

MBA
1/16/61

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS

MINUTES
BOARD OF REGENTS' MEETING
AND
REGENTS' COMMITTEE MEETINGS

July 9-10, 1987

Office of the Board of Regents
220 Morrill Hall

Year 1986-87

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Minutes of the Board of Regents' Meeting
and Regents' Committee Meetings

July 9-10, 1987

CONTENTS	PAGE
I. Committee Meetings	
A. Physical Planning & Operations Committee - July 9, 1987	1
B. Finance & Legislative Committee - July 9, 1987	4
C. Staff & Student Affairs Committee - July 9, 1987	6
D. Educational Planning & Policy Committee - July 9, 1987	8
E. Committee of the Whole - July 10, 1987	10
II. Board of Regents' Meeting - July 10, 1987	
A. Recognition of Royal Society of Arts Recipient	14
B. Recognition of UMC and UMW Judging Teams	14
C. Approval of Minutes	14
D. Report of the President	15
(1) Fire on University Property	
(2) NCAA Convention	
E. Report of the Chair	15
(1) Tour of Rosemount	
(2) Establishment of Roy Wilkins Chair	
(3) Passing of Regents' Professor Walter Heller	
(4) No August Meeting	
F. Gifts	16
G. Contracts & Grants/Applications & Awards	16
H. Report of the Committee of the Whole	
(1) KUOM Community Advisory Board Appointments	16
(2) Approval - 1987-88 Budget Plan	17
(3) Approval - Resolution on Commitment to Focus Plan & Enrollment Targets	17
(4) Approval - Resolution re Strategy for Focus	17
(5) Approval - 1987-88 Tuition Plan	18
I. Report of the Finance & Legislative Committee	
(1) Vice President's Monthly Report	19
(2) Approval - 1987-88 Hospital Budget	19
(3) Investment Manager Review (Pacific Investment Management Company)	19
(4) Update - Refinancing of Bonds	19

J.	Report of the Educational Planning & Policy Committee	
	(1) Approval - Amendments to the Human Subjects Policy	19
	(2) Approval - Name Change of Ph.D. Program in Hospital & Health Care Administration	42
	(3) Discontinuation of the Ed.D. Program in Industrial Education	
	(4) Annual Review - General College	42
K.	Report of the Faculty, Staff & Student Affairs Committee	
	(1) Approval - Monthly Report of the Vice President	42
	(2) Approval - Civil Service Class Change	43
	(3) Approval - 1987-88 Civil Service Pay Plan	43
	(4) Report - University Police Department	43
L.	Report of the Physical Planning & Operations Committee	
	(1) Approval - Vice Presidents' Monthly Report	43
	(2) Approval - Truck & Tractor Storage Building	43
	(3) Amendments to Delegation of Authority	43
	(4) Status of University Land Holdings	43
	(5) Guidelines for Reporting to Committee	43

Year 1987-88

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Physical Planning & Operations Committee

July 9, 1987

A meeting of the Physical Planning and Operations Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, July 9, 1987, at 1:30 p.m. in Room 300, Morrill Hall.

Regents present: Regent Roe, presiding; Regents Anderson, Craig, Grahek, Kuderer and Sahlstrom.

Staff present: President Keller; Vice Presidents Dunham, Lilly and Sauer; Secretary Muesing; Associate Vice Presidents Hewitt and Thomas; Treasurer Campbell.

Student Representative present: Judy Grew and Harvey Whitney.

VICE PRESIDENT'S MONTHLY REPORT

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Vice President's Monthly Report.

The committee also received a report on a fire which occurred June 13, 1987 on University property at 15th Avenue S.E. and Rollins Street which involved a variety of hazardous materials present in the storage area. Dr. Faye Thompson, Assistant Director of Environmental Health and Safety, presented background information and an update on the steps which have been taken for final clean-up of the site and disposal of the unburned chemicals and fire debris.

TRUCK AND TRACTOR STORAGE BUILDING
SOUTHERN EXPERIMENT STATION
WASECA, MINNESOTA

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of a resolution authorizing the design and construction of the Truck and Tractor Storage Building to be located at the Southern Experiment Station in Waseca, Minnesota. It was noted that funding for this project was approved in a 1987 Legislative Appropriation.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY AMENDMENT

The committee reviewed proposed amendments to the Delegation of Authority as recommended by the Vice President for Finance and Operations.

Carol Campbell, Controller, reported that the specific changes proposed would include (1) technical changes reflecting the current titles of officers previously delegated signature authority and (2) extension of authority to retain consultants other than architects and engineers to the Director of Purchasing and Materials Management for University services and to the Director and Senior Associate Directors of University Hospital and Clinic for Hospital and Clinic services. It was further reported that the first request does not alter any current or past practice and that the second request would reflect a change in practice which would expedite the purchase of services and insure that an adequate number of authorized signers are always available to transact University business.

Regent Kuderer requested that Vice President Dunham review the proposed changes before the item comes before the committee for action.

UNIVERSITY LAND HOLDINGS

The committee received a review of the current status of University land holdings. Items reviewed included the Land Sales Project, Land Inventory Computerization Project and a current update on the management of the Salt Springs Lands.

COMMITTEE AGENDA GUIDELINES

The committee engaged in a discussion regarding the reporting guidelines for presenting capital new construction, remodeling and maintenance or replacement projects at the Physical Planning and Operations Committee meetings.

It was noted that this item had been discussed at the April meeting of the committee and that concerns had been raised regarding the reporting of non-legislatively funded capital projects for building renovations and all capital maintenance or replacement projects with a scope of less than \$100,000. It was proposed at that time that these items not be presented to the Board of Regents.

Associate Vice President Hewitt stated that after reviewing this guideline he would like to propose that these projects not be presented to the Board on an

individual basis, but instead be listed in the Vice President's Monthly Report and that items of unusual interest be reported on an individual basis.

Regent Kuderer stated that he would like to have a definition of an "unusual item" included in the guidelines. Vice President Lilly stated that he would include that definition and bring the item back for action at the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Carol Campbell, Controller, reported on a recently completed legislative audit. She stated that the Legislative Auditor comes in on an intermittent basis and performs a complete review of the University's state monies. She stated that the University received a "clean bill of health" with only a few minor comments. Ms. Campbell reviewed the comments for the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.


BARBARA MUESING, Secretary

Year 1987-88

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Finance & Legislative Committee

July 9, 1987

A meeting of the Finance & Legislative Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, July 9, 1987, at 2:50 p.m. in Room 300, Morrill Hall.

