presents a progress report on two of the 5 on-going issues, namely: 1) The Faculty Retirement Plans and 2) Fringe Benefits for Part-Time Faculty. Part B contains SCFA's recommendations on faculty compensation.

### A. TWO OF THE FIVE ON-GOING ISSUES

*Faculty Retirement Plans:*

SCFA is pleased to inform the members of the Senate that the Board of Regents at their October 8 meeting approved some modifications in the current retirement plan for faculty who began participation in the faculty retirement plan prior to 1963. The modified plan guarantees, with certain modifications, a 50% (reduced proportionately for less than 30-year service) of the retiree's high five-year average salary as a retirement income, including social security, annuity payments, and any University contributions necessary to make up the difference. This will be effective for individuals who retire on June 30, 1977, or later.

If faculty members have any questions concerning this 50% Guaranteed Retirement Plan, please refer them to Employee Benefits, Telephone 373-2115.

The Committee would like to thank all the members of the faculty and the Central Administration for their help in making the 50% Guaranteed Retirement Plan possible. It is SCFA's hope that the Committee will continue to enjoy similar kinds of support in other matters dealing with the faculty welfare.

*Fringe Benefits for Part-Time Faculty*

It is SCFA's understanding that President Magrath has included a *supplement* to the faculty salary proposal in the 1977-79 Biennium Request. The amount requested is \$482,800 for social security coverage for part-time faculty. It would extend coverage to faculty who are appointed 25% of full time or more. The Committee is very grateful for the action taken by the President and hopes that this item in the Biennium Request will be approved by the Legislature.

### B. A PHILOSOPHY FOR FACULTY COMPENSATION

The following is the draft "A Philosophy For Faculty Compensation" which was approved by the SCFA at its May 25, 1976, meeting. The Committee, with the Senate's concurrence, plans to forward this document to the President for his perusal and action.

On February 28, 1974, in response to the destructive effect that significant sustained inflation was producing on the faculty quality of life, the University Senate established a Task Force on Academic Salaries to develop general principles and appropriate guidelines for establishing and maintaining an equitable system of academic salaries. While this Task Force considered only salary improvement factors, its report identified fringe benefits as a related issue and recommended that the SCFA should consider a fringe benefit system permitting appropriate individual adaptation. At the June 5, 1975, Senate meeting, Chairperson Zaidi identified the discussion and development of Long-Range Objectives of the University's Overall Compensation Plan as an ongoing issue for 1975-76.

*Introduction*

The primary objective of an Overall Compensation Plan is to aid in the attraction and retention of highly qualified faculty in an atmosphere conducive to both productivity and creativity. The initial appointment and subsequent compensation are to be governed by the principles of equal opportunity.

Since government and other institutions compete for these same individuals, the University must offer terms of employment that are competitive. Competitiveness is a function of many factors, such as the usual academic prerequisites, the opportunity for stimulating interactions with colleagues and students, the adequacy of support facilities and services, the ethos of the institution, and the general quality of life.

An Overall Compensation Plan is concerned primarily with the first two aspects of the above list, salary and fringe benefits. Dollars are the basic resources used to provide salaries and fringe benefits. These dollars also could be used to aid some of the other factors, specifically, support facilities and services. There may in fact be times when it would be preferable to spend additional dollars on the latter instead of the former. Faculty productivity and morale are maximized when the faculty has the opportunity to do pleasing and useful work under conditions that make it effective without the faculty incurring undue economic hardship for themselves or their families.

In addition to competitiveness, there are equity considerations that deserve some recognition. Faculty with long professional experience and seasoning, who have insights and wisdom that make them especially valuable to their students and colleagues, should receive appropriate recognition.

