

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE TO BE PRECEDED BY AN OPEN FORUM ON COMMITMENT TO FOCUS AND TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MEETING

Thursday, November 14, 1985
2:15 pm—Forum; 3:15 pm—Twin Cities Assembly;
3:40—University Senate

25 Law Center—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
Regents Room—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
Regents Conference Room—Waseca Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 208, including the President, 148 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee), and 59 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (105) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 139 affirmative votes at one meeting or 105 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 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. MINUTES FOR APRIL 18 AND MAY 16

Action (2 minutes)

II. SENATE OFFICERS

Action (3 minutes)

The Chairman of the Senate has designated the following as officers for 1985-86:

Parliamentarian—Josef L. Altholz
Abstractor and Clerk—Marilee Ward

III. COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, 1985-86

Action (3 minutes)

(These are in addition to those approved at the May 16, 1985, meeting.)

EDUCATIONAL POLICY Faculty: Sheila Corcoran. Students: Susan Collison, Thomas Daniels, Kathy Ebnet (UMM), Brenda Ellingboe, David Lutz.

SOCIAL CONCERNS Faculty: Michael Baizerman, Vasilikie Demos (UMM), John Dickey (chr.), Delbert Hastings, Timothy Knopp, Ileana Rodriguez, Palmer Rogers. Ex Officio: Patricia Mullen, Anna Shaver. Alumni: Jack Chestnut, Dorothy Cottrell, Emily Anne Staples. Civil Service: Lawrence Hendricks, Stephanie Oskie, 1 to be named. Students: Joe Burns, Teresa Doyle, John Kaatz, Judith Lifson, Dawn Linskens, Chris Moore, Karen Schultz.

BUSINESS & RULES Students: John Katz, David Lenander.

FINANCE Faculty at-large: Sally Jorgenson. Students at-large: Gerald Bauer, Patricia Thomas.

PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE ALLOCATION Students: Jay Blanchett, Tim Gilbert, Suzanne Herrick.

PLANNING Faculty: Carl Adams. Students: Julie Bates, Jeffrey Moser.

EXTENSION & COMMUNITY PROGRAMS Students: Barbara Block, Christine DeMoss, David Lenander, Aileen Teppener, Tracy Tomey.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION Faculty: Jane Plihal. Students: Miguel Carter, David Lykins, Elvis Muhaabwa, Elizabeth Roach.

LIBRARY Faculty: Thomas Noonan. Students: John Dumonceaux, Scott Fogelson, Tony Hill, Eric Moe.

RESEARCH Faculty: Robert Spencer. Students: Leslie Bisson, Todd Juneau, Audrey Spiess.

SUMMER SESSIONS Students: Michael Chevrier (UMM), Ron Kubik (UMM), Trond Stockenstrom, 2 to be named.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN Faculty appointed: Sara Evans, Eleanor Hoffman (UMD), Clarice Olien, Vera Schletzer (chr.), Janet Spector. Faculty elected: Miriam Cohn, Suzanne Sherry. Ex Officio: Patricia Mullen, Betty Robinett.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY APPEALS Students: Sandra Braman, David Lutz, Deborah Shands, Andrea Sheldon.

INFORMATION

CONSULTATIVE Students: Jeff Capouch (UMC), Patricia Gearrick, Sue Gruenes (UMW), Ron Kubik (UMM), Bruce Williams (UMD).

COMMITTEES Students: Ed Krenik, David Pietz (UMM), Lynn Rysman, Gerard Sordelet.

FINANCE Faculty: Charles Campbell (SCFA), Paul Gassman (Research), William Hanson (SCEP), Henricus Hogenkamp (PPSA), Wendell Johnson (UMC), Jack Merwin (SCC) (chr.). Students: Linda Hanson (SCC), Ron Kubik (UMM).

ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS Students: Katherine Cheolis, Mari-Beth Fuerstneau, Judy Grew.

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT Faculty: James Bowyer, Bruce Burnes, William Charlesworth, Jill Gidmark, Lyndel King, K. S. P. Kumar, Elaine May (chr.). Ex Officio: John Wallace. Students: Michele Aronson, Jill Gaudette, Kim Hunchis, Scott Macintire, Thea Stone.

SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED Faculty: Frank Beil (UMM), Terence Collins. Ex Officio: Sue Kroeger. Students: Rahn Workcuff, 1 to be named.

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES Faculty: Bert Ahern (UMM), John Clark, Wendell DeBoer (chr.), Fred A. Johnson, Richard L. Jones, Larry Kinney, Dianne Monson, Robert Pepin, Dennis Savaiano, Stephen Sylvester (UMC). Ex Officio: Gretchen Kreuter, James Preus. Students: Dave Arkin, Yvonne Landrus, Kevin Miller, Susan Pollonais, Shelly VanDenElzen.