Regents present: Regent Anderson, presiding; Regents Kuderer, Lebedoff, McGuiggan, Moore and Roe.

Staff present: Vice Presidents Lilly and Vanselow; Secretary Muesing; Treasurer Campbell.

Student Representatives present: Judy Grew and Steve Hughes.

VICE PRESIDENT'S MONTHLY REPORT

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Vice President for Finance Monthly Report.

1988 HOSPITAL BUDGET

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the 1987-88 Hospital and Clinic Operating Budget approved by the Hospital Board of Governors on April 22, 1987.

INVESTMENT MANAGER REVIEW
PACIFIC INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT COMPANY

The committee reviewed the investment performance, strategies and outlook of Pacific Investment Management Company for the University's fixed income assets in the Group Income Pool.

Mr. Dean Meiling from Pacific Investment Management Company presented the information to the committee.

NEW BUSINESS

Controller Campbell presented an update on the refinancing of bonds.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.


BARBARA MUESING, Secretary

Year 1987-88

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Faculty, Staff & Student Affairs Committee

July 9, 1987

A meeting of the Faculty, Staff and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, July 9, 1987, at 3:00 p.m. in the Regents' Room, 238 Morrill Hall.

Regents present: Regent Hilke, presiding; Regents Casey, Craig, Grahek, Sahlstrom and Schertler.

Staff present: President Keller; Vice Presidents Benjamin, Dunham and Wilderson; Secretary Muesing; Associate Vice Presidents Perlmutter, Robinett and Thomas; Interim Associate Vice President Lupton; Assistant Vice President Barbatsis; Chancellors Ianni, Imholte and Sargeant.

Student Representatives present: Troy Fuerst and Sheri Lombardi.

VICE PRESIDENT'S MONTHLY REPORT

Vice President Benjamin presented the Vice President's Monthly Report to the committee for approval.

Following a brief discussion, the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Vice President's Monthly Report.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASS CHANGE

Roger Forrester, Acting Director of the Personnel Department, presented the following Civil Service Class Change to the committee for approval:

1. Establishment of new Class No. 1519V, Compensation Manager, \$2031-3236 (A12M/Target Grade A17), effective June 16, 1987.

Following a brief discussion, the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Civil Service Class Change.

1987-88 CIVIL SERVICE PAY PLAN

Roger Forrester, Acting Director of the Personnel Department, and John Erickson, Compensation Manager, presented the 1987-88 Civil Service and Non-Academic Student Employee pay plans to the committee for approval. They also presented the list of Civil Service classifications scheduled to receive pay equity adjustments this fiscal year.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the 1987-88 Civil Service and Non-Academic Student Employee pay plans.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPARTMENT

Vice President Wilderson introduced Gary Wilson, Chief of the University Police Department, who took office in August of 1986.

Chief Wilson led a lengthy discussion on the activities of the Police Department since he took over the position of Police Chief. He stated that the Department has been reorganized and job descriptions, assignments and the process of performance evaluation are being revised. He stated that there are currently seven vacancies in the Police Department, and he noted that affirmative action guidelines are being followed in the hiring process.

Through the use of visual aids, Chief Wilson reviewed the Department's budget and statistics on Police Department personnel, campus crime trends and types of crimes.

Following a brief discussion, Regent Hilke thanked Chief Wilson for the informative presentation.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.


BARBARA MUESING, Secretary

Year 1987-88

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Educational Planning & Policy Committee

July 9, 1987

A meeting of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee of the Board of Regents was held on Thursday, July 9, 1987, at 1:30 p.m. in the Regents' Room, 238 Morrill Hall.

Regents present: Regent Casey, presiding; Regents Hilke, Lebedoff, McGuiggan, Moore and Schertler.

Staff present: President Keller; Vice Presidents Benjamin, Dunham, Sauer and Vanselow; Secretary Muesing; Associate Vice Presidents Murthy, Perlmutter and Robinett; Chancellors Frederick, Ianni, Imholte and Sargeant.

Student Representatives present: Cynthia Beard and Steve Hughes.

Regent Casey indicated that he is the new Chair of the committee, and he welcomed suggestions from the committee members and the Student Representatives as to how to improve the committee.

HUMAN SUBJECTS POLICY AMENDMENT

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposed revisions to the Regents' policy regarding the use of human subjects in research.

CHANGE IN NAME OF Ph.D. PROGRAM IN HOSPITAL
AND HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION TO HEALTH SERVICES
RESEARCH, POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal to change the name of the Ph.D. program in Hospital and Health Care Administration to Health Services Research, Policy and Administration.

DISCONTINUATION OF Ed.D. PROGRAM IN INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

Vice President Benjamin presented a proposal to discontinue the Ed.D. Program in Industrial Education.

Following a brief discussion, Regent Casey noted that this item will be presented for approval in September.

GENERAL COLLEGE - ANNUAL REVIEW

Keith McFarland and Marjorie Cowmeadow, Acting Dean and Assistant Dean, respectively, of General College, led a discussion on the General College planning activities in response to Strategy for Focus. Dean McFarland noted that he has appointed a Strategy for Focus Steering Committee, which is examining the mission statement and defining who the General College shall serve. He stated that the group recently met with the University Academic Planning Group.

Assistant Dean Cowmeadow presented an update on admissions applications for Fall, 1987. She stated that there is an increase in applications over previous years, and it appears there will be more applicants than available spaces. There are currently 629 students who have made a firm commitment to enter General College in the Fall, and the curricular and programmatic offerings have been planned to accommodate 1,000 new students. Dean McFarland stated that this situation will necessitate the development of standardized criteria for making admissions decisions, and he stated that the Steering Committee will be working to develop such criteria.

An extensive discussion ensued. Several Regents expressed concerns regarding admissions decisions being made without standard criteria being in place. Regent Casey asked Dean McFarland to present an update on this issue at the September meeting. Dean McFarland indicated that he will be out of town at that time, but a representative of General College will make a presentation.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.


BARBARA MUESING, Secretary

Year 1987-88

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

Committee of the Whole

July 10, 1987

A meeting of the Committee of the Whole of the Board of Regents was held on Friday, July 10, 1987, at 8:30 a.m. in the Regents' Room, 238 Morrill Hall.

Regents present: Regent Lebedoff, presiding; Regents Anderson, Casey, Craig, Grahek, Hilke, Kuderer, McGuiggan, Moore, Roe, Sahlstrom and Schertler.