Salary is an excellent way to compensate faculty. It maximizes the freedom and flexibility of individuals to use their compensation in any way they wish. Each faculty member can set personal priorities for the use of his/her salary. However, salary alone does not provide the most effective compensation; some fringe benefits give the faculty more value than the equivalent cost paid in salary. This results in savings to the faculty due to group purchases or because of the institution's purchasing power. Tax regulations also enter into the value of the compensation program since employer purchased benefits are purchased with pre-tax dollars. Some benefits such as research leaves, travel expenses and secretarial assistance are in part conditions of work and in part faculty benefits. Other benefits such as access to athletic facilities may be of minor pecuniary importance but can afford convenience or privilege.

A good case can be made that it would be foolish to design a compensation plan which only lists specific salary levels and benefits. The primary objective of the plan is to attract and retain highly qualified faculty. That is, if it is to fulfill its mission, the University must be able to compete for highly qualified faculty. Thus any plan must be expected to, and be able to, change from time to time as external factors impinge on the competitiveness of the University's current plan. Examples of such factors would be cost of living increases in periods of inflationary pressures, widespread adoption of specific benefits elsewhere and the introduction of new government programs.

While one does not want to commit a compensation plan to a particular list of items, one can formulate a set of principles or guidelines to use in evaluating the desirability of specific items.

**Principle #1** Highest priority shall be for competitive salaries which will attract and retain highly qualified faculty. The Task Force on Academic Salaries recommended this approach for the University to achieve its mission at least cost to the taxpayers. They recommend a peer group salary structure, which reflects the reality that faculty members in some fields command salaries higher than faculty members in other fields because of differences in the supply and demand for academics. Further, faculty members in demand by nonacademic employers generally receive higher salaries than their counterparts, whose disciplines are limited to the academic setting.

**Principle #2** The second highest priority should be given to financial insulation against unanticipated, unexpected, uncontrollable events which impair the faculty members employability or threaten the well being of his/her dependents.

**Principle #3** Retirement, while anticipated and expected, has an economic impact that is so great that a retirement benefit requires a similar high priority, if retired persons are to have a measure of economic security. Adequate provisions for retirement are worth special note. The year 1963 was a watershed in the retirement program. Those whose participation in the University retirement program was largely before 1963 constitute a distinct and disadvantaged group. While this document prescribes no remedies, the issue is noted because equity is involved.

**Principle #4** Of lesser priority are benefits that may ease extraordinary burdens at particular times, such as housing for new faculty, family educational privileges, and low

*interest personal loans.* In contrast to the high priority benefits which are utilized by virtually all faculty, these latter elements are most often provided on an elective basis and are designed to meet individual needs. The priority for this type of benefit is more a factor of timeliness than universal utilization. A mechanism to minimize the impact of potential unemployment of untenured faculty would be to provide the option of health insurance coverage conversion at group rates. The Task Force on Academic Salaries recommended a "cafeteria" design for these benefits that provides a variety of optional (up to a limit) fringe benefits which would be flexible enough to be adaptable for individual needs.

#### *Benefits Resources*

It should be understood that the choice and pattern of benefits offered by the University depend upon their cost in institutional resources and the alternative uses of these resources. Hence, consideration such as the advantages derived from group institutional action and the tax advantages of one use of funds compared with another use must be taken into account. There are many lesser or less frequent considerations, falling into the convenience or privileges category, whose sum often is major and whose importance varies from campus to campus. Moreover, some campuses have resources—such as land, houses, or special gifts—whose purpose is restricted. These may sometimes be used to provide the faculty with resources that have few, if any, alternate uses.

#### *Factors Affecting the Quality of Faculty Service*

The following elaboration of benefits beyond salary is not intended to be exhaustive but represents what has been described elsewhere. It also should be noted that the effect of the recent inflation which has had such an impact on purchasing power makes any benefits provided from pretaxed dollars even more important.

As observed previously, the chief purpose of a compensation program is to enhance the University's educational service by increasing the productivity and morale of the faculty. Thus, the choice of benefits depends on how directly and how greatly those benefits affect the work and spirit of the faculty. Among this partial list of factors, benefits which affect the productivity and morale of the faculty are: (a) education, (b) range of continuing intellectual contacts, (c) freedom, (d) the absence of interfering worries or obligations, (e) health and vigor, and, of course, (f) native ability and character.