ANIMAL CARE Faculty: Richard Goodrich, Edwin Haller (UMD), D. M. Hoppe (UMM), James Lauer, Gail Peterson (chr.), Richard Phillips, George Ruth, Patrick Schlievert, Leon Singer. Ex Officio: Patrick Manning. Student: Susan Bergsbaken.

USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH Faculty: Terence Ball, James Berry, Richard Bianco, Peter Carlyle, Robert Cipolle, Bruce Dalgaard, Alfred Dees, Amos Deinard, Cindy Emblom, Gerald Erickson, Bernadine Feldman, Stanley Finkelstein, Thomas Green, Megan Gunnar, Dale Hammerschmidt, Vernon Hendrix, Mark Herzberg, Richard Holloway, Robert Jeffery, Judith Lambrecht, Myer Leonard, Lawrence Lockman, Ruth Loewenson, Robert McCaa, Kenneth McClain, Philip McGlave, James Mitchell, Jeylan Mortimer, Robert Patterson, Riv-Ellen Prell, Thomas Rector, Leslie Robison, Robert Ross, John Savage, Jacqueline Shick, William Sonis, Richard Sykes, Yang Wang, W. Dixon Ward, Mary Ellen Wells, Absalom Yellin. Community Representatives: James Bracke, Michael Steenson, Craig Van Kampen. Students: Thomas Bodger, Richard Danila, Julie Deming, Lisa Hartman, Robin Johnson, Beth Kimball, John Lindholm, Mike Loveless, Patrick McCoy, Robert Miller, Becky Savageau, Karen Schultz, Jeff Sullivan, Steve Thompson.

IV. WELCOME AND ORIENTATION, PRESIDENT KELLER

(10 minutes)

V. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(5 minutes)

VI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR'S REPORT

(5 minutes)

VII. FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAIR'S REPORT

(5 minutes)

VIII. BUSINESS & RULES COMMITTEE

STUDENT GOVERNANCE AMENDMENT

(5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve an amendment to the Senate Constitution as follows: Article III, Section 6, University Senate Officers, label the existing text "a" and add 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."

INFORMATION:

The motion was approved 125 to 0 at the last Senate meeting. It is being presented once again to fulfill the requirement for a majority of the membership to favor a constitutional amendment at two successive meetings.

CAROLINE CZARNECKI
Chair

IX. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE
(10 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the present University Senate Rules, Article IV, Section 3, to change the membership requirements of the Animal Care Committee as set forth below: (Additions are underlined and deletions have lines through them.)

The committee shall be composed of not more than 10 12 members: 2 faculty/academic professional representatives of the Minneapolis Health Sciences; one faculty/academic professional member each from the College of Veterinary Medicine, College of Agriculture, College of Liberal Arts, College of Biological Sciences, Department of Environmental Health and Safety (either a member of the faculty, academic professional, or civil service staff), Duluth campus, Morris campus, a student, and ex-officio representation of the director of Research Animal Resources, and one person who is not affiliated with the University. The primary concerns of at least one member must be in a discipline not utilizing live animals other than humans for research purposes; if the stipulated membership does not include such representation, an additional member shall be added. Members shall be appointed by the president.

COMMENT:

To comply with revised NIH policy guidelines for grants and contracts on laboratory animal welfare, effective December 31, 1985, changes are proposed in the structure of the membership of the Senate (Operations) Committee on Animal Care.

SHIRLEY CLARK
Chair

X. MOTION BY I. T. SENATOR
STUDENT GOVERNANCE AMENDMENT
(5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate constitution be amended to make the student body president is the logical focal point for MSA activity, it seems only reasonable that the president should be able to participate directly and officially in the decision-making processes of the University Senate. This motion will also enable the president to be eligible for election to the Senate Consultative Committee.

COMMENT:

In an effort to centralize the authority of student government, and since the student body president is the logical focal point for MSA activity, it seems only reasonable that the president should be able to participate directly and officially in the decision-making processes of the University Senate. This motion will also enable the president to be eligible for election to the Senate Consultative Committee.

BETH EMANUELSON
I. T. Senator

XI. ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The All-University Honors Committee met on October 23, 1984, February 5, 1985, and April 16, 1985.

The committee recommended granting of three honorary degrees, twelve outstanding achievement awards, and one alumni service award. It approved the following building names:

Twin Cities Campus: The plant and soil building to be named Borlaug Hall, and the ice rink of Williams Arena to be named the John Mariucci Arena.

Duluth: The social sciences building to be named Cina Hall, and the gymnasium to be named Romano Gymnasium.

The committee also directed the chairman to apprise University units of the opportunities for University honors.