Staff present: President Keller; Vice Presidents Benjamin, Dunham, Kegler, Lilly, Vanselow and Wilderson; Secretary Muesing; Associate Vice Presidents Murthy, Perlmutter and Robb; Assistant Vice Presidents Berg and Potami; Chancellors Frederick, Ianni, Imholte and Sargeant.

Student Representative present: Judy Grew.

RECOGNITION OF REGENT MCGUIGGAN

President Keller presented Regent McGuiggan with a gavel in recognition of his service as Chair of the Board of Regents.

KUOM COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD APPOINTMENTS

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the appointments to the KUOM Community Advisory Board.

1987-88 BUDGET PLAN

President Keller presented the 1987-88 Budget Plan to the committee for approval, noting that this item has been discussed at length at previous meetings.

The committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the 1987-88 Budget Plan.

1987-88 TUITION PLAN

President Keller presented the 1987-88 Tuition Plan to the committee for approval. He noted that the plan moves 10 percent toward cost-related tuition, with a 3 percent minimum and 8 percent maximum increase (an average increase of 5 percent).

Judy Grew, Chair of the Student Representatives and Student Body President, stated that the proposed tuition rates have the support of student leaders on the Twin Cities and Coordinate Campuses. Regent Schertler commended Ms. Grew for providing the Regents and the Administration with the student opinion on this important issue.

Regent Roe stated that he feels tuition is already too high, and he is opposed to any tuition increase at this time.

Following the discussion, the committee voted by a majority, with Regents Anderson and Roe voting against the motion, to recommend approval of the proposed tuition rates.

COMMITMENT TO FOCUS PLAN AND ENROLLMENT TARGETS

President Keller noted that the 1987 Legislature conditioned the release of rank adjustment funds on endorsement of the Commitment to Focus plan by the Board of Regents and the Legislature specified maximum enrollments. He presented the following resolution to the committee for approval:

WHEREAS, the 1987 Legislature conditioned release of rank adjustment funds on endorsement by the Board of Regents of the Commitment to Focus plan and its instruction to the President to proceed with the plan; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature specified maximum enrollments in each of the next three biennia for which legislative funding would be provided;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board reaffirms its endorsement of the general principles of Commitment to Focus and those specific plans previously endorsed, including preparation standards, specific unit reorganizations and redirections, and special task force reports;

FURTHER, the Board directs the President to continue to implement those general principles and specific plans previously endorsed by the Board; and

FINALLY, the Board accepts as enrollment targets for the University the enrollments corresponding to the maximum funding levels specified by the 1987 Legislature unless and until the Legislature alters those maxima. The Board directs the administration to develop and submit to the Board in each year reports on success in meeting targets and plans for achieving targets in each succeeding year. Such plans and reports should include information on the effectiveness of various counseling programs in helping students to make the proper choice of post-secondary institution.

Several Regents emphasized the importance of the land grant tradition, and expressed concerns regarding maintaining access to the University. President Keller agreed that access is important, and stated that the proposal to establish enrollment targets is the only responsible approach to access. He indicated that the University wants to be in a position to accept anyone who wants to attend and is prepared to benefit, but in order to do so the University needs additional resources from the Legislature.

Following the discussion, the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the resolution.

STRATEGY FOR FOCUS UPDATE

Vice President Benjamin commented briefly on the recommendations contained in the report of the Strategy for Focus Task Force. He noted that the discussion was scheduled in part due to the controversy which the report has generated, and invited comments from the Regents.

Regent Hilke presented the following resolution to the committee for consideration:

1. We recognize the Strategy for Focus Task Force for having done the job it was asked to do, and on having produced a major document of intelligence and courage.

2. We remind all friends of the University that the Task Force document is preliminary; its authors assume that significant changes will be made before and after it reaches the Board and this is surely true.

3. Out of respect both for the distinguished committee which authored the report and for the process of University governance, we

will not vote today on recommendations in that respect.

4. However, we share with the Administration the view that closing an entire collegiate unit is most unlikely to be either wise or acceptable. We wish, particularly, to convey our strong disposition against closing the College of Veterinary Medicine or the School of Dentistry. We also note our strong disposition against closing units, such as Vocational and Technical Education, that uniquely serve an important state need. We understand that these latter recommendations have been made largely on the basis of the need to correct the problem of serious underfunding of undergraduate arts and sciences. When final recommendations are brought forward to the Board, the Administration should indicate the extent to which reductions in undergraduate enrollment over the next several years will, in themselves, ameliorate that underfunding problem.

5. Finally, we endorse the policies outlined in the President's letter of July 6, 1987, for guiding the internal discussions of the Task Force report over these next months.

An extensive discussion ensued. Each Regent expressed concerns and opinions regarding various portions of the report, including its impact on the land grant mission of the University. Following the discussion, the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the resolution.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.


BARBARA MUESING, Secretary

Year 1987-88

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BOARD OF REGENTS

July 10, 1987

A meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota was held on Friday, July 10, 1987, at 10:45 a.m. in the Regents' Room, 238 Morrill Hall.

Regents present: Anderson, Casey, Craig, Grahek, Hilke, Kuderer, Lebedoff, McGuiggan, Moore, Roe, Sahlstrom and Schertler. President Keller presided.

Staff present: Vice Presidents Benjamin, Dunham, Lilly, Vanselow and Wilderson; Secretary Muesing; Treasurer Campbell; Chancellors Frederick, Ianni, Imholte and Sargeant.

RECOGNITION OF ROYAL SOCIETY OF ARTS
SILVER MEDAL RECIPIENT

Recognition was given to Kaye Ellen Andersh, a June graduate of the University of Minnesota, Morris, who was the 1987 recipient of the Royal Society of the Arts Silver Medal.

Chancellor Imholte presented the medal to Ms. Andersh.

RECOGNITION OF UMC AND UMW JUDGING TEAMS

Recognition was given to the University of Minnesota Technical College, Crookston Crops Team for their achievement in winning the 1987 National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture Invitational Judging Contest held April 2-4, 1987 at El Reno Community College, El Reno, Oklahoma.