- a. Many schools make leaves of absence for the completion of graduate work a primary benefit. Others make special arrangements for attendance of faculty members at neighboring universities or at their own institution and arrange the teaching schedules to facilitate such attendance. Still others make loans to faculty members in order that additional academic work may be possible.
- b. Reimbursement for travel to meetings as well as regular availability of both short and long term leaves, research assignments, post-doctoral fellowships, and cultural events on campus serve to promote the intellectual life of a faculty.
- c. Academic freedom is protected by tenure, and the liberty to develop one's own intellectual interests should be accorded faculty members. Adequate numbers of leaves and leave compensation can afford faculty the opportunity to choose their own activities outside the academic world.
- d. Salary, insurance, provisions for retirement, and other benefits that make a direct financial contribution to an individual's well-being not only lead to peace of mind but reduce the temptation to participate for pay in non-academic activities. A second subset of benefits might be called aids to work—administrative, secretarial, and even mechanical aids reduce the waste of time of highly trained scholars. These aids contribute substantially to both productivity and morale.
- e. Inclusion of programs of medical services and medical insurance for the faculty hardly need more mention. Similarly programs to provide support to the aged and disabled faculty who may have lost their effectiveness on account of age or loss of health are important. Retirement benefits, disability insurance, as well as sick leaves, serve this purpose.
- f. A high-minded faculty of native ability is secured only through a combination of the competitive attractiveness of an institution and the insight and judgment in selection of such individuals. It is important to reemphasize that competition is not only with other educational institutions but with industry and government. In this compensation plays a part. While educational institutions may not offer stock bonuses or participate in the galaxy of privileges provided by private industry, they can create, through benefits appropriate to their nature, a community where talent thrives.

#### *Summary*

Listed by degree of importance and the frequency of this importance, some of the more valuable staff benefits other than salary are outlined below. Within the categories, the more important tend to come first, but this ordering is open to question. It should be emphasized that priorities change as needs are met. Moreover, the variations of human judgment enter into any such listing.

- I. In the first category (unexpected, unanticipated, uncontrollable or major impact):
  1. A reasonable retirement policy fair to all and with several options and provisions for post-retirement annuities including Social Security benefits.
  2. Major medical insurance.
  3. Group disability insurance.
  4. Group life and travel insurance.
  5. Continued benefits and privileges for retired faculty members and widows. These include major medical insurance. Work facilities for retired faculty members are of special importance.
- II. In the second category (timeless burdens):
  1. Secretarial assistance.
  2. Housing—especially for new members.
  3. Comprehensive basic group health insurance.
  4. Provision for income during disability caused by sickness or accident. This may be approached during a short-term disability by an informal or formal policy for salary continuation, and at a later time by disability insurance.
  5. Time for continued scholarly activities. This involves leaves of absence for research or individual education, research assignments, or a combination of the two, as well as aid for scholarly work in the summer.
  6. Educational privilege. An effective plan is a combination of tuition waiver and grants to go elsewhere.
- III. In the third category (convenience or privilege):
  1. Faculty club and social facilities.
  2. Travel expenses to meetings (especially to equalize departmental opportunities).
  3. Parking.
  4. Moving expenses.
- IV. And a fourth level (privilege):
  1. Credit union.
  2. Athletic facilities.
  3. Campus events.

**MAHMOOD ZAIDI**  
Chairperson

### **X. ANNUAL REPORT, 1975-76** **UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS** Reported for Information

A part of the charge to the University Committee on University-ROTC Relations is to review and formulate policy regarding U-ROTC relationships. The present policy was established by the Regents after considerable campus debate in the late 1960's. In the years since 1970, the committee has examined the feasibility of implementing that policy

and has reported its progress annually. Although there have been some changes in the ROTC program that resulted from the Regents' policy statement, the basic organization of ROTC on campus has not been altered to reflect the intent of that policy. The clear intent of the Regents and the goal that has been sought by the committee and the Vice President for Academic Administration is to increase integration of ROTC into the University curriculum (Regents' policy statement item III).

