

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, May 16, 1985

3:30 p.m.

25 Law Center—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
502 Darland Adm. Bldg.—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
Learning Resources Center Conference Room—Waseca Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 212, including the President, 150 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), and 61 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (107) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 142 affirmative votes at one meeting or 107 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 107 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting.

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

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

ATTENDANCE RECORD

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

RULES

Rules will be available at the door.

I. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1985-86

Action (3 minutes)

EDUCATIONAL POLICY Faculty: William Hanson (chr.), W. Andrew Collins, Van Gooch (UMM), Lawrence Goodman, Ian Maitland, Marvin Mattson (UMC), Elaine May, Michael Root, David R. Thompson, Mary Young. Ex Officio: John Wallace. Students: 5 to be named.

PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE ALLOCATION Faculty: Henricus Hogenkamp (chr.), Dwight Brown, Robert Dixon, Richard L. Jones, Tap Payne (UMM), Thomas Scott, Robert Sloan. Ex Officio: Clint Hewitt, Rick Heydinger, Cherie Perlmutter. Students: 3 to be named.

EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS Faculty: June Tapp (chr.), Guy Baldwin, Howard Bissonette, John Brandl, Richard Cardozo, Scott Giebink, John Leppi (UMD), Thomas McRoberts (UMM), Peter Robinson, Gordon Stobb. Ex Officio: Patrick Borich, Harold Miller, John Wallace. Alumni: 1 to be named. Students: 5 to be named.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION Faculty: Dario Menanteau (chr.), Robinson Abbott (UMM), John Cogan, Robert Kvakiv, Benjamin Liu, Donald Marion, Byron Marshall, Marilyn Rossmann. Ex Officio: Josef Mestenhauser, Carol Pazandak. Students: 4 to be named.

LIBRARY Faculty: Brian Job (chr.), Ayers Bagley, Changhee Chae (UMM), John Chipman, Vernon Eidman, Evelyn Firchow, Donald Gillmor, Leon Green, Louise Hawley (UMD), William Madden, Robert McCollister, Carl Osborne. Ex Officio: Russell DuBois (UMM), Rick Heydinger, Harold Opgrand (UMC), Donald Pearce (UMD), Kathleen Price, Eldred Smith, Nan Wilhelmson (UMW). Students: 4 to be named.

RESEARCH Faculty: Paul Gassman (chr.), Ira Adelman, Paul Anderson (UMD), Ronald Anderson, David Hamilton, Ed Ney, Ellen Ordway (UMM), Bruce Overmier. Ex Officio: Signe Betsinger, Robert Holt, Stan Kegler, V. Rama Murthy, Anton Potami, Kenneth Reid, Neal Vanselow. Students: 3 to be named.

SUMMER SESSIONS Faculty: Ruth Jones (chr.), Edward Cushing, Arnold Henjum (UMM), Judith Lambrecht, John Malmberg, Byron Marshall, Chester Miracle. Ex Officio: Steven Schomberg, John Wallace. Students: 5 to be named.

BUSINESS AND RULES Faculty: Caroline Czarnecki (chr.), John Fossum, Marilyn Grantham, Joel Nelson. Ex Officio: Marilee Ward, 1 to be named. Students: 2 to be named.

FINANCE Faculty at-large: John Adams, 1 to be named. Students-at-large: 2 to be named.

PLANNING Faculty: W. Donald Spring (UMM) (chr.), James Hearn, Walter Johnson, Lansine Kaba, Patricia Swan, 1 to be named. Ex Officio: David J. Berg. Students: 2 to be named.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY APPEALS Faculty: David Weissbrodt (chr.), E. C. Alexander, Jooinn Lee (UMM), H. E. Mason, Philip Regal, Karen Richards, Harvey Sarles. Civil Service: Vivan Jenkins-Nelsen, Marilyn Nowicki. Students: 4 to be named.

INFORMATION:

COMMITTEES Faculty: Marion Brooks-Wallace, Shirley Clark, James Gremmels (UMM), Ruth-Ellen Joeres, Charlotte MacLeod (UMD), Paul Quie, Roger Stuewer, C. Arthur Williams. Students: 7 to be named.

CONSULTATIVE Faculty: Ellen Berscheid, Richard Goldstein, David Hamilton, Joseph Latterell (UMM), Cleon Melsa (UMC), Jack Merwin, Paul Murphy, Irwin Rubenstein, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman. Students: Steve Florman, Dan Griffith, Linda Hanson, Tim Pratt, Roy St. Laurent, 4 to be named.

ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS Faculty: Wayland Noland (chr.), Wilbert Ahern (UMM), Robert Beck, Frank Irving, Archibald Leyasmeyer, Jonathan Wirtschafter. Ex Officio: James Day, Stan Kegler, V. Rama Murthy, Stephen Roszell. Alumni: 5 to be named. Students: 3 to be named.

SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED Faculty: Bill Rempel (chr.), Donald Asp, Lenore Burgard, Allen Greenbaum (UMD), John Kearnes (UMM), Manfred Meier, Richard Weatherman. Ex Officio: 1 to be named. Students: 2 to be named.

II. BUSINESS & RULES COMMITTEE

STUDENT GOVERNANCE AMENDMENTS

(15 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following amendment to the Senate Constitution:

Amend Article III, Section 6, University Senate Officers, by labeling the existing text "a" and adding the following new paragraph "b": The officers of the Student Senate shall be a chair, a vice chair, a clerk, and a treasurer. The chair and vice chair shall be elected by the Student Senate at its last regularly scheduled spring quarter meeting from the members of the Student Senate. Term of office shall be July 1 to June 30, and the person holding office is eligible for re-election. The clerk and treasurer shall be appointed by the chair subject to the approval of the Student Senate. The duties of the clerk and treasurer shall be prescribed in the Bylaws. The Student Consultative Committee shall periodically review these officer positions.

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following amendment to the Senate Bylaws: Add to Article I, Senate Membership, Elections, and Officers, a new Section 9: The treasurer of the Student Senate shall be the chief budget officer of the Student Senate. The treasurer shall chair the budget subcommittee of the Student Senate.

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following amendment to the Senate Bylaws: Add to Article III, Section 1, Subsection A, under Duties and Responsibilities (3) Student Consultative Committee, a new third point: to provide for a budget subcommittee of the Student Senate. The budget subcommittee shall be chaired by the treasurer of the Student Senate. Three members shall be appointed by the chair of the Student Senate with one member from each of the following committees: Student Senate Consultative Committee, Student Committee on Committees, Student Lobby Advisory Committee. These appointments are subject to the approval of the Student Senate.

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following amendment to the Senate Bylaws: Add to Article III, Senate Committees, the following new Section 3:

3. Committees Reporting to the Student Senate

A. STUDENT AFFAIRS

The Student Affairs Committee is concerned with policies and procedures that affect the welfare of the student body. These matters may include such items as tuition, financial aid, housing, student activities and organizations, student publications, and other matters that influence the responsibilities, rights, privileges, opportunities, and quality of life of the student body, and any other responsibilities as delegated to it by the Student Consultative Committee.