ROBERT THOMAS KUDRLE
Chair

XII. ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The principal activity of the University Animal Care Committee this year involved the inspection and evaluation of the University's several animal care and use programs in compliance with the requirements for grantee institutions of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Committee inspection teams inspected the animal care facilities of 10 different departments, including the Andrew Boss Laboratory for Meat Science, Food Science and Nutrition, Genetics and Cell Biology, Biochemistry, Animal Science, Veterinary Biology, Veterinary Pathobiology, Veterinary Medical Services, Psychology, and the Hormel Institute. The inspection teams' findings and recommendations were communicated both in conferences with and in letters to the departments. The fact that the laboratory animal care programs of the Health Sciences were fully accredited earlier this year by the American Association for the Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC) greatly aided the committee in its responsibility to NIH; AAALAC-accredited units need not also be evaluated by the institution's animal care committee since NIH accepts AAALAC accreditation in place of animal care committee evaluation. (The laboratory animal care program at the University of Minnesota-Duluth has been AAALAC accredited for some years and therefore it also did not require explicit evaluation by the committee.) The results of the inspections were collated at the committee's spring quarter meeting and formed the basis of the report to NIH to be submitted in June 1985.

In addition to the program of inspections for the NIH report described above, the Animal Care Committee held quarterly meetings at which various policy matters were taken up. For example, at its fall quarter meeting, the committee gave considerable time and attention to the complex issue of when it is advisable to construct totally new animal care facilities as opposed to renovating current facilities. One result of this discussion was that the committee formally recommended to the administration that the University take immediate steps to upgrade that space in the Phillips-Wangensteen Building originally intended for laboratory animal care facilities, and completely phase out the animal care facility in Lyon Labs. The committee also acted to have the University of Minnesota become an institutional member of the Scientists Center for Animal Welfare (SCAW). SCAW recognizes the indispensability of the use of animals in biomedical research and seeks the best possible reconciliation of human needs with concern for the needs and well-being of all animals. At its spring quarter meeting, the committee reviewed anticipated changes in NIH policy concerning the makeup and responsibilities of the animal care and use committees of awardee institutions, and moved to incorporate those changes into its committee procedures so that they will be fully operational by the time school resumes in the fall. In connection with these anticipated changes in NIH regulations, the committee strongly recommends that the University move toward obtaining AAALAC accreditation of all units involved in animal research over the next two years.

GAIL B. PETERSON
Chairman

XIII. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The committee met 6 times during the year to nominate new committee members and to consider changes in the present structure. The following tasks were accomplished:

1. Faculty and student members met separately to prepare slates of nominations to fill 1985-86 committee vacancies and then jointly to ratify the nominations and to recommend chairs.
2. Nominated for approval by the Assembly a nominating committee to prepare a slate of candidates for the Assembly Steering Committee election.
3. Conducted annual survey of senators' interest in committee service as well as soliciting nominations through *Brief* and by letters to deans, directors, and department heads, and chairs of all Senate and Assembly committees.
4. Formed subcommittees to review the activities and duties and responsibilities of the Extension & Community Programs, Summer Sessions, Placement Services, Housing, University Health Services, and Academic Freedom & Responsibility Appeals Committees. Reports were submitted at the winter quarter meeting and action was taken as appropriate for each committee.
5. Submitted a motion for action to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly to add as an ex officio member of the Honors Programs Committee the Director of Academic Honors Program in Student Affairs. This motion was approved at the Assembly's February 14, 1985, meeting.
6. Appointed the at-large faculty and alternate members to the Board of Student Publications as specified in the Board's Constitution.
7. Discussed a request to add a community representative and an additional ex officio member to the Extension & Community Programs Committee. Request was reviewed and a letter was sent explaining why request was not granted.
8. Discussed a request to add to the Senate structure a committee on information systems. After considerable debate it was agreed that certain other committees should be consulted about the impact of establishing such a committee. Letter reflecting committee's views was sent to Consultative Committee.

Shown on the chart below are proportions of new faculty/academic professional appointments to Senate and Assembly committees* by rank and sex, with comparable all-University figures:

Rank	Distribution by Rank		Distribution by Sex	
	Percent of New Committee Members of this Rank	Percent of Faculty/Aca Prof Members of this Rank	Percent of New Committee Members Who are Women	Percent of Faculty/Aca Prof Members Who are Women
Professor	45%	37%	14%	7%
Associate Professor	30	24	28	20
Assistant Professor	16	28	19	33
Instructor	0	8	0	38
Academic Professional	9	3	67	57
Total	100%	100%		

* includes appointments made by the President, Committee on Committees, and Consultative Committee

**figure reflects only those academic professionals who are eligible to serve on the Senate and its committees

PAUL QUIE
Chair

XIV. EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The Educational Development Committee met nine times during the 1984-85 academic year. Meetings held during the fall were devoted to planning for the 1984-85 competitions and to a review of history of the Educational Development Program (EDP) since its adoption by the University Senate in 1970.