The objective is based on certain principles and assumptions which have promulgated as University policy by the Board of Regents. The presence of ROTC on campus represents an obligation by the University to the society of which it is a part. That obligation may even be strengthened today by the adoption of an all-volunteer military establishment which provides an alternative to an all-military-academy officer corps. There is also a desire for quality control of courses offered by the ROTC within the context of the basic principle of faculty control of academic programs. Yet, at the same time the University is bound by contractual agreements with the Department of Defense which make certain stipulations about curricula and academic credits.

With these and similar factors to serve as guides, this committee, the Faculty Advisory Committee appointed by President Moos in 1971, and the Vice President for Academic Administration have explored various means to achieve an integration of ROTC into the University program: (1) Team-teaching involving ROTC and an academic department with course cross-listing; (2) visiting lecturers in ROTC courses on a paid or overload basis; (3) courses taught entirely in an academic department for ROTC students; (4) conferences and symposia involving civilian and military students and faculty. Our experience with these models is summarized below.

The three ROTC departments participated in a two-year experimental team-taught course in leadership, SpComm 3-111. The course is being extensively evaluated and, although the results are not yet entirely clear, the course will continue at least one more year. Overall, the committee concluded that the advantage of having a 50-50 mix of ROTC and non-ROTC students as well as the exposure of both groups to the concept and application of leadership from a civilian and military viewpoint outweighed the problems which were largely administrative. The main problem centered about an Air Force policy which allows team-teaching of ROTC courses only if the AFROTC instructor is a 50% partner in planning, grading and contact teaching. This policy became untenable where differences of opinion regarding course content and grading existed. Another potential problem that was perceived with this type of program is the vulnerability of ROTC students to the influence of an instructor who may have strong anti-military feelings. The purpose of the ROTC program is to prepare prospective military officers for commissioning not to discourage uncommitted candidates.

Another model of integrated teaching is illustrated by the World Military History course sponsored by the Army ROTC in conjunction with the History Department. The course coordinator has been a faculty member of the Department of Military Science with paid guest lecturers from History. (The present coordinator holds an MA in History.) This program has been successful and is heavily subscribed by both ROTC (all services) students and non-ROTC students. It has been in effect for several years and it is anticipated that it will continue in substantially the same manner for the next academic year.

The cost of both of these programs is born by the University, since the ROTC Departments have no funds beyond the salaries of their own faculties for instruction. It seems to us that the second of these two programs has been the more successful, both because it has satisfied the ROTC requirements within the context of Regents' policy of integrating the ROTC courses into a more academic program and because of its lower cost. The present funding of these integrated courses is on a year-by-year basis and is not a part of any regular budget. Therefore, they cannot be considered a regular part of the program.

Not all courses required of ROTC students are taught by ROTC faculty. For example, NROTC students are required to take a course in national security affairs which has been offered in the past by the Political Science Department. However, that course was dropped recently because of a faculty shortage in Political Science, and the ROTC must now seek another way to satisfy its requirement. Therefore, in this case, this model has been less successful than the other two.

Members of the ROTC faculty have participated in conferences and symposia sponsored by University departments as in the recent World Affairs Center Symposium on UN Peacekeeping. Such programs have been successful because they are non-credit and informal and deal with specific subjects of current interest, and they provide another way of bringing together ROTC and regular academic faculty and students.