Membership

The Student Affairs Committee shall be composed of at least 10 members of the student body, one faculty member, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Of the student members, 3 shall be from the Twin Cities campus, 2 from the Duluth campus, and one each from the Crookston, Morris, and Waseca campuses. At least 2 of the student members and the faculty member shall be senators at the time of appointment. Members shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate.

Duties and Responsibilities

- to make recommendations to the Student Senate on all policies and procedures of the University that influence the welfare of the student body.
- to submit an annual report to the Student Senate.

B. STUDENT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

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

Membership

The Student Committee on Committees shall be composed of the student members of the Senate Committee on Committees.

Duties and Responsibilities

- to review the representation and input from students of the various campuses to the Senate and committees of the Senate, taking necessary action to ensure high quality student participation.
- to advise the Student Consultative Committee on student participation in the Senate and the structure of the Student Senate and its committees.
- to submit an annual report to the Student Senate.

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following amendment to the Senate Rules: Amend Article II, Standing rules of the Senate, by adding Section 5:

5. Policy Statement of the Student Senate

There shall be a policy statement of the Student Senate which shall define any further policy and operating procedure of the Student Senate not contained in or in conflict with the University Senate Constitution, Bylaws, or Rules. This statement shall be adopted and amended by a two-thirds vote of those members of the Student Senate present and voting at any meeting, or by a majority of those members of the Student Senate present and voting at two consecutive meetings.

INFORMATION:

The Business and Rules Committee opposes the above motion on the grounds that it is vague, and we fail to see a reason for it.

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following amendment to the Senate Rules: (deletion has line through it; addition is underlined)

Amend Article III, Rules for Committees of the University Senate, by changing Item 3 to read, Terms of Membership, and Chairing of Committees, and Removal of Student Members for Neglect of Meetings.

Make the current text "a" and add the following new "b": A student member of a committee of the Senate shall forfeit membership by neglecting three consecutive meetings of the committee for which notification was given. A student member whose membership has been forfeited may appeal to the Student Committee on Committees for reinstatement.

RICHARD PURPLE
Chair

III. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

Faculty members of the Committee are Shirley Clark, *ex officio*, Vice Chair of the Senate (Educational Policy and Administration, TC), Phyllis Freier (Physics, TC), Joseph Latterell (Chemistry, UMM), Cleon Melsa (Arts and Sciences, UMC), Jack Merwin, Chair (Educational Psychology, TC), Paul Murphy (History, TC), Irwin Rubenstein (Genetics and Cell Biology, TC), Frank Sorauf (Political Science, TC), Deon Stuthman (Agronomy and Plant Genetics, TC), and Wesley B. Sundquist (Agricultural and Applied Economics, TC).

Student members are Cathleen Birk (TC), Beth Emanuelson (TC), Charles Farrell (UMM), Sue Gruenes (UMW), Douglas Melby, Student Chair (TC), Paul Schulte (TC), David Shope (TC), Maria Sikafy (UMC, replacing Eric Stroschein for the spring quarter), and Bruce Williams (UMD).

By June the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) will have held 18 meetings, 9 of which will have included a discussion with Dr. Kenneth Keller as Academic Vice President, Interim President, and President. One of these meetings was closed at Dr. Keller's request so that he could brief SCC on the developing draft of what was to become the "Commitment to Focus" paper and SCC could offer its comments, critique, and suggestions. The committee appreciates the time given by Presidents C. Peter Magrath and Kenneth Keller and by

Vice President David Lilly and Associate Vice Presidents Clinton Hewitt and Betty W. Robinett to discuss important issues of mutual interest. The meeting of October 18 was held on the campus at Morris, where the SCC enjoyed fine hospitality and useful interchanges with students, faculty, and administrators.

The committee, its faculty and student components working separately and reporting to each other, made appointments and nominations to the following bodies:

- Presidential Search Advisory Committee (8 faculty and 4 students; recommended names were accepted by the regents);
- Senate Committee on Business and Rules;
- Senate Committee on Planning;
- Senate Committee on All-University Honors (recommendations made to the President);
- President's Student Behavior Review Panel (recommendations made to the President).

The SCC chair convened once per quarter the Facilitative Committee of the Senate, consisting of the chairpersons of 14 committees. Additional efforts at communication included a newsletter of committee activities published by SCC in April and an open forum on the issue of semester vs. quarter calendars.

Principal business:

—Discussed with President Magrath and Interim President-Designate Keller the transition in the presidency and related central administration changes;

—Discussed in broad terms with Drs. Magrath and Keller the biennial budget request and capital request; heard regular reports on Senate Finance Committee-central administration interactions on these requests;

—Discussed policy proposals of the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation with committee chair Robert Sloan, Vice Presidents Keller and Lilly and Associate Vice President Hewitt; sought and received written responses to the criticisms and charges raised; recommended no further action on the policy proposals for a year or so, at which time effectiveness of responses could be assessed;

—Discussed fundamental, interrelated aspects of governance at numerous meetings: (1) how to enhance the effectiveness of the faculty and joint faculty-student governance systems through increased participation on issues of importance to the University community; (2) how to increase Senate/Assembly influence and make it timely through informed communication between Senate and Assembly committees and central administration; (3) how to improve faculty members' sense of representativeness and confidence in the Senate committee system through effective communications and through follow-up on implementation of Senate policy. The Committee recommended against a motion that would have largely removed students from the University Senate. SCC and its subcommittees on governance are continuing to address concrete proposals for structural and operational changes. SCC is resolved to strengthen its assistance to the other committees of the Senate through such means as holding an early fall workshop for all committee chairpersons and publishing an intercommittee newsletter. SCC moved through the Senate an amendment to the bylaws removing the limitation on subjects the Student SCC and the Faculty Consultative Committee may separately discuss with the President.

—Received interim reports from Professor Wesley B. Sundquist, the SCC member on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, held a joint meeting with that committee midway through the search process, and received an oral report from Professor John Howe, the Advisory Committee chair, upon completion of the search. SCC is convinced the entire process was thorough, fair, and successful.

—Helped structure faculty and student participation in the study of whether to convert to a semester system; requested the Planning, Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, and Consultative Committees to advise the special working group; sponsored an April Senate forum on the question; discussed the working group's interim report with Associate Vice President Robinett.

—Asked the Educational Policy Committee to take the initiative in designing a new Senate committee on computers and other information systems in consultation with the Library, Research, and Consultative Committees and with Assistant Vice President Barbara Wolfe.

—Discussed and made recommendations on further revisions in a new set of grievance procedures developed by a special SCC subcommittee to clarify and make uniform throughout the University the procedures to be followed in addressing grievances which are outside the domain of the Judicial Committee (i.e., salary disputes and academic freedom and responsibility issues). SCC expects to bring to the Senate in 1985-86 a motion on adoption of new procedures.