Recognition was also given to the University of Minnesota Technical College, Waseca Horticulture Judging Team for their achievement in winning the Horticulture Judging Context at the above contest held in Oklahoma.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the following meetings:

Physical Planning & Operations Committee -
June 11, 1987
Finance & Legislative Committee - June 11, 1987
Staff & Student Affairs Committee - June 11, 1987
Educational Planning & Policy Committee -
June 11, 1987
Committee of the Whole - June 12, 1987
Board of Regents - June 12, 1987

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

President Keller reported on the recent fire which occurred at the former Cargill property at 15th Avenue S.E. and Rollins Street, which the University now owns and uses for storage. He stated that his reason for reporting on this issue was to bring to light something which had not been made clear from reports that were given by the press. He stated that the storage area contained a variety of chemical waste materials from area high schools. He elaborated that the University of Minnesota annually provides service to the Minnesota Department of Education to help high schools deal with the difficult problem of managing chemicals they no longer need. He stated that while the recent fire was terribly unfortunate, he did want to inform Board members that the temporary storage of these materials is in compliance with the Pollution Control Agency.

He further reported that he recently attended his first National Collegiate Athletic Association Convention and briefly summarized his views of the meetings.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Chair Lebedoff reported that on Thursday, July 9, members of the Board of Regents toured the Agricultural Experiment Station and Research Center at Rosemount. He stated that it was an extremely useful learning experience for the Board and that he was grateful for the hospitality extended to them.

He also reported that several members of the Board recently attended a ceremony to honor the establishment of the Roy Wilkins Chair.

In addition, he noted the passing of former Regents' Professor Walter Heller.

Chair Lebedoff further stated that unless issues arise requiring action by the Board of Regents, there would not be an August meeting of the Board.

GIFTS

Associate Vice President Steve Roszell presented the monthly list of gifts to the University of Minnesota, the University of Minnesota Foundation, the Arboretum Foundation and the Minnesota Medical Foundation.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the gifts. Documentation is filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,952.

CONTRACTS & GRANTS/APPLICATIONS & AWARDS

Vice President Benjamin submitted for approval the contracts & grants/applications & awards.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the contracts & grants/applications & awards. Documentation is filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,953.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Regent Lebedoff, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following actions:

- a) Approval of the following names for appointment to the KUOM Community Advisory Board:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Category</u>
For one-year terms, terminating May 1988:	
Charles R. Krusell	Business
Jan Smaby	Education
Louis Sundin	Labor
For two-year terms, terminating May 1989:	
Tom Bartikowski	Business
Bob DeHaven	Business
Paul Goldberg	Government
Robbin Johnson	Agriculture
Sylvia Payne	Minority & Ethnic
Charlotte D. Schwartz	Other
For three-year terms, terminating May 1990:	
Carol Flynn	Labor
Nancy Malmon	Organizations of and for Women
Dave Moore	Business
Raymond Stephens	Education

Shoue Vang
Laura Wittstock

Civic, Neighbor-
hood, Fraternal
Minority & Ethnic

- b) Approval of the 1987-88 Budget Plan. Documentation is filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,954.
- c) Approval of resolution re Commitment to Focus Plan and Enrollment Targets, as follows:

WHEREAS, the 1987 Legislature conditioned release of rank adjustment funds on endorsement by the Board of Regents of the Commitment to Focus plan and its instruction to the President to proceed with the plan; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature specified maximum enrollments in each of the next three biennia for which legislative funding would be provided;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board reaffirms its endorsement of the general principles of Commitment to Focus and those specific plans previously endorsed, including preparation standards, specific unit reorganizations and redirections, and special task force reports;

FURTHER, the Board directs the President to continue to implement those general principles and specific plans previously endorsed by the Board; and

FINALLY, the Board accepts as enrollment targets for the University, the enrollments corresponding to the maximum funding levels specified by the 1987 Legislature unless and until the Legislature alters those maxima. The Board directs the administration to develop and submit to the Board in each year reports on success in meeting targets and plans for achieving targets in each succeeding year. Such plans and reports should include information on the effectiveness of various counseling programs in helping students to make the proper choice of post-secondary institution.

- d) Approval of resolution re Strategy for Focus, as follows:

1. We recognize the Strategy for Focus Task Force for having done the job it was asked to do, and on having produced a major document of intelligence and courage.

2. We remind all friends of the University that the Task Force document is preliminary; its authors assume that significant changes will be made before and after it reaches the Board and this is surely true.

3. Out of respect both for the distinguished committee which authored the report and for the process of University governance, we will not vote today on recommendations in that report.

4. However, we share with the Administration the view that closing an entire collegiate unit is most unlikely to be either wise or acceptable. We wish, particularly, to convey our strong disposition against closing the College of Veterinary Medicine or the School of Dentistry. We also note our strong disposition against closing units, such as Vocational and Technical Education, that uniquely serve an important state need. We understand that these latter recommendations have been made largely on the basis of the need to correct the problem of serious underfunding of undergraduate arts and sciences. When final recommendations are brought forward to the Board, the Administration should indicate the extent to which reductions in undergraduate enrollment over the next several years will, in themselves, ameliorate that underfunding problem.

5. Finally, we endorse the policies outlined in the President's letter of July 6, 1987, for guiding the internal discussions of the Task Force report over these next months.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Committee of the Whole.

Chair Lebedoff reported that the committee also voted by a majority to recommend approval of the following action:

- a) Approval of the 1987-88 Tuition Plan. Documentation is filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,955.

The Board of Regents voted by a majority of 10 to 2 to approve the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole, with Regents Anderson and Roe voting against the resolution.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE & LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Regent Anderson, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following actions:

- a) Approval of the Vice President for Finance Report which includes Investments, Accounts Receivable, Property Accounting, and Miscellaneous - Finance & Investments. Documentation is filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,956.
- b) Approval of the 1987-88 Hospital and Clinic Operating Budget.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Finance & Legislative Committee.

Chair Anderson reported that the committee also received an investment manager review from the Pacific Investment Management Company and received an update on the refinancing of bonds.

REPORT OF THE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING & POLICY COMMITTEE

Regent Casey, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following actions:

- a) Approval of amendments to the Human Subjects Policy as follows:

THE BOARD OF REGENTS' POLICY ON PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH

- I. STATEMENT OF POLICY AND PRINCIPLES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA WITH REGARD TO THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
- II. COMMITTEE/ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE
 - A. Composition of the Committee
 1. Source of Membership
 2. Selection/Appointment
 3. Requirements for Membership of Each Committee
 - B. Executive Subcommittee on Policy
 - C. Administrative Assistant to the Committee

D. Duties and Responsibilities of the Committee

1. Administration of Policy
2. Formulation of Policy
3. Reporting to the Senate

III. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

A. SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES TO BE COVERED BY PROCEDURES

B. ACTIVITIES NOT COVERED BY PROCEDURES

C. CATEGORIES OF REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROCEDURES

1. Screened for Exempt Status
2. Summary Protocols
3. Expedited Review
4. Full Review by Committee

D. APPEALS OF COMMITTEE DECISIONS

E. COMPLAINTS AGAINST INVESTIGATORS

PART I

STATEMENT OF POLICY AND PRINCIPLES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA WITH REGARD TO THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

- A. The original statement of policy was adopted in November 1966. Amendments and revisions were approved November 1972; June 1973; July 1974; April 1976; September 1978; and February 1983.