With regard to the 1984-85 competitions, the following actions were taken:

1. A set of guidelines describing both the Educational Development and Small Grants Programs was approved for distribution to all members of the faculty during fall quarter. Two thematic concerns were adopted as issues of special importance in the guidelines for the EDP: a) proposals dealing with problems which arise from large class sizes, and b) proposals which are designed to enhance active involvement in learning on the part of students.
2. A decision was made to allocate funds available for educational development as follows:

a. Educational Development Program	\$225,000
b. Small Grants Program	70,000
c. Special Projects (e.g. faculty workshops and seminars, undergraduate assistantships)	57,650
Total Funds	\$325,650

3. The formula for allocating funds to various collegiate/campus units within the EDP for 1985-86 was modified to give greater weight to student credit hours generated and less weight to size of instructional budgets. The 1985-86 college campus authorizations are:

Agriculture	\$ 7,100	CLA	\$54,200
CBS	6,000	Management	9,000
Crookston	4,200	Med School	24,800
Dentistry	5,400	Morris	6,900
Duluth	27,500	Nursing	1,800
Education	11,600	Pharmacy	1,900
Forestry	1,200	SPH	2,800
GC	8,600	IT	38,100
Home Ec	3,500	CVM	3,900
Law	2,700	Waseca	3,700

The review of the history of the EDP led the committee into a lengthy discussion of the original goals of the program and the subsequent retrenchments in the University budget which have prevented the realization of those goals. It was noted that the EDP plan approved by the Senate in 1970 called for an allocation of 3% of the University's instructional budget to educational development activities by 1974-75 and thereafter. The plan further specified an even distribution of funds at the departmental, collegiate, and all-University levels with 1% allocated to each level. The three major objectives were stated as:

1. To emphasize in concrete fashion that the responsibility for educational development rests firmly at the three levels of academic responsibility: the department, the college, and centrally.
2. To provide a review procedure which will insure that resources assigned to educational development are used exclusively for that purpose. The review procedure will provide ample opportunity for advice and counsel at all levels to insure optimum use of these modest resources. It is assumed that the review procedure will only rarely provide percentages less than 1%; such cases will be considered failures of the idea of University educational development.

And most importantly:

3. To provide in a regular way for the development of the educational program of the University as a normal, unexceptional, systematic, and on-going responsibility of the University.

(University Senate Minutes, May 28, 1970)

The committee agreed that both the rationale and objectives of the plan are as valid in 1985 as they were in 1970. Consequently, at the meeting of November 30, 1984, the following motion was made and passed by unanimous vote:

The Committee on Educational Development endorses the Report of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (of May 28, 1970) and assumes it is operating under this document.

The committee noted that the current program does not conform to the plan adopted by the Senate in two important respects. First, the funding for the program has never approached that envisioned in the original plan. The highest level of funding for EDP was \$364,995 in 1976-77. The \$225,000 allocated for 1985-86 represents less than .1% of the total University instructional budget in contrast to the 3% which was the level of funding stated in the 1970 plan.

Second, the current EDP program includes a mechanism for allocation of funds only at the college/campus level. There has been no all-University level for the past three years and there has never been funding at the departmental level. Of course, if the total funding remains at its present level, the addition of all-University and department level programs seems unrealistic.

As an outgrowth of these discussions, a special subcommittee was established to develop recommendations for possible modifications in the 1970 plan and to suggest future guidelines for the EDP. That subcommittee has collected relevant information on the distribution of departments by "size" defined in terms of: a) number of FTE faculty, and b) total SCH generated/year. The subcommittee also designed a brief survey concerning the EDP which was mailed to deans and department chairs late in the spring quarter. Results of that survey are not available at this time.

The committee also reviewed reports of funding for a variety of educational development activities besides the EDP and Small Grants Program which we directly monitor. The Office of Educational Development has provided partial support for each of these programs during the past year. These include the:

- a. Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program
- b. Bush Sabbatical Program
- c. University Fellowship Program
- d. Office of International Programs
- e. Northwest Area Project

The total University funding of these programs was \$260,000 in 1984-85.

As in the past, a major responsibility of the committee was the screening of 19 college/campus applications received for consideration under the EDP and 72 applications received under the Small Grants Program. Modifications were requested in several proposals submitted under the EDP before authorizing release of funds. Forty Small Grants projects were funded in whole or in part. The total funds approved for Small Grants was \$69,607.

In summary, besides its usual duties, the Committee on Educational Development has begun an examination of the EDP with a view to differences between the original plan and the current program which has evolved over the past 15 years. That examination is incomplete at this time and will be a major task for the future.