—Discussed extensively at three meetings the "Commitment to Focus" and ultimately endorsed the proposal with the understanding of appropriate and timely consultation on implementation, and reiterating the President's own conditions requiring funding formula change and complementary changes on the part of the other Minnesota systems of higher education.

Interviewed the four finalists for the position of Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action and wrote assessments to the President.

—Discussed preliminarily what evaluation should take place in 1985-86 of the experiment of non-voting, *ex-officio* membership by civil service employees on nine Senate and Assembly committees. (Civil service employees are full members on two Senate and three Assembly committees.)

JACK C. MERWIN
Chair

IV. BUSINESS & RULES COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

Business and Rules has met 5 times during the current academic year. We have carried out our duties with respect to all items brought before us. This has included routine housekeeping amendments to the various constitutions, bylaws, and rules of the Senate, Faculty Senate, Student Senate, and Campus Assembly. In addition, we considered more substantive items with respect to revisions of the Student Senate constitution and bylaws, which are reported on the current agenda. Finally, we rendered opinions to the Consultative Committee on the Campus Assembly's policy statement on sponsorships, promotions, and advertisements, on the setting of Senate agendas, and on the matter of other committees' annual reports. With respect to the latter, rest assured that at least the members of Business and Rules have read your annual report in its entirety.

Members of the committee were Josef Altholz, Caroline Czarnecki, David Lenander, Bill Meyer, Joel Nelson, Richard Purple (chr.), and *ex officio* John Cound and Marilee Ward.

RICHARD PURPLE
Chair

V. FINANCE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The Senate Finance Committee (SFC) includes members of other designated Senate committees, at-large faculty and student members, and two non-voting civil service representatives. Those serving on the committee this year were John Adams, Eric Ahlgren, Mark Brenner, Richard Goldstein, Marilyn Gorlin, Linda Hanson, Wendell Johnson, Gerald Klement, F. Gerald Kline, David Madison, Douglas Melby, Jeff Moser, Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, Robert Sloan, David Storvick, Deon Stuthman, and John Sullivan. The Academic Vice President or an associate has attended each SFC meeting. Professor W. Phillips Shively, Faculty Consultative Committee liaison with the Legislature, was invited and did attend most of our eleven sessions. At least two more meetings are scheduled for the remainder of the year. During most of the year, our monthly meetings were scheduled approximately one week prior to the regular Regents' meetings to maximize timely communication to central administration on issues of interest to the faculty.

Joint meetings have been held with the Senate Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Research (SCR), the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), and the Senate Finance Committee.

Major issues of concern to the committee this year included:

1. Development of the 1985-87 legislative requests, both operating and maintenance and capital, and assessment of the consistency of these requests with planning priorities.
2. Development of budget principles and alternative allocation strategies under varying funding scenarios, and the relationships of both to the current cycle of planning (Cycle III).
3. Current status of units' retrenchment and reallocation plans with emphasis on their adherence to retrenchment schedules previously submitted as a part of past cycles of planning.
4. The relationship to institutional priorities of research funded by the Legislative Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCMR).
5. Comparison of U of M legislative funding with that of other public Big Ten institutions.
6. Development of plans for improving "Instructional Computing" and information systems and their costs (in a joint meeting with SCR and SCEP).
7. Rollover of faculty retirement funds into IRA accounts and modifications of Early Retirement Options (in a joint meeting with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs).

The committee commends central officers who interacted with us for their cooperative spirit when consulting with our group. The list includes President Kenneth Keller and Vice Presidents V. Rama Murthy, Richard Heydinger, and Barbara Wolfe.

DEON D. STUTHMAN
Chair

VI. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The Senate Committee on International Education (SCIE) met seven times during the academic year. Members of the committee included Robinson Abbott, John Cogan, Robert Kvavik, Donald Marion, Byron Marshall, Karen Olness, Marilyn Rossmann, Joseph Mestenhauser (*ex-officio*), Carol Razandak (*ex-officio*), Benjamin Bornzstein, Cynthia House, Lisa Lindley, Anne Stoack, and Dario Menanteau.

The SCIE focused its attention on the following issues: (1) an analysis of existing University policies and procedures dealing with international education and exchange agreements; (2) reviewed the presidential report on the President's Task Force on the International Character of the University; (3) identified areas in which educational policies need further study and development; (4) explored cooperation and coordination with international units and other University committees, and (5) studied the report of the National Advisory Board on International Education Programs and other documents relevant to the functions of the committee.

Action items recommended by the International Education Committee on the basis of its discussions were as follows:

1. The committee reviewed and recommended the acceptance of two documents submitted by the Institute of International Studies and MSID: (a) "A Memorandum of Understanding Concerning International Exchange and Cooperation between the University of Minnesota and the Fundacion Social (Colombia)," and (b) An "Internship Agreement was accomplished according to the functions assigned by the University Senate to the former Council on International Education (replaced by the Senate Committee on International Education) regarding the reviewing of all-University international exchange agreements (Senate minutes, March 3, 1977).
2. The committee unanimously reiterated its endorsement and support to the general objective and recommendations issued by the President's Task Force on the International Character of the University. The committee called the attention of the Senate administration to the fact that only five from a total of over thirty recommendations listed by the Task Force report were selected for implementation by the end of 1984.

Other activities pursued by the SCIE included: (a) participation in a joint meeting with international units and President Keller concerning the status and perspectives of international education at the University; (b) attendance at the "International Dimensions in the Curriculum" conference organized by the Office of international technical assistance activities and areas of impact of international exchange agreements on academic and support units.

DARIO MENANTEAU-HORTA
Chair

VII. EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

During this year in its 6 meetings, ECPC will have fulfilled its specified duties and responsibilities, after several years of relative inactivity. In addition to considering such issues as the role of ECPC for the total University; the responsibility of a land-grant university for service; the place of rewards/incentives to faculty; and possibilities and policies, ECPC concentrated on the idea of an all-University "hotline."

The committee felt the hotline idea addressed at least 3 issues facing the University: demonstrating its service contribution to the public; offering faculty another vehicle for rewarding its efforts; and educating the public and faculty about outreach as another means for illuminating the research/creative, teaching, and service aspects of professing. Recognizing the joint nature of such an endeavor fiscally and administratively, Wallace on behalf of the Office of Academic Affairs advised the ECPC of his support of the idea and willingness to present the idea to President Keller. If accepted, a subcommittee will be appointed to plan and implement the hotline with the notion of making available to the public the resources and knowledge of all the University. The Committee views the hotline idea as timely in terms of community image and need.

ECPC also discussed the issue of inloading pursuant to its status and use on the total campus. ECPC concluded before any further education or exploration was done on this topic that the Educational Policy Committee should be requested to provide the whole Senate and concerns committees with a report on the relevant pilot studies. Inloading and the implications of same are especially pertinent to extension and outreach programs and the professors involved therein in terms of compensation and teaching loads or schedules, for example.