The University of Minnesota reaffirms its established policy with regard to the use of human subjects in scientific research:

1. To safeguard and fully respect the rights and welfare of the individuals involved as human subjects in such research
2. To accomplish this with as little obstruction as possible to the furtherance of scientific progress through continuing investigation of human beings in their environment

3. To assume an institutional responsibility for the implementation of these two objectives

In performance of this institutional responsibility, the University of Minnesota will:

1. Provide for review, prior to initiation, of all research involving human subjects irrespective of funding, carried on in the University or under its auspices, by University Committees on the Use of Human Subjects in Research, all of whose members are independent of the investigator and who have no vested interest in the specific project of research. This review will involve determination of:
 - a. the rights and welfare of the individuals involved as human subjects of research
 - b. the appropriateness of the methods used to secure adequately informed consent for research involving human subjects
 - c. the risks of the research, excluding the effects of applying knowledge gained in the research
 - d. the potential benefits of the research
2. Exercise continuing surveillance of research which involves human subjects, including review of and prior approval of changes in procedures which may affect the previous approval of the research
3. Provide guidance and advice for the investigators on safeguarding the rights and welfare of the human beings involved in such research
4. Assure that provision is made for professional care and proper facilities for the safety and welfare of human beings involved in such research
5. Keep written records of all reviews of and decisions on research projects which involve human subjects and keep sample copies of consent forms provided to these

subjects where required by regulation or policy.

B. Principles Governing the Use of Human Subjects in Research

Subjects of research are expected to have given informed consent to their participation in any research project. All exceptions to the requirement of informed consent for projects or procedures must be approved by an appropriate review committee.

It is expected that investigators will design research procedures in such a way that they satisfy the following principles:

PRINCIPLE 1.

Research procedures shall not involve the exposure of subjects to a physical, psychological or social risk that is appreciably greater than the subjects would normally encounter in the conduct of their affairs, or encounter in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests, unless it is clearly demonstrated that the procedure has been designed to minimize the risk and that the benefits of the research justify the risk.

PRINCIPLE 2.

Investigators and their research staff will treat information pertaining to subjects as confidential. Subjects must be informed of exceptions to confidentiality. For example, in research involving experimental drugs or devices, subjects must be informed that the FDA and sponsoring companies have a right to access of data, including identities.

PART II

COMMITTEE/ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Review of research projects involving the use of human subjects is performed by three committees; two of these committees review research in health and biological sciences and the third reviews research in social and behavioral sciences.

A. Composition of the Committees

1. Source of Membership

The membership of the Committees on the Use of Human Subjects in Research will be drawn from members of the University community (faculty/academic professional, staff and students) and from the community at large (one member for each committee).

a. Faculty/academic professional, staff and student members (undergraduate, graduate or professional) will be selected from the following four categories and assigned to appropriate committees:

- (1) health and biological sciences
- (2) social and behavioral sciences
- (3) Hospital administration (2)
- (4) other units of the University not included in (1), (2), or (3).

b. Members will be chosen from the community at large (3).

2. Selection/Appointment of Members

a. University Community

The members of the Committees from the biological and health sciences and from the social and behavioral sciences will be drawn from units in which a primary focus of professional activity is the conduct of research with human subjects in those areas, as well as from units having persons qualified to help clarify ethical, moral, and legal issues and to discuss the relevance of research to the common good.

b. Community at Large

The members from the community-at-large shall be appointed by the President upon submission of nominees by the Administrative Assistant and the Committee chairs.

- c. All members shall be appointed by the President.
- d. Members will be assigned to specific Committees by the Administrative Assistant.

(1) Terms

The terms of membership of the Committees shall be in accordance with the rules and operational procedures of the University Senate, U1.302.3 (three-year renewable terms for faculty/academic professional and staff; one-year renewable terms for student and community representatives).

(2) Chairs

The chairs of the Committees shall be elected by a majority of the appointed members of each Committee by mail ballot.

3. Required Membership for Each Committee

- a. Each Committee will have no fewer than twelve members, at least nine of whom will be faculty/academic professional or staff and at least two of whom will be students.
- b. Each Committee will have at least one community representative who is not otherwise affiliated with the University and who is not part of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the University.
- c. Each Committee will include members from health and biological sciences, social and behavioral sciences, and other units of the University in proportion as the needs of the Committee dictate.
- d. No Committee shall consist entirely of men or entirely of women, or entirely of members of one profession.

- e. Each Committee shall include at least one member whose primary concerns are in non-scientific areas.
- f. Each health sciences committee will include one Hospital administrator.

B. Duties and Responsibilities of the Committees

1. Administration of Policy

- a. The Committees on the Use of Human Subjects in Research shall review, prior to initiation of research by the investigator, proposed research involving human subjects. They shall also maintain continuing surveillance and provide advice with respect to approved projects of research involving human subjects, to assure the fullest protection of the rights and welfare of such subjects.
- b. The Committees shall review and approve or disapprove investigator-initiated applications within one month of submission. Approval or disapproval requires a quorum, which consists of a majority of members of a Committee present at a meeting, a majority of whom are faculty. Committee recommendations shall be by majority vote with the opportunity for an expression of a formal minority opinion.

2. Formulation of Policy

The Committees may initiate and recommend statements of policy and procedures necessary to implement this policy statement and the institutional responsibility of the University with regard to the use of human subjects in research. Such general statements of policy and procedure must be approved by all Committees before they are operative, and must be enforced consistently by all Committees. Approved policies and procedures will be binding on the Committees, members of the faculty and staff of the University, and other individuals engaged in research involving the use of human subjects carried on under the auspices of the University.

3. Reporting to the Senate

The Committees shall report to the University Senate through the Senate Consultative Committee in accordance with the rules and organizational procedures of the Senate, U1.302.5.

C. Executive Subcommittee on Policy

There shall be one executive subcommittee on policy which, in addition to the reviewing Committees, will formulate and recommend policies. Members of this subcommittee will be the chairs of the Committees, a student representative, and a community representative. Other Committee members may be invited to participate as the subject matter to be discussed dictates. The subcommittee chair will be elected by a majority of the subcommittee members. New policies or changes in policy approved by the subcommittee shall be made known to all members of the Committees by way of minutes of the subcommittee meeting. Any Committee member may petition the subcommittee for review of any policy statement formulated and approved by the subcommittee and may request that the issue be brought to the attention of the Committees for their action. A majority of the members of the three Committees will be required to veto any subcommittee action.