JAMES S. TERWILLIGER
Chair

XV. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

Committee members were Jeffrey Frey, Lael Gatewood, Van Gooch, Lawrence Goodman, William Hanson, F. Gerald Kline (Chair), Gretchen Kreuter (Secretary, ex officio), Andrew Lee, Tom Lussenhop, David Lutz, Robert McCollister, Elaine May, David R. Thompson, John Wallace (ex officio), Gloria Williams, Mary Young.

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) had an active year. It met every second week to discuss the broad range of issues that were put before it.

The following activities comprise the bulk of the effort by the committee. In two instances, work was carried over from the previous year.

SCEP has undertaken an extensive evaluation of all the task force reports that were generated by committees appointed by President Magrath during the last two years. These reports were scrutinized for educational policy issues as well as issues related to the use of special ad hoc committees relative to the Senate governance structure. The issues outlined by SCEP were assembled from the task force reports and further culled to concentrate on central educational policy issues. This task will carry on into next year as they are now being compared with the overview that has been recently released by the President.

Carried over from the previous year's work was a faculty quality of instruction analysis presented by a subcommittee chaired by Professor Gloria Williams. This report and its recommendations were forwarded to the Senate Consultative Committee for discussion and further evaluation and action.

Also carried over from the previous year's work was a subcommittee project chaired by Professor Lael Gatewood concerning instructional computing at the University. This report was forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and to the new Assistant Vice President for Information Systems, Dr. Barbara Wolfe. An outgrowth of that report and other discussions with Dr. Wolfe and SCEP produced a working subcommittee to advise her on policy issues. This subcommittee, made up of members from the Library Committee, the Research Committee, and other interested parties in the University, is seen as a forerunner to a separate standing committee that may be recommended to the University Senate dealing with instructional and research computing and information needs at the University.

SCEP has also been following closely work by Associate Vice President Betty Robinett's committee on a potential semester teaching calendar as opposed to the present quarter system. SCEP made recommendations concerning three central issues having to do with a change, should it take place, and it released a document urging the overall University community to concentrate the debate around any potential change on the educational gains or losses as opposed to other important but secondary issues. SCEP took no stand pro or con on the quarter versus semester calendar.

The committee took a position on the debate put forward by Professors Swan and Turner concerning student membership in the Senate. In this instance SCEP firmly opposed the changes recommended in the Swan-Turner motion.

Another area of discussion and concern was the return of indirect cost recovery monies and the kinds of policies that might best be devised on that. SCEP supported the general proposition of more indirect cost recovery monies going back to the various units in the University. However, there was no decision on the formula that might be appropriate for such indirect cost recovery returns. This is being carried over to next year.

Another major activity that SCEP undertakes each year is the coordination of the Morse-Amoco Teaching Awards. Nine awards were presented this year by a subcommittee chaired by Professor Mary Young.

F. GERALD KLINE
Chair

XVI. HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The three Committees on the Use of Human Subjects in Research have carried out their responsibilities to the research community of the University by reviewing and processing research proposals as expeditiously as possible. The number of proposals submitted by investigators in the health sciences has remained fairly constant; applications from the social sciences have declined over the past few years for a variety of reasons. Much of the research from investigators in social science areas is now handled by expedited review procedures (one reviewer only) or is exempt from review and requires only screening by the committee administrative office (e.g., most survey research).

During 1984-85, the committee processed proposals as follows:

1. Re-reviews/Changes in Protocol		71	
2. New proposals (full Committee review)			
Medical	267		
Social	59	326	

(expedited—one reviewer)

Medical	127		
Social	89	216	
3. Renewals			905
4. Screened for Exemption (approximate number)			800

In addition, the committee was involved in five complaints against investigators. Three of these complaints were settled informally. Ad hoc committees were formed to investigate the other two, one of which was referred to the President's Office for final settlement.

The committees believe that information about their functions and the policy which requires all research involving human subjects to be submitted to them should be given more publicity and broader dissemination, and they hope to accomplish these goals in the coming year.

MEGAN GUNNAR
LAWRENCE A. LOCKMAN
JOHN J. SAUK, JR.
Chairpersons

XVII. LIBRARY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The committee met nine times, on October 19, November 16, December 10, January 25, February 22 (alone and jointly with the Automated Library System Proposals Review Committee), March 15, April 15, May 10, and May 20. The following issues were dealt with:

1. Appropriate and Flexible Faculty Status within Libraries

A resolution on this question was accepted by the Senate at its April 18 meeting.

2. Duluth Library Document Delivery

The Duluth Library Policies Committee at its meeting of November 1, 1984, passed the following resolution: "Resolved, that all faculty should be guaranteed equal access to all University library collections and services, and that arrangements to effect that access be expedited." The Senate Library Committee considered the general question of easier access to Twin Cities campus libraries collections for coordinate campus faculty. Options discussed by the committee were (a) inclusion of the coordinate campuses in an overall document delivery program (which would require funding, might conflict with current agreements with MINITEX, and might not be an improvement over MINITEX); (b) delivery by UMD vehicles which already visit the Twin Cities campus several times a week; (c) preferential treatment by MINITEX (which might require renegotiation of agreements with the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board and the MINITEX Advisory Board); (d) improved acquisition funding for the coordinate campus libraries.