ECPC has also been concerned with its configuration and requested the Committee on Committees to extend ECPC's representation (e.g., from Law, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, etc.). The membership of the 1985-1986 ECPC seems to move in that direction and Quie's suggestions on committee makeup were very helpful. We have stayed in contact with MSA and encouraged consistent student participation too.

On balance, this year's ECPC felt it had accomplished some of its goals, become more active, and looks forward to dealing with other issues raised and addressed this past year. The University is an educational source whether communicating about basic research or applied programs in foreign languages or physics, discovering a child advocate, or draining a basement. The committee realizes that the faculty may need to reevaluate the meaning of extension and the implications of any "outreach" as well as "non-reach" programs. We welcome your suggestions.

JUNE LOUIN TAPP
Chair

VIII. RESEARCH COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The Research Committee was asked to develop a University policy to handle allegations of research fraud, and so we discussed and heard testimony on that issue at each of our monthly meetings throughout the year. The members of the committee concluded that it would be most efficacious to incorporate procedures to deal with such allegations by working with the subcommittee of the Consultative Committee that has been charged with revising the entire grievance structure at the University. That subcommittee is chaired by Carol

Panzandak and Phyllis Freier, and the chair of the Research Committee worked closely with them to incorporate allegations of research fraud into the proposed grievance structure that deals with academic freedom and responsibility. A draft of the section incorporating allegations of fraud, along with a list of guidelines for the committees that hear fraud cases, was approved by the Research Committee and forwarded to the Consultative Committee for further action.

Another major issue that continues to be of central concern to the members of the Research Committee is how to allocate indirect cost recovery funds (ICR). The committee brought a motion to the Senate at its winter meeting inviting the Academic Vice President to report annually to the Research Committee on the expenditure of that portion of ICR funds that are retained and allocated by central administration. It was approved by the Senate. The research committee will bring before the Senate any resolutions or problems that evolve from discussing these annual reports. After this motion was passed by the Senate, the Research Committee continued to discuss the ICR issue, and some concern was expressed about the current policy, which allocates those funds that are to be distributed $\frac{2}{3}$ to central and $\frac{1}{3}$ proportionately to the units that generated them. In fact, during this fiscal year, the actual ratio is closer to $\frac{1}{2}$ central, $\frac{1}{2}$ units, and so the Research Committee passed a motion to alter current policy to recognize that reality. The motion apportions those ICR funds to be allocated $\frac{1}{2}$ central, $\frac{1}{2}$ collegiate units. The funds going to colleges are to be apportioned $\frac{1}{3}$ retained at the college level, $\frac{1}{3}$ proportionately to the departments that generated them, and $\frac{1}{3}$ to the principal investigators, unless the latter is less than \$100, in which case it will revert to the department. This motion has been forwarded to SCEP and will probably get to the Senate next fall.

The Research Committee has also concerned itself with the issues of funds for graduate student tuition fellowships, recommending that the central administration assign a high budget priority to this item; research computing funds and arrangements, meeting with the new Assistant Vice President for Information Processing, Dr. Wolfe, and participating in setting up an ad hoc advisory committee for information processing and computing; University policies on computing fringe benefits and overhead on grants; and the implications of recent task force reports on graduate education and the research efforts of the faculty. The committee is currently awaiting the administration's detailed responses to these task force reports, and will discuss these responses and the issues involved at its May meeting. Most of these issues will continue to top the committee's agenda next year.

JOHN SULLIVAN
Chair

IX. STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

As of May 1, the Student Academic Support Services Committee (SASSC) has met 7 times, and one additional meeting is planned, on May 16, 1985, prior to the Senate meeting.

Major topics addressed this year have included final review and presentation of a statement of minimum standards of academic progress for financial aid recipients, review and comment on the proposed student financial aid packaging policy for 1985-86, the issue of the many signature requirements which hamper computerized registration, and finally, implications for Student Support Services of President Keller's Commitment to Focus proposal.

The statement on minimum standards of academic progress was held over from the previous year so that additional information requested by SASSC could be provided and certain changes incorporated. The complete text was published in the docket for the Twin Cities Assembly and University Senate meetings of November 15, 1984, and presented for information at those meetings by the SASSC and SCC chairs. It has since been published as a separate brochure by Student Affairs, and is in effect until further notice.

Student financial aid is administered by the Office of Student Financial Aid (OSFA), a Student Support Services (SSS) unit. A variety of fund sources and recipient groups is involved, each with its own requirements and constraints mandated by law, by funding sources, or by University policies and procedures. Administration would be complex enough if available funding were adequate for established needs. Since this is far from the case, OSFA needs guidelines for financial aid decisions each year. The so-called financial aid packaging plan represents such guidelines, with SASSC serving as a faculty/student advisory group to OSFA in formulating a recommended plan. The Vice President for Student Affairs also sought comment from deans, directors and others in the University community. No adverse response was provided to SASSC regarding the plan recommended for 1985-86, and it has been placed in effect by OSFA.

Turning to the issue of signature requirements, to remove registration holds or authorize overrides of computer checks, the Task Force on the Student Experience recommended that colleges review all requirements which force students to go through these complicated steps, to see if the registration process can be simplified and the true potential of computerized registration thereby achieved. SASSC learned that during fall quarter of 1984, 29,000 holds and 18,000 manual overrides were provided through the system. This was discussed with the Council of Undergraduate Deans. As a result, a memorandum out-

lining a four-point plan was distributed to college deans from the Academic Vice President's office requesting that reviews of college and department practices be initiated and that responses be provided by specified dates. This will be a carryover item for this committee in 1985-86.

Finally, issues relevant to SSS arising out of the Commitment to Focus are being addressed. These include such matters as the financial aid status of General College students if there are no GC degree programs, the impact on SSS of possible changes in lower division admissions and in CEE admissions, and the possible role of SASSC as a policy advisory committee to SSS rather than a policy review committee. Specific recommendations on these issues may be voted at our final 1984-85 meeting on May 16. This also will be a carryover issue for next year's committee.

ELWOOD F. CALDWELL
Chair

X. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The Assembly was not finally appointed until the closing days of fall quarter, 1984.

The Assembly met twice during winter quarter. The first meeting focused on the College's proposal to the high-ability Academic Task Force. The second meeting involved a survey of several initiatives that the College might take as a part of its experimental programs mission (which has lain fallow for several years in the face of past retrenchments).

Chiefly through its Consultative Committee, the Assembly responded in February to President Keller's recommendation concerning University Without Walls, one of University College's two permanent programs.

We have invited Vice President John Wallace to talk with the Assembly in early May. We hope that he will clarify our role in developing experimental programs and our situation with regard to other aspects of intercollegiate and cross collegiate education.