The committee discussed at several meetings the matter of credit for ROTC courses. It was pointed out by the service representatives that the University is obligated under contract to grant appropriate academic credit applicable toward graduation for these courses. However, it was found that the policy of granting credit varies within the University. It was the Committee's understanding that the College of Liberal Arts grants degree credit for ROTC courses but does not accept them for CLE credit. On the other hand, the Institute of Technology permits nine ROTC course credits to satisfy "free" elective requirements in the student's curriculum, and none are allowed toward satisfaction of the CLE requirements, except for those ROTC courses which have been certified as suitable for the Man and Society category of the CLE requirements by the appropriate academic department of the University. The result is that IT students in ROTC programs carry ROTC credits as an overload. Given these differences, several avenues were explored in an effort to determine if it would be possible to have a uniform policy for the University. Discussions about this problem were held with members of the Council on Liberal Education and administrators from the College of Liberal Arts and the Institute of Technology. One outcome has been a list of suggestions from the administration of the Institute of Technology which are currently under review by the committee.

The conditions which existed on campus at the time of the Regents' report on ROTC no longer exist or have greatly changed. There has also been only a minimum effort on the part of the faculty and administration to fully implement that policy. Therefore, unless the faculty shows more interest in participating in programs designed to implement the intent of that report, it is the recommendation of this committee that the ROTC policy be amended to reflect the present operation of the ROTC program. Furthermore, there are policy items that cannot be implemented without funding. Present policy cannot be implemented entirely by overload teaching and temporary funding. Therefore, along with fuller cooperation it is necessary to establish regular funding for programs that have proved successful.

**RICHARD E. Poppele**  
Chairman

### **XI. ANNUAL REPORT, 1975-76** **COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION** Reported for Information

The major effort of the 1975-76 Council was directed to a comprehensive self-study of the nature and effect of old recommendations promulgated by the Council since 1962. Through a survey questionnaire each member of the Council evaluated each recommendation, rating the degree to which it has been implemented, its present importance to the University, and the need for continued Council attention. Through this mechanism the Council has identified three clusters of issues centering on:

1. the University of Minnesota liberal education requirement;
2. the control of quality of the liberal education experiences provided for University undergraduates; and
3. University programs for the improvement of undergraduate education.

Three study groups, comprising members of the Council, have been formed and are working toward a refinement of past recommendations based upon current or anticipated exigencies. This effort will provide much of the agenda for next year's deliberations.

In addition, the Council provided counsel to the Bachelor of Elected Studies (BES) Advisory Committee regarding the liberal education component of BES degree programs.

The Council manages two specific programs for the University intended to contribute to the improvement of undergraduate education: the Horace T. Morse-Amoco Foundation Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education and the Small Grants Program.

Since 1965, the Council has awarded 66 certificates and cash awards to faculty members selected for their outstanding contributions to undergraduate education. The program has been supported from its inception by an annual grant to the University for this purpose from the Amoco Foundation; the 1975-76 grant was in the amount of \$5,000.

Nominations for the award are submitted by committees of the various colleges of the University offering undergraduate instruction. These nominations are reviewed by a committee of the Council, chaired in 1975-76 by R. Willis, and awards are made by the Council on the recommendation of the Committee. This year 25 nominations were received from twelve collegiate units. The individuals receiving the 1975-76 award and a \$500 honorarium are:

*Julie A. Carson*, Department of English (Twin Cities); nominated by the College of Liberal Arts.

*Hollie L. Collins*, Department of Biology; nominated by the University of Minnesota, Duluth.

*Patricia M. Fergus*, Department of English (Twin Cities); nominated by University College and the College of Liberal Arts.

*Joseph A. Gallian*, Department of Mathematics; nominated by the University of Minnesota, Duluth.

*Magnus Olson*, Department of Zoology (Twin Cities); nominated by the College of Biological Sciences.

*Michael Q. Patton*, Department of Sociology (Twin Cities); nominated by University College.

*Verá M. Schletzer*, Continuing Education and Extension (Twin Cities); nominated by Continuing Education and Extension.

*James B. Togeas*, Department of Chemistry; nominated by the University of Minnesota, Morris.