An ad hoc committee was appointed to study the question and suggest a solution. This ad hoc committee reported to the Committee at its February 22nd meeting. It noted that some flexibility was possible within the MINITEX system, since it allows lending libraries to determine the term of loan for materials. Accordingly, the committee passed the following resolution:

"The Senate Library Committee recommends to the University Libraries-Twin Cities that they implement a standard policy allowing coordinate campus faculty and students access to all collections equivalent to [that available to] faculty and students, respectively, located on the Twin Cities campus. There should be no discrimination based on access method. Initial implementation should be through improved MINITEX services."

3. Government Publications Review

In accordance with the motion passed by last year's committee and reported in the Faculty Senate minutes for November 15, 1984, p. 19, University Librarian Eldred Smith appointed an outside committee to visit the Twin Cities Libraries and review the operations of the Government Publications division. The review committee, consisting of Nancy Cline and Diane Smith of the Pennsylvania State University Library, visited on April 23-25; the visit included a luncheon meeting with the Senate Library Committee and an afternoon meeting with interested faculty. Its recommendations were expected to be made by the end of May.

4. Library Automation

The committee met jointly with the Automated Library System Proposals Review Committee on February 22 to hear and discuss its report and recommendations concerning the finalists among the prospective vendors for the library automation system. On the recommendation of the committee, the University Librarian invited the three finalists to visit the University campus to give demonstrations open to faculty, students, and library staff. The schedules for these demonstrations were publicized in advance, and faculty members were invited to attend and send their comments to the University Librarian. Each vendor provided four demonstrations on the day of its visit: BLIS (Biblio-Techniques Library & Information System, not yet in operation in any University Library), April 9; LIAS (Library Information Access System, currently in operation at Pennsylvania State University), April 12; and NOTIS (Northwestern Online Total Integrated System, currently in operation at Northwestern University and several other locations), on April 17. Views of committee members regarding the merits of the three vendors were conveyed to the University Librarian by the Committee Chair, but no formal recommendation was made. On May 15 the University Librarian presented his recommendation in favor of the NOTIS system to the University Oversight Committee for Library Automation.

5. Faculty Carrels in Wilson Library

Stimulated by a letter to the University Librarian from a faculty member, the committee decided to take responsibility for recommending new procedures for allocation of faculty carrels. The following facts were noted in the committee's discussions:

a. There are 131 carrels designated as "faculty carrels," and some 2000 faculty members eligible to use them.

b. Carrels are currently allocated on a "first-come first-served" basis; with the current low turnover of carrels, people who have applied have to wait 12-18 months to get one. It is reported that some faculty members have waited for over 3 years. Some faculty members who would like to have a carrel are discouraged by the long waiting time from applying at all.

c. Some spot checks have indicated that at most one out of four carrels show any sign of being used by the faculty member to whom it is assigned; some remain vacant for an entire year while the faculty member is on leave and does not relinquish the carrel.

d. Some occupants of carrels use them as a quiet second office with a minimum of or no relation to the Library collection. Meanwhile there is such a shortage of space in the general reading room that users of the library sometimes cannot find a place to sit.

e. Faculty members in the humanities, for whom access to a library is essential for research and productivity, must travel long distances from their offices on the East Bank to Wilson Library where the humanities collections are housed. Their offices are not air conditioned.

f. Faculty members on the West Bank (in the Social Science and Management & Economics Buildings) face deteriorated and difficult working conditions resulting from a recent administrative decision, made on energy-conservation grounds, to seal the windows, remove the venetian blinds, and turn the air conditioning off on weekends and after 5 p.m. on weekdays. This may have led to increased demand for library carrels.

In view of the above considerations, it was decided to draft a questionnaire to be sent to the 131 current holders of faculty carrels and to the 25 persons on the waiting list. A notice was sent to BRIEF inviting other faculty members to fill out the questionnaire. A comprehensive summary of the questionnaire results was prepared by the library staff and studied by the committee, and selected respondents were invited to meet with the committee and present their views. The committee came to the conclusion that the fairest way to resolve the problem was through the sharing of carrels and their reassignment at the end of each academic year. Specifically, the following four principles were decided on:

1. Carrels should be reassigned at the end of each academic year. Carrels should be applied for by filling out a form at the beginning of each academic year specifying the reasons for the need of a carrel and (for current holders) indicating the published research that has been facilitated by use of the carrel. In this form, the applicant's special needs could be indicated.