DONALD ROSS
Chair

XI. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

Questions shall be submitted in writing to the Clerk eight calendar days before the meeting. The consultative Committee shall review them. Because a limited time is allotted to answering questions, it may be necessary for the committee to combine similar questions and to withhold others. The committee will also be guided by the breadth of interest in the issue. All questions received, together with the names of the questioners, shall be distributed at the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall group questions by general topic and shall indicate those which have been forwarded for answers. The person answering a question may if he/she chooses, entertain additional questions from the floor which extend the original question.

1. What is the formula that is used to calculate the pension supplement that is currently paid to some faculty retirees?
2. What is the number of individuals currently receiving a supplement?
3. What is the total annual cost of this supplement?

L. E. GOODMAN
Record Professor of Civil Engr.

XII. OLD BUSINESS

XIII. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

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

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Thursday, May 16, 1985
(Immediately following the University Senate meeting)

The Senate constitution provides that all members of the faculty who hold regular appointment as defined in the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* may be present at Faculty Senate meetings and shall be entitled to speak and to offer motions for Faculty Senate action. Only elected faculty members (or their designated alternates) shall be entitled to vote.

I. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1985-86

Action (2 minutes)

JUDICIAL Faculty: Robert Park (chr.), Carole Bland, Clara Bloomfield, Miriam Cohn, Amos Dienard, Timothy Dunnigan, Hilmi Elifogul (UMM), Arnold Flikke, Donna Forbes (UMD), Donald Gillmor, Nelson Goldberg, Janice Hogan, Susan Meyers, Stephen Prager, Kathryn Reyerson, George Seltzer, Gordon Swanson, Marla White, Gayle Yates.

TENURE Faculty: Fred Morrison (co-chair), Sam Krislov (co-chair), George Copa, Daniel Feeney, Philip Frickey, Audrey Grosch, Larry Miller, W. Donald Spring (UMM). Ex Officio: Betty Robinett. Students: 2 to be named.

II. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

Membership: Shirley Clark, *ex officio* as vice chairperson of the University Senate (TC), Phyllis Freier (TC), Joseph Latterell (UMM), Cleon Melsa (UMC), Jack Merwin, chair (TC), Paul Murphy (TC), Irwin Rubenstein (TC), Frank Sorauf (TC), Deon Stuthman (TC), Wesley B. Sundquist (TC).

The committee (FCC) held 16 meetings, all but three of which were open. Seven included discussions with the President. Two meetings were closed to encourage complete candor in discussions on rewording sections of the tenure code to respond to regental concerns. A third meeting was closed at the request of President Keller when he invited FCC to join him in a discussion of the proposals he was developing for restructuring central administration. In October, in conjunction with the SCC meeting on the Morris Campus, the FCC benefitted from an open exchange of information and concerns in a forum with the UMM faculty. FCC met once each quarter with the regents: the tenure code was the subject of the fall and winter meetings; the spring discussion revolved around the two questions of what it means to become a world class university and how FCC and the regents can work mutually for the greater good of the University.

Major committee business:

- Discussed and made suggestions on the revised University grievance procedures. FCC supports the effort to handle allegations of research fraud through the procedures set forth in the grievance procedures section on academic freedom and responsibility; it believes procedures regarding charges of such fraud should be uniform throughout the University.
- Discussed with the President and offered advice on such matters as setting a thematic tone for the University, the Rajender consent decree petition on internal tribunals (see below), administrative structural and title changes contemplated for the coordinate campuses, central administration's procedures in promotion and tenure cases viewed as borderline, and legislative relations.
- Discussed with Associate Vice President A. J. Linck, prior to his departure to become the Provost at Colorado State University, several major University matters including particularly the importance of tying University planning to budgeting and the biennial request, and the need to facilitate interdisciplinary research.
- Studied the report of the Cohn Committee on Internal Tribunals (which had been created in response to a Rajender consent decree petition); supported the concept of a faculty assistance office (asking that it be available to all faculty) and of the option to have the findings of the internal tribunals binding. FCC remains skeptical toward the proposal to draw hearing panels by lot from among volunteers. FCC favors adherence to identical procedures and consideration for all faculty rather than perpetuating any differentiation in approach.
- Appointed, jointly with the Faculty Affairs Committee, an extended subcommittee on faculty salaries to develop long-range principles for the distribution of salary monies and to advise central administration on their application.
- Heard a series of reports from the faculty's legislative liaison, Professor W. Phillips Shively, on the legislative session, on meetings between legislators and faculty, and on how the several University faculty lobbying groups have worked cooperatively. FCC discussed the legislative session with the President and discussed with both Presidents Magrath and Keller use of the permanent university fund, together with matching funds, to support academic positions including, at the highest level, fully endowed chairs.
- Is presently moving toward organizing more forums on matters of general importance for members of the faculty.

JACK C. MERWIN
Chair

III. JUDICIAL COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

Since the last report, dated May 2, 1984, the Senate Judicial Committee has had under consideration a total of twelve cases, four of which were filed prior to the last report. Of these, one was settled without a hearing, the second case was settled during the hearing process, and the last two cases required full hearings and the Findings and Recommendations forwarded to the President.*

Of the eight cases filed since May 2, 1984, one was settled prior to the assignment of a panel, three were settled during the prehearing stage, one case is still in the discovery phase, one case has been heard and the Findings and Recommendations forwarded to the President, and the last two cases are awaiting the assignment of panels.

Of the twelve cases under consideration this year, six involved denial of tenure and promotion, two, sexual harassment, two, dismissal for cause, one case involved a long term T appointment and the last case, harassment.

Annual Meeting with the President

A major focus of the meeting this year centered on an assessment of the effectiveness of the Judicial Committee, which depends to a great degree on the perception of its integrity and credibility. Interim President Keller felt that the whole committee should be more involved in cases in order to promote consistency in the hearing process. The committee is currently exploring ways in which to strengthen the judicial process without making it too cumbersome to function.

*Abstracts of these cases are on file in the office of the Senate Clerk.

Another issue that was discussed involved the *de novo* hearing in sexual harassment cases. The President urged the committee to find a way to eliminate the need for this *de novo* hearing. Although the issue is still under discussion, the consensus is that the present prosecutorial structure in sexual harassment cases, where the parties are dealt with separately and punishment assigned without a hearing involving both parties, mandates the need for a separate appeal body.

Evaluation of the Recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Internal Tribunals

I. Faculty Assistance Office

A. FUNCTIONS—The Judicial Committee endorses the establishment of a faculty assistance office. The office would provide a needed place where University employees could obtain assistance in filing complaints and would minimize the need for faculty members to enlist costly legal services for Judicial Committee cases.

B. STAFF—The Judicial Committee opposes the idea of a permanent directorship. Although a permanent director might provide consistency in the process, the committee felt rotation was necessary to protect the system from possible polarization.

Although the committee favors rotating directors, it opposes requesting that faculty members take a leave of absence from their research or academic pursuits in order to fill the position.