D. Administrative Assistant to the Committee

1. An Administrative Assistant to the Committees, with staff, will handle the administrative work of the Committees. To accomplish this, the Administrative Assistant will:
 - a. Assign proposals to the respective Committees for review; schedule meetings; prepare their agenda; assign proposed research to one of the four review categories (see section III.C);
 - b. Attend meetings and take notes of discussions and actions of the Committees;
 - c. Report to investigators the results of reviews of their research projects; and

- d. Maintain records for the Committees and policy subcommittee. These include formal requests for approval of research projects, minutes of all Committee and subcommittee meetings, formal decisions of the Committees together with copies of all letters of approval/nonapproval sent to the investigators, and any periodic reports by investigators to the Committees, as may be required by the procedures of the Committees.

In addition, the Administrative Assistant will:

- e. Provide the Committees and the University community with interpretation of all current policies and regulations (internal and external) regarding the use of human subjects in research;
 - f. Assure that all relevant proposals satisfy current agency and University regulations concerning human subjects and bring any reported problems or irregularities to the attention of an appropriate Committee;
 - g. Be responsible for all certifications and notices of approval of research project to funding agencies on behalf of the University;
 - h. Inform the Committee members of changes in the Department of Health and Human Services defined categories of exempt or expedited research procedures as published in the Federal Register; and
 - i. Determine whether screened for exempt status notifications describe research which is covered by a category exempted from review.
2. The Administrative Assistant has an annual appointment in the Graduate School, subject to renewal for successive terms.

PART III
PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW
AND
THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

A. Scope of Activities to be Covered by Procedures

1. Research Activities Considered to Involve Human Subjects

The phrases "research involving human subjects" and "procedures involving human subjects" as used in this statement of policy are not limited to, although they cover, the deliberate experimentation with human beings. They include, as well, the performance of any procedures which are designed and performed primarily for reasons other than the benefit of the human subjects involved. In this case the primary purpose of the research would be the collection of data for subsequent correlation or evaluation indirectly related to the treatment, care or benefit of human subjects. Procedures which fall within the scope of "research involving human subjects" include not only physical, chemical, electrical or psychological stimulation of responses within the human body, but also interviews, observation of behavior, administration of tests or other techniques of measurement or evaluation of individual human beings.

"Human subjects" include a living human conceptus. There shall be no "use of a living human conceptus for any type of scientific, laboratory research of other experimentation except to protect the life or health of the conceptus" and except in a situation where the proposed research or experimentation has been shown by "verifiable scientific evidence, to be harmless to the conceptus." "Living" as used in this paragraph means the "presence of life, such as movement, heart or respiratory activity, the presence of life, such as movement, heart or respiratory activity, the presence of electroencephalographic or electrocardiographic activity."

(Minn. Stat. 145.421, Subd. 3 and Minn. Stat 145.422, Subd. 1 and 2)

2. Additional procedures covered are the collection of data from:

- a. the physical examination of individual human beings and their bodily products;
- b. the observation of activities performed by individual human beings or groups of human beings;
- c. the observation of physical or psychological reaction of individual human beings or groups of human beings to stimuli, whether the stimuli are controlled by the investigator or are present in a normal non-manipulated environment.

3. Research involving human subjects is "carried on in the University of Minnesota or under its auspices" when:

- a. the procedures are performed on the premises of the University, or
- b. the procedures are performed with or involve the use of facilities or equipment belonging to the University, or
- c. the research is financed by the University or by funds administered by the University, or
- d. the research project satisfies a requirement imposed by the University as a condition for the award of a degree or for completion of a course of study in the University, or
- e. the research project satisfies an obligation of employment by the University.

B. Activities Not Covered by Procedures

1. Beneficial Services

"Research involving human subjects" and "procedures involving human subjects" as

used in the Statement of Policy do not include activities or procedures in which human beings are involved solely for their own direct benefit or that of other individual human beings. These procedures include:

- a. the teaching or training of individuals;
- b. the examination, investigation or evaluation of individuals for diagnostic purposes for their own benefit or the immediate benefit of others (as in mass screening for disease, or physical examination of staff and students of the University or other similar institutions);
- c. standard, accepted medical treatment of patients;
- d. interviewing or investigating individuals related to the performance of professional services (as in the practice of law, psychotherapy, counseling, social work or teaching).

2. Clinical Training

"Research involving human subjects" and "procedures involving human subjects" as used in the Statement of Policy do not include clinical training within the University or under its auspices. Such clinical training covers those procedures used primarily to teach students the elements of clinical practice.

On the other hand, training for conduct of research involving human subjects is within the meaning and scope of this policy when human beings are used as subjects for the research itself, and individual research projects carried out by such trainees are subject to review by the Committee.

3. Use of Archival Data

Research which involves the use of archival data in the form of public records or historical documents is not subject to review by the Committees, even though the original storage of the data

was not for research purposes. This exemption, however, does not include archival data collected by public agencies or institutions where there is limited access to the information; use of these kinds of data is covered by the screened-for-exempt status procedures.

4. Evaluation of Curricula, Departments, Classes, Courses or Training Programs Educational or administrative research which has as its sole purpose the evaluation of a curriculum, a department, a class, a course, or a training program is not subject to review by the Committees. In these cases, only information directly related to the curriculum, department, etc., may be used.

C. Categories of Review and Procedures for Implementation of Review

Under this Policy, all research involving human subjects is classified into four categories as listed in major headings 1-4 below and is given different forms of review based upon the category to which it is assigned.

1. Screened for Exempt Status

- a. Procedures established by the Department of Health and Human Services (January, 1981) and approved by the Regents (February, 1983) as those for which the risks to participants are equivalent to those encountered in daily life and for which prior review and written informed consent are not generally required. Written informed consent must be obtained, however, prior to the participation by patients in hospitals and residents of health care facilities in experimental research, according to Minnesota Statutes 1984 (144.751 Subdivision 13). This statute applies, of course, to all research involving these patients and residents no matter what the form of review.
- b. The screened for exempt status list may be modified at any time by

federal regulations. When such changes are made, the Administrative Assistant will inform the Committees, which will in turn make recommendations to the Regents concerning their adoption. (The first such list is presented in Appendix A.)