2. Carrels should be shared among up to three persons, it being understood that users would arrange their schedules so as to use the carrels at different times.

3. Random selection would determine which carrels should be shared, with two qualifications: (a) persons on leave, carrying on full-time research, would not be required to share their carrels; (b) nonsmokers would not be required to share carrels with smokers.

4. There should be an opportunity for persons to apply as a group.

It is planned that these principles will be followed by the library staff in allocating faculty carrels in Wilson Library starting in the fall of 1985.

6. Space Needs on the Minneapolis Campus

The committee noted the following facts concerning physical library facilities on the Minneapolis campus:

1. There is severe inadequacy of study space for students. As a result, students (having no other choice) use the Wilson and Walter libraries as study halls, resulting in scarcity of seating space for users of the libraries.

2. There is at present insufficient space in Wilson Library for periodicals and government publications currently housed in Walter storage. The move to Wilson Library that took place in the fall of 1984, of the large portion of the general collection in the social sciences and humanities that had previously been housed in Walter storage—a move that has been greatly welcomed by faculty—has caused unavoidable space problems in Wilson Library, notably scarcity of seating capacity.

3. The sudden administrative decision made in March 1985 to move the I.T. libraries (other than the Mathematics library) into the Walter Library, given the deteriorated physical condition of the latter, has caused widespread concern among I.T. faculty.

4. The cancellation of the original plans to build a humanities tower on the West Bank, which had formed the basis for the decision to move the humanities collections to Wilson Library, has resulted in the highly anomalous situation that the one faculty group that is most dependent on the libraries for its research, teaching, and productivity, is the group to whom the libraries have become the least accessible. This has brought about a severe morale problem among humanities faculty.

In the light of the above considerations, the committee is presenting two accompanying resolutions for action by the Senate.*

7. Student Participation in the Committee's Activities

The committee, impressed and gratified by the participation of some of its student members, went on record as commending the active and constructive contribution of its student members.

JOHN S. CHIPMAN
Chair

*The Business and Rules Committee notes that the resolutions have been withdrawn.

XVIII. SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The Services for the Handicapped Committee met three times during the 1984-85 academic year.

The fall quarter meeting was used to distribute informational material on physical and programmatic access for persons with handicaps. These included copies of *Open Door Minds*, published by the Office for Students with Disabilities; "Your Responsibilities to Disabled Persons as a School or College Administrator" and "Your Rights as a Disabled Person," both published by the former Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; *Accommodating the Spectrum of Individual Abilities* by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; and copies of the University's "Equal Employment Opportunity Policy Statement and Affirmative Action Program for the Handicapped."

Three items left over from last year were identified for further effort.

1. Required physical examination for University employees. (This was found to be voluntary, and presents no problems.)

2. Insufficient numbers of adequate handicapped parking spaces on campus.

3. Progress with the college and department coordinator's network.

The issue of the legality of a tuition waiver for a group of individuals with one disability by the University, but not for individuals with other disabilities, was raised.

The committee worked on the parking problem during the year and was supplied with maps to indicate the location of handicapped parking locations on the Twin Cities campus. Efforts by Parking Services are in progress to increase the handicapped total parking to the state-recommended ration of 1 to 50, not counting on-street metered spots as handicapped locations. Progress reports were made at the winter and spring quarter meetings.

The tuition waiver for visually impaired residents occupied much time. Mr. Alan Greenbaum collected documents to summarize the information and history on this issue. The committee is working with the Office of Student Financial Aid, the University Attorney's Office, and the Minnesota State Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped to resolve this problem in a fair and orderly manner. Jack Merwin, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, has been kept informed of our efforts on this issue.

A sample survey of the coordinator's network was conducted for the St. Paul campus by means of a questionnaire. The response indicates a need for efforts to increase the effectiveness of the network.

The committee passed a resolution that departments of the University be encouraged to purchase accessible adaptations or versions of equipment that are purchased with University funds for use by students in general. This will be forwarded for consideration by the entire Senate.

The committee requested that the Senate Consultative Committee establish a subgroup of the college coordinator's network as the program access committee for the University. The committee discussed the idea of a central service in the state to provide taping services for the handicapped rather than each individual school making the duplicative efforts.

BILL REMPEL
Chair

XIX. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

The committee reviewed a report on the 1984 Consolidated Fund Drive. The Senate had previously approved the committee's recommendation that the number of participating organizations in the Consolidated Fund Drive be expanded and charged the Social Concerns Committee to monitor any problems that might arise as a result of those changes. It was reported to the committee that the University administration encountered no complications due to the new procedures, although there was apparently some confusion in the minds of many as to the way in which the donor card should be filled out. None of the organizations participating in the Consolidated Fund Drive had any major complaints about the administration of the drive, but most organizations reported that donations were reduced.