The Small Grants Program was established in 1967 by the Council to promote improvement in undergraduate education. Its purpose is accomplished through the award of grants to faculty-student groups. Proposals for educational development projects are received and reviewed by a faculty-student subcommittee, chaired for 1975-76 by D. Berry, which makes awards on behalf of the Council. For 1975-76, 124 proposals were received, requesting a total of \$252,237 in grant support. The Council was able to support 59 proposals with resources totaling \$85,571.

**JAMES H. WERTZ**  
Chairman

## XII. QUESTIONS TO ADMINISTRATORS

What is the present status of changes in tuition charges to a per-credit basis? Has the Senate Committee on Educational Policy been consulted in this matter and have effects of such pricing on curricula, in particular, on minimum credits for a degree and distribution requirements, been considered?

**WILLIAM E. RANZ**  
IT Senator

## XIII. OLD BUSINESS

## XIV. NEW BUSINESS

## XV. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

JEAN H. ALEXANDER  
1885-1976

OTTO E. DOMIAN  
1901-1976

HERSHELL R. GILES  
1910-1976

MARK KEITH  
1898-1976

ORVILLE M. KISER  
1889-1976

MAUDE L. LINDQUIST  
1906-1976

MARK THOMPSON  
1884-1976

HAROLD T. WIDDOWSON  
1897-1976

WILLIAM S. WILLIAMS  
1893-1976

## XVI. ADJOURNMENT

ITEM TO BE ADDED TO THE NOVEMBER 30, 1978, SENATE AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON SENATE COMMITTEES

SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

MOTION:

That the Senate approve the following revision to the Handbook of Rules and Operational Procedures:

U1.4.8 SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

(added portions are enclosed in parentheses, deleted portions crossed out)

Membership. The Senate Library Committee shall consist of no more than 12 members of the faculty, appropriately representative of the several campuses and instructional units, 8 representatives of the student body, and ~~ex-officio representation from the following administrative units,~~ (the following non-voting ex officio members:) Director, University Libraries, (Twin Cities Campus; Supervisor, Learning Resources, Crookston Campus; Director of Libraries, Duluth Campus; Head Librarian, Morris Campus; Supervisor, Learning Resources, Waseca Campus; Law Librarian; and representative,) Office of the Vice President, Academic Affairs.

Support and Service. The Office of the Vice President, Academic Affairs, shall supply support and service as needed and appropriate.

Duties and Responsibilities. The Committee shall: 1) consider and recommend to the Senate any resolutions in connection with University library policy and administration that may be deemed advisable; 2) serve as an advisory body to the ~~Director of University Libraries,~~ (directors and other heads of University libraries who are named as ex officio members of the Committee;) 3) evaluate University-wide library facilities, services, and collections, and advise thereon; 4) on the request of the Senate, inform it ~~as to~~ (on) any matters affecting library policy and administration. The Committee shall give particular emphasis to the coordination of (the) libraries ~~on the several campuses,~~ (,) and shall ~~investigate and make policies with respect to increasing the educational services of the total, University-wide library system. Proposals emanating from joint studies shall be brought to the University Senate.~~ (conduct investigations and recommend policies with respect to maintaining and to increasing the educational services of all University Libraries.)

Reporting to the University Senate. The Committee shall report to the Senate at least annually, its reports to be printed in the Minutes. (A copy of its reports shall be sent to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.)

DEON STUTHMAN  
Chairman

UNIVERSITY POLICY AGENDA 1978-79

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 1978-79 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. Development and Implementation of a Reallocation System for the 1979-80 Budget

The necessity to develop an effective and acceptable system for reallocating institutional resources has long been recognized by parties both internal and external to the University. Accordingly, since last summer, the President and the senior officers have been actively involved in drafting a reallocation proposal for discussion and review by various institutional constituencies. A number of faculty and student groups (primarily the University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review [UCBRBR] and the Senate Consultative Committee [SCC], as well as a faculty/student/administrative committee chaired by Associate Vice President Linck) have also had significant input in the development process. Additional opportunities for systemwide participation vis-a-vis the design and the criteria to be used in the 1978-79 reallocation have been provided through the Senate committee structure and through a series of public hearings. Opportunities for participation in the actual reallocation decisions will be afforded in the months ahead as well.