- c. Projects screened for exempt status may be initiated only after investigators inform the administrative staff of the Committee of their intent to engage in research of this kind and receive written confirmation that the procedure does not require prior review. Investigators notify the Committees' staff on a one-page form which asks only for information needed to determine that the procedure does, indeed, fall within an exempt category.

2. Summary Protocols

- a. Summary protocols are those research protocols established by an investigator or a department or school within the University which involve no or minimal risk to subjects and which describe standard research designs including methods, procedures, and/or techniques specific to a department or research program. The principal investigator must submit a full description of the proposed research design including:
 - (1) a specific description of the procedures as they affect subjects, including descriptions of what are considered allowable variations;
 - (2) a specification of precautions necessary to safeguard the welfare of subjects;
 - (3) the subject populations to which the procedures can be applied without risks to the rights and welfare of the subjects;
 - (4) a specification of forms of consent required, if any;

- (5) a specification of methods to be used to assure confidentiality where that is appropriate; and
 - (6) variations in the procedures not approved because of the likelihood of risks to the rights and welfare of subjects.
- b. The initial protocol must be submitted to an appropriate Committee for full review. Once the protocol has been reviewed and approved, individual projects covered by the protocol may be reviewed and approved through an expedited review procedure. Research may not be initiated prior to receipt of written approval from the Committees. This should be sent within two weeks of receipt of the application. Forms are available in the offices of those departments which have summary protocols on file in the Committee office.
 - c. Summary protocols are reviewed and renewed annually.
 - d. The Administrative Assistant maintains a Summary Protocol Handbook listing all approved summary protocols.

3. Expedited Review

- a. Procedures for expedited review have been established by the Department of Health and Human Services (January, 1981) and approved by the Regents (February, 1983) for certain kinds of research involving no more than minimal risk, and for minor changes in approved research. (See Appendix B for list of expedited review categories.)
- b. The list of categories which qualify for expedited review may be amended, as appropriate, through periodic publication in the Federal Register. The Administrative Assistant will keep Committee members informed of changes in this list.

- c. The review of research qualifying for expedited procedures may be carried out by a Committee chair or by one or more experienced reviewers, who may approve the project as submitted or approve it with stipulations, but may not disapprove it. If the reviewer is unwilling to approve the project, it must be forwarded to a Committee for full review.
- d. A list of research protocols which have been approved through this procedure will appear in the appropriate minutes of meetings of the Committees.

4. Full Committee Review

- a. Projects which do not fall within any of the three previous categories must be submitted to one of the Committees, as appropriate, for review. Written approval from the Committee is required before research can be initiated.
- b. Projects will be evaluated with regard to the rights and welfare of subjects at risk in the research. If a Committee believes that the risks to the subjects are within the scope of principles 1 and 2, or that the benefits to be realized from the research outweigh the risks to subjects; that all reasonable precautions have been taken to minimize such risks; and that the consent process conforms to Federal and Committee regulations, they will approve the proposal.
- c. To obtain Committee review of research, investigators will obtain the appropriate application form from the Committee office. After filling this out, they will forward it, plus consent form(s) and any appropriate documents, to the Administrative Assistant. Information to be included should indicate:
 - (1) the hypothesis or research question of the study

- (2) the subject population to be involved and that selection of the subjects is equitable, taking into account the purposes of the research and the setting in which the research will be conducted;
 - (3) the procedures which subjects will undergo;
 - (4) the risks involved to such human subjects;
 - (5) the precautions which are to be taken to avoid risk to the human subject, including the methods to be used in securing an adequately informed consent by the human subjects or their legal representatives, and the measures used to protect the confidentiality of the data;
 - (6) the provisions which are made for professional attention or facilities to provide for the welfare of subjects during and following the research procedures.
- d. When the application has been received, the Administrative Assistant will place the project on the next meeting agenda of an appropriate Committee, which will be within a month of receipt of the application.
 - e. Following review of the projected research, the Committee will determine whether to approve the research project with or without modification, or to disapprove it. The determination of the Committee shall be by majority vote with opportunity for a formal recording of minority views if so requested by those holding such views. Any two Committee members may invoke an appeal procedure (see Section D).
 - f. The formal action of the Committee and any expression of minority views will be reported by the Administrative Assistant to the investigator.

The Administrative Assistant will keep on file all decisions, which will be open to all Committee members.

- g. All approved research projects are subject to annual review. Projects involving high risk may be reviewed more often if the Committees so determine.

D. Appeals of Committee Decisions

1. Any two members of a Committee may request review of a decision within one week of a Committee's action.
2. Any applicant may appeal an adverse decision of a review Committee.
3. The appealing party may request reconsideration by the original Committee or by an ad hoc committee appointed by the chairs of the three Committees. An ad hoc committee appointed to hear such an appeal may include a member of the original review committee. The investigator in person may present to the subcommittee information he/she believes relevant, as may members of the original review Committee. Review of a decision of a Committee so appealed must be completed within one month of receipt of such request by the Administrative Assistant.
4. Notice of action by the subcommittee will be sent by the Administrative Assistant to the investigator and to each member of the original and ad hoc Committees.
5. Actions taken by the Committees on the Use of Human Subjects in Research, whether or not on an initial consideration of an application, will be considered as final, with the following exceptions:
 - a. If the principal investigator is a member of faculty or staff of the University, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs may review the submission and disapproval of a proposed research project to determine whether there has been any infringement of academic freedom. If the Committee

on Faculty Affairs finds that the circumstances involved in the action of the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research does involve such an infringement, it may direct the Committee to re-examine the proposal and reconsider its action. Upon re-examination and reconsideration of its action, the decision of the Committee is final.

- b. If the principal investigator is a student of the University, the Twin Cities Assembly Committee on Student Affairs (or the comparable Committee on Student Affairs of such other campus at which the student is in residence) may review the submission and disapproval of a proposed research project to determine whether there has been an infringement of academic freedom, and it may direct the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research to re-examine the proposal and reconsider its action. Upon re-examination and reconsideration of its action, the decision of the Committee is final.

E. Complaints against Investigators

1. Anyone may make a complaint to the Committees on the Use of Human Subjects in Research that an investigator has failed to submit a protocol to the Committees for review prior to the initiation of a research study, or that an investigator has failed to comply with the prescribed standards for the use of human subjects in a research protocol approved by the Committee.
2. All complaints related to the conduct of research with human subjects shall be directed to the Administrative Assistant to the Committees. The Administrative Assistant shall review the complaint with the relevant chair of a Committee who may request that the investigator against whom the complaint has been made discontinue the research project involved until the complaint has been settled. The complaint will then be brought to the attention of the appropriate Committee. The Committee will consider each com-

plaint so submitted, and if the members decide, by majority vote, that the complaint merits investigation, then the complaint will receive a full investigation. If the investigator has not already been informed of the complaint (see above), he will be informed at this time that a complaint has been filed and is under investigation by the Committee.