II. Judicial Committee Structure

A. SELECTION OF MEMBERS—The Judicial Committee opposes the selection of members by lot from a pool of faculty members who volunteer to serve on the committee. The committee also opposes holding elections to select its Chair. There is no way to guarantee that a particular Chair or committee will be completely impartial by instituting such a process. There is a difference between being asked by the Committee on Committees to serve rather than volunteering to serve. Furthermore, selecting the Chair from the outside serves to de-politicize the Judicial Committee by eliminating any campaigning and the awkwardness for committee members to vote on one another. However, it was felt that the credibility of the system would be greatly improved if all members of the faculty were made aware of the current selection process.**

B. The committee endorses the spirit in which proposed structural changes were recommended. The committee agrees to take the proposals under advisement, consider the details, subsequent to an agreement of principle between the University women and the administration. The committee re-affirms its authority to change its rules with the permission of the Faculty Senate and opposes the idea that the University itself can change the Judicial Committee's procedures.

III. Judicial Committee procedures for Dealing with Claims Filed Under Rajender Consent Decree

A. REFERRAL OF CLAIMS UNDER CONSENT DECREE—The committee endorses the recommendation to route Rajender complaints through the Judicial Committee instead of through administrative bodies.

B. PROCEDURES FOR HEARING PANEL CASES—The Judicial Committee agrees with the *ad hoc* Committee on the necessity for binding agreements in Rajender cases. The committee feels the agreement should include the special masters, since they prescribe the remedies for cases based upon the decisions given them.

**Selection Process for Judicial Committee Members

The Committee on Committees solicits recommendations for membership and committee Chairs from Deans, Directors, Department Heads and other committee Chairpersons; faculty members from the Committee on Committees also make their own recommendations, and an advertisement is placed in the newsletter *Brief*. Other resources used to solicit names for nomination are the faculty interest survey (circulated every three years) and a letter sent each year to new faculty asking them to indicate on which committees they would be willing to serve. The Committee on Committees meets and selects from this pool of names those faculty members who will serve on the Judicial Committee. A letter is then sent to each person selected asking if they accept the appointment.

Although there are no written criteria for selecting members, in general the Committee on Committees looks for people who have a broad knowledge of the University and the ability to be impartial. They also try to balance collegiate units and ranks excepting assistant professors (as it is felt to be too great a time commitment) and administrators responsible for personnel decisions (to avoid a conflict of interest). The committee would probably not select faculty members who were not recommended to or known by a member of the Committee on Committees nor would they select those faculty who have Judicial Committee claims pending against the University.

Final Thought

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the faculty members who have given so generously of their time and energy to the Committee this year.

LEONARD J. GREENBERG
Chair

IV. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, I wish to thank heartily those members of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and others serving on SCFA subcommittees, who contributed invaluable to SCFA's deliberations and recommendations by virtue of their acumen, good will, consistent performance, hard work, and overall discharge of SCFA "duties and responsibilities: to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate on all policies and procedures of the University which influence the personal and professional welfare of the faculty" (elsewhere in this report, members are referred to by surname only):

SCFA current-faculty members James F. Berry (Neurology), Raymond Bohling (Engineering Library), William Boylan (Animal Science), Charles Campbell (Physics), David W. Davis (Horticultural Science), Margery Durham (English), Harry Foreman (Pediatrics & Population Studies), Richard Goldstein (Mechanical Engineering), Harvey Keynes (Mathematics), Jooinn Lee (Social Sciences-Morris), Charlotte MacLeod (Physiology-Duluth), John Munholland (History), Timothy Nantell (Management), Warren Roberts (Psychology),

George Sell (Mathematics), and Robert Ulstrom (Pediatrics); non-SCFA subcommittee members George Benson (Management Science), Clarke Chambers (History), Mary Corcoran (Educational Psychology), John Darley (Psychology Emeritus), John Fossum (Industrial Relations), Geoffrey Maruyama (Educational Psychology), Frank Sorauf (Political Science), Arthur Walzer (Rhetoric), Jean Ward (Journalism), and C. Arthur Williams (Management); and actively participating ex officio members Harold Bernard (Employee Benefits), Burton Paulu (Retirees Association), Betty Robinett (Academic Affairs), Eugene Ronning (graduate assistant), and Marilee Ward (University Senate).

REPORT

By the end of 1984-85 the committee will have met fourteen times for a period of two hours or more, and members of subcommittees will have given a great deal of additional time to SCFA service. Some of the committee's work has been completed and some remains to be completed later this quarter or in 1985-86. The issues addressed were many and varied; study of some resulted in recommendations made to the Senate, central administration, and other bodies, while study of others led to no further action through lack of need, or deferral on account of more pressing business or unavailability of essential information, or both.

That beginnings are easier seen than ends the history of two of our first concerns shows.

HEALTH-PLANS COVERAGE SUBCOMMITTEE. Before the first meeting the committee was advised by a faculty member of non-coverage by University health-plans of "temporomandibular joint." We learned that this relatively rare ailment has been recognized as a medical—or dental—condition quite recently and is the subject of continuing study and disagreement. Employee Benefits reported that health-insurers asked about it had replied that including it as standard coverage would be prohibitively expensive. We also learned that Group Health does cover the condition, but the implications of its non-coverage by Blue Cross/Blue Shield, for example, led to the forming of a Health-Plans Coverage subcommittee (Bernard, David, Foreman, and Ulstrom-chair), which gathered and studied data and made a preliminary report that is being studied by SCFA as of this writing (28 April). Faculty members should know that fairly detailed comparative information about coverage by the various health plans can be found in *Health and Welfare Plan*, which is published annually by the State of Minnesota and is available on request from Employee Benefits (which routinely supplies a copy to all new University employees).

ROLLOVER OPTION. The "Rollover Option" had been recommended one vote short of unanimously by the Faculty Senate in Spring 1984 but was initially opposed by central administration, which came to share SCFA's position, however, in the course of discussion at two 1984-85 Board of Regents committee meetings, where SCFA was represented by Harry Foreman, chair of the SCFA subcommittee (others Benson, Bernard, Darley, Goldstein, Sell, J. Ward). This option enables a faculty member, at the time of retirement, to transfer (or "to rollover") his or her accumulated retirement funds from the Faculty Retirement Program into an individual retirement account (IRA) of his or her choice, thus foregoing the fixed payments of the annuity under the standard retirement plan and assuming responsibility for management of the funds as a source of investment and income and as part of the faculty member's estate. The University of Minnesota is among the first universities in the country to adopt this option, which is unfortunately not available to participants in the TIAA/CREF retirement plans. Once this option became a matter of University policy, central administration was quick to respond to SCFA's request for an orientation program and accordingly set up meetings—ably conducted by Kenneth O. Doyle and Harold Bernard on 17-18 April—to provide information to prospective retirees on possible ways of investing funds made available by exercising the option.