2. Development of a Continuing Reallocation System for Future Years

Efforts have also been undertaken to begin the development of a reallocation process that might be employed on a systematic and continuing basis in future years. A faculty/student/administrative committee, chaired by Vice President Brown, has been appointed to propose a reallocation system and criteria for the 1980-81 fiscal year and thereafter until a long-range institutional plan is in place. Again, participation by University Senate committees (SCC and UCBRR in particular) and the general University community will be afforded.

3. Development of a Long-Range Institutional Plan

The University Planning Council, chaired by Vice President Stein, is attempting to assess and improve our planning efforts. The Council's broad objective is to produce a long-range institutional plan that might serve to guide systemwide decisions in the years ahead. Specific objectives are being examined by four subcommittees in terms of 1) evaluation of institutional output and effectiveness of the planning process; 2) organization of the institution, including review of presidential areas; 3) examination of Biennial Request and budget processes; and 4) review of institutional mission, goals, objectives, priorities, and criteria for determining program status.

#### 4. Coordination of Academic and Facilities' Planning

The importance of linking academic and facilities' planning has become increasingly clear over the past several years. Accordingly, the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Physical Planning are seeking to improve the coordination between programmatic and building planning. Emphasis will be placed upon remodeling and renovation of existing facilities, upon mechanisms for determining priorities for capital improvement, and upon the development of effective space management procedures.

#### 5. Academic Affairs Planning

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs has undertaken efforts to increase the planning and coordination of systemwide services and activities relating to 1) the development of University media resources, particularly in terms of radio and video transmission and the audiovisual library service; 2) the improvement in University computer services; 3) the development of a systemwide delivery system for University of Mid-America materials; and 4) the automation of University library services.

#### 6. Completion of "Outreach" Report

The interim report of the Task Force on University Outreach activities has been under examination by various institutional constituencies since November, 1977. After final reactions to the interim report are received, the Task Force will complete its work, recommending specific proposals for further development of outreach programs and activities to meet the needs of the coming decades.

#### 7. Review of Teaching Evaluation Practices

Over the past year, some students have expressed an increasing desire to initiate a system of teaching evaluation that would afford them more useful consumer information in selecting courses and instructors. To determine whether such information can be provided, a number of major organizational, procedural, and legal questions must be examined. Undertaking this examination is the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP). Upon the completion of its review and report, the recommendations of SCEP will be shared with the University Senate and other institutional groups.

#### 8. Review of Faculty Retirement Programs

The Retirement Plan Task Force is working closely with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) to study the faculty retirement plan and its impact on both current and retired faculty members. Recommendations for changes in the present retirement programs are anticipated and will be shared with interested University parties before any changes are implemented.

#### 9. External Affairs Emphases

Discussions with state and legislative officials will emphasize 1) the needs of the University as outlined in the 1979-81 Biennial and Capital Requests, 2) the development of a strategy for state funding which is less dependent on student-faculty ratios, and 3) the importance of University research and service activities to the state and the nation.

#### 10. Reviews of Graduate School Programs

In addition to the general policy agenda that will be followed during the 1978-79 academic year, the University Senate has also requested a list of those

graduate school programs that will be reviewed during the current academic year.  
These are:

Twin Cities Campus

African Studies (limited scope)  
Ancient Studies  
Botany  
Classical Civilization (limited scope)  
Computer Science  
Criminal Justice Studies  
Ecology and Behavioral Biology  
Experimental Surgery  
Humanities  
Industrial Engineering  
Mechanical Engineering  
Operations Research  
Otolaryngology  
Radiology  
Slavic and East European Languages  
Surgery

UMD Campus

Art and Art Education  
Educational Administration  
Elementary and Secondary Education  
Music and Music Education  
Physics