3. For each investigation, an ad hoc subcommittee of not fewer than five members, the majority of whom shall be faculty members, shall be appointed by the chairs of the Committees. The ad hoc investigating committee should have access to the resources necessary to conduct a complete investigation, be composed of a majority of individuals with the technical competence to understand relevant scientific issues, and should be able to draw upon the competence of non-Committee members in conducting its investigation.
4. The Committee's report of the investigation shall be forwarded to the President of the University for final disposition.

APPENDIX A

SCREENED FOR EXEMPT STATUS PROCEDURES

These seven categories are based, almost verbatim, upon the five provided in the DHHS guidelines (45 CFR Part 46.101(b)) and one provided in amendment (b)(c) effective April 4, 1983. The seventh category, included with category #3 by DHHS, relates to research on elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.

This review procedure shall include all projects which involve only the following research procedures, singly or in combination:

1. Conducted in Educational Settings

Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as:

- a) Research on regular and special educational instructional strategies, or

- b) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

Does not include questionnaires, etc., distributed in an educational setting which do not relate to a) or b) above.

2. Educational Tests

Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement) if information taken from these sources is recorded in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

3. Survey/Interview Procedures

Research involving survey or interview procedures with legally competent non-institutionalized adults, except where all of the following exists:

- a) Responses are recorded in such a manner that the human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects,
- b) the subject's responses, if they became known outside the research, could reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject's financial standing or employability, and
- c) the research deals with sensitive aspects of the subject's own behavior, such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, or the use of alcohol.

For research involving subjects in hospitals and nursing homes, written informed consent is required by MN Statute 1982, Section 144.651.

4. Observation

Research involving the observation (including observation by participants) of public behavior of legally competent non-institutionalized adults. This research may include

the observation of minors in cases where the investigator is not a participant in the activity being observed. Where all of the following conditions exist, this research cannot be considered in this category.

- a) Observations are recorded in such a manner that the human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects,
- b) the observations recorded about the individual, if they become known outside the research, could reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject's financial standing or employability, and
- c) the research deals with sensitive aspects of the subject's own behavior, such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, or use of alcohol.

5. Secondary Use of Data

Research involving the collecting or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or indirectly, through identifiers linked to the subjects.

6. Research and Demonstration Projects

Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of the Department of Health & Human Services, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine:

- a) Programs under the Social Security Act, or other public benefit or service program,
- b) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs,
- c) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures, or
- d) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

7. Survey/Interviews of Public Figures

All research involving survey or interview procedures is exempt, without exception, when the respondents are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.

APPENDIX B

EXPEDITED REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. Collection of hair and nail clippings, in a non-disfiguring manner, deciduous teeth, and permanent teeth if patient care indicates a need for extraction.
2. Collection of excreta and external secretions including sweat, uncannulated saliva, placenta removed at delivery, and amniotic fluid at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor.
3. Recording of data from subjects 18 years of age or older using non-invasive procedures routinely employed in clinical practice. This includes the use of physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of matter or significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject's privacy. It also includes such procedures as weighing, testing sensory acuity, electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, diagnostic echography, and electroretinography. It does not include exposure to electromagnetic radiation outside the visible range (for example, X-rays, microwaves).
4. Collection of blood samples by venipuncture, in amounts not exceeding 450 milliliters in an 8-week period and no more often than two times per week, from subjects 18 years of age or older and who are not pregnant.
5. Collection of both supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus provided the procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques.

6. Voice recording made for research purposes such as investigations of speech defects.
 7. Moderate exercise by healthy volunteers.
 8. The study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens.
 9. Research on individual or group behavior or characteristics of individuals such as studies of perception, cognition, game theory or test development, where the investigator does not manipulate subjects' behavior and the research will not involve stress to subjects.
 10. Research on drugs or devices for which an investigational new drug exemption or an investigational device exemption is not required.
- b) Approval of resolution re Name Change of Ph.D. Program in Hospital and Health Care Administration, as follows:

RESOLVED, that the name change of the Ph.D. Program in Hospital and Health Care Administration to Health Services Research, Policy and Administration, as presented at the June, 1987 meeting of the Board of Regents, be approved.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Educational Planning and Policy Committee.

Chair Casey reported that the committee also reviewed a proposal for the discontinuation of the Ed.D. Program in Industrial Education and received an annual review for General College.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY, STAFF & STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Regent Hilke, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following actions:

- a) Approval of resolution re Vice President's Monthly Report, as follows:

RESOLVED, that on the recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the personnel actions affecting Academic and Professional and Administrative faculty and staff mem-

bers as listed in the Vice President's Monthly Report are hereby approved.

Documentation is filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,957.

- b) Approval of the Civil Service Class Change as reported to the committee and filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,958.
- c) Approval of the 1987-88 Civil Service Pay Plan. Documentation is filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,959.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Faculty, Staff & Student Affairs Committee.

Chair Hilke reported that the committee also received a report from the University Police Department.

REPORT OF THE PHYSICAL PLANNING & OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Regent Roe, Chair of the committee, reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the following actions:

- a) Approval of the Monthly Report of the Vice President for Finance which included Purchasing, Project Status Report, and Miscellaneous - Physical Planning & Operations. Documentation is filed supplement to the minutes, No. 21,960.
- b) Approval of resolution re Truck and Tractor Storage Building, as follows:

RESOLVED, that on the recommendation of the President and the Vice President for Finance and Operations, the appropriate Administrative Officers are authorized to proceed with the design and construction of the Truck and Tractor Storage Building to be located at the Southern Experiment Station, Waseca, Minnesota.

The Board of Regents voted unanimously to approve the recommendations of the Physical Planning & Operations Committee.

Chair Roe reported that the committee reviewed proposed amendments to the Delegation of Authority; reviewed the current status of University land holdings; and engaged in a discussion regarding the reporting guidelines for presenting capital new construction, remodeling and maintenance or replacement projects to the committee. In

addition, he reported that the committee received information on a recent University legislative audit and that information was provided to the committee regarding a recent fire on University property.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.


BARBARA MUESING, Secretary