Detailed comment on all matters addressed by SCFA this year would swell this report to a volume, but I list the major ones here, with reference by parenthetical date to the SCFA minutes that document discussion (these may be ignored except by those for whom they are a convenience), and I comment briefly below on several, in alphabetical order. Those identified by P are pending; they were taken up briefly but deferred. Distinguished professorships (10 & 24 Apr), early and creative retirements (16 & 30 Jan, 13 Mar, 10 Apr), economic status of retired faculty (29 Oct, 13 Mar; in progress), faculty ombudsman (29 Oct; P), flexible-benefits package (29 Oct, 10 Dec; P), health benefits (29 Oct, 24 Apr; discussed above), indemnification and defense of [faculty] employees (27 Feb; in progress), inloading (Faculty Senate Minutes, 17 May 1984, pp. 29-30, s.v. "Regularizing Instruction Guidelines"; SCFA 19 Nov), rollover option (29 Oct, 19 Nov, 10 Dec, 16 & 30 Jan, 13 Feb, 10 & 24 Apr; discussed above), sabbatical leaves (16 & 30 Jan; in progress), salary issues (29 Oct, 10 Dec, 13 Feb, 13 Mar, 10 & 24 Apr; in progress), semester system (13 & 27 Feb, 13 Mar, 10 & 24 Apr), teaching in programs with non-University sponsorship (29 Oct; P; interim policy in effect at present), tenure-code revisions (10 Dec), and tuition remission for faculty dependents (10 Dec, 16 Jan; P).

DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORSHIPS. In discussion with Assistant Vice-President John Wallace of a proposal by his office, made in response to a suggestion first made by Emeritus Regents' Professor of Classics and Director of the Center for Ancient Studies William A. McDonald, SCFA was in favor of titled professorships conferred to give special emphasis and recognition to the first and third components of the university-professional triad of teaching, research, and service (the Regents' professorship is said at present to give special emphasis to research). No special recommendation was made on the title of such a professorship, but suggestions were made, including Regents' Professorship, with a difference.

ECONOMIC STATUS OF RETIRED FACULTY. A subcommittee appointed to investigate and make appropriate recommendations has completed the draft of a report that will shortly be on the SCFA agenda for study, as of this date (28 April; Bernard, Berry, Davis-chair, Paulu, Roberts, Ulstrom).

INDEMNIFICATION AND DEFENSE OF [FACULTY] EMPLOYEES. (ref. University General Counsel Stephen S. Dunham's memorandum of 30 Jan 85 to the Board of Regents on Proposed Regents Policy on Indemnification and Defense of Employees). The proposed policy is too complicated for accurate exposition in little, but it proposes changes that will improve the University's present policy and make the coverage as broad as possible. "The Regents' present policy and state law provide protection for employees acting in the 'scope of employment' unless the conduct is 'malfeasance in office or willful or wanton neglect of duty.'"

SABBATICAL LEAVES. An SCFA subcommittee (Campbell, Lee, MacLeod, Nantell-chair, Paulu, Robinett, Walzer) is studying aspects of the sabbatical-leave program and is expected shortly to have a recommendation ready for SCFA to make to central administration in favor of a plan that would supplement sabbatical salaries in a manner similar to that of the Bush Fellowship Program, the last year of which is 1985-86. Approximately twenty-five Bush Fellowships per year have provided sabbatical-salary supplementation in the amount of the larger of \$9,000 or 30% salary, and travel expenses up to \$2,000, when appropriate.

SALARY ISSUES—the matter of greatest continuing concern to most faculty members. Early on, two subcommittees were appointed to study particular aspects, one to consider and recommend on principles of salary-distribution and a formula for 1985-86, the other to continue the work of a 1983-84 SCFA subcommittee chaired by Ellen Berscheid and reported on in the Faculty Senate minutes of 17 May 1984 (30-39). One of the 1983-84 study's conclusions was particularly disturbing, that there seemed to be a negative correlation between compensation and length of service to the University. More statistics, and more readily usable statistics, have recently been made available by central administration that will permit the 1984-85 SCFA subcommittee to add further data and inferences to the Berscheid study already completed (Bohling, Chambers, Corcoran, Fossum, Maruyama-chair). Preliminary findings by this subcommittee confirm the findings of last year's.

The work of the subcommittee on principles and distribution-formula (Boylan-coordinator, Keynes, Munholland) has recently become the concern of an extended subcommittee of SCFA, jointly appointed by the SCFA and Senate Consultative Committee chairs, that is expected to have made some recommendations before this report is printed (Durham, Goldstein, Keynes, Maruyama, Sorauf, Walzer, Williams-chair). It would be premature to "report" what has not yet been found, much less recommended, but attention is being given by one subcommittee or another to such faculty concerns as "preventive retention" increases, the status of faculty-purchasing power that was supposed to be restored to 1972 parity in the near future, and the distribution-formula itself, which has varied over the past half decade from all "merit" to "merit" together with cost-of-living-related specified sums or percentages, or both.

SEMESTER SYSTEM. Because the nature of the academic year profoundly "influence[s] the personal and professional welfare of the faculty," among other important con-

stituencies, SCFA gave considerable time to study of the minutes and draft report of the Semester Work Group. As a result, SCFA unanimously endorsed a Senate resolution by Faculty Senator Edward Ney to the effect that no definitive action should be taken to change to a semester system until the relevant information had been gathered and made available for discussion by the Senate Consultative Committee and the University Senate. Later SCFA addressed a motion to the Faculty Senate, "that the question of change to a semester system be submitted to a vote of the [regular] faculty as a whole and that the [Faculty] Senate not approve the change unless the faculty vote reaches a 60% or greater majority in favor of the change." Further discussion led SCFA to substitute for this motion two motions to be made to the faculty of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. The first, calling for a regular-faculty referendum on the question whether the Twin Cities Campus should change to a semester system, passed. The second, calling for a 55% majority to qualify for the support of TCCA faculty, did not. SCFA took no position on the quarter or semester systems as such. It took the positions it did because most members were convinced that a major change in system required general consultation and the approval of a substantial majority.

TUITION REMISSION FOR FACULTY DEPENDENTS. This has not ceased to be of interest since it was killed in the Senate over a decade ago by the observation that "faculty should not be subsidized for procreation." Correspondence from Associate Vice-President for Administration and Personnel William C. Thomas indicates that the costs and possibilities are under active investigation by the administration, and that five Big Ten universities have had such a plan in effect for three years or more, four with 50% reimbursement and one with 80%, two of the five accommodating graduate as well as undergraduate study.

Finally, I wish to express my best wishes to the Faculty Affairs Committee of 1985-86, to give special thanks to Marilee Ward for taking excellent minutes and for all her other help with SCFA business, and to note that I was honored to serve as chair in 1984-85. If I didn't know enough even by the end of the year, it was not for lack of trying, and I certainly know more than I did at the beginning, thanks to the members of the committee and related committees and of the administration that I was privileged and pleased to work with in the course of pursuing the committee's work.

THOMAS CLAYTON
Chair

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE

Thursday, May 16, 1985
(Immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting)

The voting membership of the University Student Senate totals 61, including the Student Consultative Committee.

I. MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 14 Action (2 minutes)

II. COMMITTEES OF THE STUDENT SENATE, 1984-85

INFORMATION:

STUDENT LOBBY ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Matthew Goldman (chair).

III. INTERIM REPORT OF THE STUDENT LOBBY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Student Lobby Advisory Committee (SLAC) was reactivated this year as the legislative relations subcommittee of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC). SLAC contains nine members, representing students from each of the five University of Minnesota campuses.

SLAC's legislative efforts have focused on tuition relief, increased financial aid, capital request items for all of the campuses, placing a non-voting student member on the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), increased funding for intercollegiate athletics, and holding the legal drinking age in Minnesota to 19 years of age.

In a close working relationship with the Legislative Relations Committee of MSA, the faculty, and administration, SLAC's lobbying efforts have been very successful. One of the highlights to this date, has been the Education Division of the House Appropriations Committee providing tuition relief for students which should keep tuition increases within 5%. The same committee also allocated \$5.5 million for intercollegiate athletics, including an amendment assuring a fair distribution of these funds among the coordinate campuses. In addition, UMD and the Twin Cities have received funds to improve their rec sports facilities. Financial aid proposals have passed through both House and Senate committees which will provide more money for non-traditional and part-time students. Also, a bill placing a non-voting student member on the HECB awaits the Governor's signature. Finally, the bill to raise the legal drinking age in Minnesota to 21 years of age has been tied up until at least September of 1986.

MATTHEW A. GOLDMAN
Chair

IV. STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The members of the Student Consultative Committee for the 1984-85 year were Cathy Birk, Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell (UMM), Sue Gruenes (UMW), Douglas Melby, Paul Schulte, David Shope, Eric Stroschein (UMC), and Bruce Williams (UMD).

Student Consultative Committee had a productive and hectic year. Beginning last spring the committee's attention was directed to the issue of governance, both student government and University Senate structure.

V. TENURE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The Senate Tenure Committee held a number of meetings through the year. In fall and winter quarters, our business centered around final revisions and adoption of the new tenure regulations. In this connection we met with the Committee of the Whole of the Board of Regents and with representatives of the University administration. After hearing their comments, the committee held public hearings and proposed amendments. That language was considered at a Senate meeting in January. The Board of Regents adopted the amended regulations at its February meeting. They will take effect July 1.

The Senate requested that a formal interpretation be added to Section 7.11 of the new regulations. The committee held a public hearing on this question and adopted that interpretation in March. It is currently pending before the Board of Regents. We anticipate that it will be adopted. (The full text of that interpretation was included in a special report to the Faculty Senate in April.)

The committee is presently at work on a new set of procedural rules to guide departments, collegiate review committees, deans, and other administrators in making tenure decisions. These procedural rules were called for by the new regulations, and will replace the old Koeffler-Ibele memorandum. A preliminary draft is nearly completed. That draft will be forwarded to departments and colleges for an initial review by those who have close contact with the tenure process. After we receive comments, we will be preparing a final draft (probably early in fall quarter), which will be forwarded to the Senate for information. These procedures provide greater detail on certain procedures which are regulated in general terms by the tenure regulations.

FRED MORRISON
Chair

VI. ADJOURNMENT

On the student government side the recommendations of the Extended Subcommittee on the Student Senate were finalized, representing the culmination of a year and a half of work. The resulting recommendations on structure were presented to the Student Consultative Committee for approval before being sent to the Senate Business and Rules Committee. The motions to amend the constitution and bylaws will come before the University Senate for final approval on May 16, marking the end of a two-year process. The result will be a more effective Student Senate with its own officers. Also, the Student Senate approved the implementing legislation that provided for the Student Senate's lobbying efforts.

In the summer, the committee was asked to appoint students to the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Unfortunately, the committee lost our chair, Michael Olmstead, to the advisory committee. Doug Melby was elected to replace Mr. Olmstead. Other housekeeping business included appointments and meeting with the student representatives to the Board of Regents to formulate a new policy for selecting the student representatives.

November brought the "Swan" motion. Students agreed that governance ought to be improved, but didn't believe the "Swan" motion was the best solution. Working first to defeat the motion, and after December on other proposals to improve student participation, took us into the new year.

Out of discussions on governance several steps were taken by students to upgrade student participation. Just to name a few positive actions: a clerical person was hired to assist in watching attendance and vacancies, a data base was developed, and a researcher was hired.

Aside from governance, a major concern was the action of the legislature. The Student Lobby Advisory Committee was reconstituted as an extended subcommittee of the Student Consultative Committee. Students were fortunate to have Paul Schulte serve as acting chair until Matt Goldman was selected as permanent Chair to lobby on behalf of all University students. Mr. Schulte and Student Senate Chair Charles Farrell attended a national lobbying conference in Washington.

During the year, the Student Consultative Committee fulfilled its commitment to travel to each campus and meet with student leaders. This committee suggests next year's committee do the same in order to build unity, goodwill, and understanding among the campuses. The committee would like to recommend that the Faculty Consultative Committee also visit the coordinate campuses, as a good number of faculty have never seen the associate campuses.

The year will end with an orientation for new members on May 30.

DOUGLAS J. MELBY
Chair

V. ELECTION OF 1985-86 STUDENT SENATE OFFICERS

INFORMATION:

The officers elected today, a chair and a vice chair, shall serve as interim officers until the necessary amendments are approved to the University Senate constitution, if said approval does not occur at today's meeting.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

May 8, 1985

TO: Clerk of the Senate and Assembly
University of Minnesota Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly

FROM: Jeffery Moser, Student Senator

SUBJECT: Questions for the University President
for the Thursday, May 16, TCCA and University Senate Meeting

Please answer:

1. The governance process aside, what is your preference in the university's possible change of quarters to semesters and why?
2. Will you raise the status of Deputy Vice President of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics to full Vice President status? Explain your answer.
3. Why is it or is it not appropriate for the university to accept funding to do research for the United States Defense Department? or, in other words, what should be the university's appropriate process for decision making and action on research projects funded by sources that may have aims contrary to the mission of the University of Minnesota?

JRM:jrm

Motion to be read to the University Senate, May 16, 1985

Whereas the Board of Regents will meet on June 13-14, 1985 to review University investments in companies which do business with South Africa;

Whereas University President Keller has appointed a commission to assess the current, and to propose alternative strategies of investment with respect to South African Apartheid;

Whereas the Senate has previously demonstrated their support and commitment to this cause as reported by the Social Concerns Committee on April 20, 1982 ;

Be it resolved that the University Senate supports these initiatives to strengthen our divestment policy. We call upon the Board of Regents to include on their agenda of June 13-14 the university community proponents of divestment.

Be it further resolved that it is the sense of the Senate that the Regents should divest out of all corporations and financial institutions directly or indirectly doing business in or with the Republic of South Africa.

JAY COGGINS
Senator