The committee reported its position concerning divestiture of University investments in South Africa to the Senate at its May, 1985, meeting prior to the Senate vote on this issue. The committee strongly endorsed divestiture.

An outstanding piece of business concerning which only preliminary discussion has taken place is the issue of the University providing veteran's preference in its civil service hiring practices, as does the State of Minnesota.

SHELDON GOLDSTEIN
Chair

XX. SUMMER SESSIONS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1984-85

In the 1984-85 academic year the responsibility for Summer Session was moved to the Division of Continuing Education and Extension. In addition, Steven Schomberg became the new Director of Summer Session and Assistant Dean of Continuing Education and Extension.

The primary discussions of the year involved the question and implementation of in-loading Summer Session and the effects of a change to a semester system. It was noted that in the summer of 1985 that some CLA and Education courses would be in-loaded. With regard to a semester system, it was not felt that this would pose a difficulty for Summer Session.

The responsibility of the Summer Session committee and how it could be utilized in the future was also a topic of discussion.

E. DAN DAHLBERG
Chair

XXI. BUSINESS & RULES COMMITTEE

Information

The Business and Rules Committee reports that Annual Reports for 1984-85 were received from all committees of the University and Faculty Senates except the Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee (Charlotte Striebel, Chair), the Planning Committee (Mark Brenner, Chair), and the Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee (Robert Sloan, Chair).

CAROLINE CZARNECKI
Chair

XXII. 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.

XXIII. OLD BUSINESS

XXIV. 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.

XXV. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

WILLIAM H. ALDERMAN

1885-1985

HENRY E. ALLEN

1902-1985

PETER BUSA

1914-1985

JOHN N. CAMPBELL

1892-1985

STRATHMORE R. B. COOKE

1907-1985

WILLIAM HART

1892-1984

REUBEN L. HILL

1912-1985

DONALD A. MARTINDALE

1915-1985

RICARDO A. NARVAEZ

1921-1985

DONALD E. OLSON

1922-1985

ALLAN D. PETERSEN

1924-1985

DONALD R. TORBERT

1908-1985

XXVI. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Thursday, November 14, 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. MINUTES FOR APRIL 18 AND MAY 16
(2 minutes)

II. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1985-86
Action (2 minutes)

(These are in addition to those approved at the May 16, 1985 meeting.)

FACULTY AFFAIRS Faculty: James Berry, Mark Brenner, William Boylan (chr.), Charles Campbell, David Davis, Margery Durham, Roland Guyotte (UMM), Royce Hanson, Leonid Hurwicz, Harvey Keynes, Geoffrey Maruyama, Timothy Nantell, Anne Pick, Marian Pour-EI, Paul Quie, W. Phillips Shively. Ex Officio: Harold Bernard, Burton Paulu, Betty Robinett. Graduate Assistant: Eugene Ronning.

JUDICIAL Faculty: Eugenia Taylor, Paul Waibel.

TENURE Students: Barbara Block, 1 to be named.

III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR'S REPORT
(5 minutes)

IV. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CHAIR'S REPORT
(5 minutes)

V. TENURE COMMITTEE CHAIR'S REPORT
(10 minutes)

VI. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE
Thursday, Nov. 14, 1985
(immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting)

The voting membership of the University Student Senate totals 59, including the Student Consultative Committee.

I. MINUTES OF MAY 16
Action (2 minutes)

II. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1985-86
Action (5 minutes)

III. OFFICERS, 1985-86
Action (2 minutes)

The Chair of the University Student Senate has designated the following as officers for 1985-86:

Clerk—Marilee Ward
Treasurer—Patricia Gearrick

IV. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT
(10 minutes)

V. OLD BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS
(2 minutes)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

April 18, 1985

Semester System

Two motions to be made to the faculty senators of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly on 18 April 1985, replacing a motion made on 15 March 1985, to the same general purpose, for consideration by the Faculty Senate:

MOTION 1:

That the question of change to a semester system be submitted to a vote of all regular faculty members on the Twin Cities campus of the University.

MOTION 2:

Be it resolved that the present state of mind of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly would be to disapprove change to a semester system unless the vote of the regular faculty members of the Twin Cities campus reaches a 55% or greater majority of those voting in favor of the change.

INFORMATION:

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs believes that a change to a semester system is so momentous that it should not be made unless the reasons for the change are considerably stronger than those for retaining the quarter system. Since every faculty member is likely to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of the respective systems differently, a vote of all regular faculty members affected by such a change is the most reasonable, clear, and reliable way to determine the collective faculty judgment of the relative merits and desirability of the two systems. A majority vote of 55% of those voting would give reasonable assurance of a genuine faculty preference for this major change that a simple majority vote would not.

THOMAS CLAYTON
Chair

Which academic calendar do you prefer?

33/prefm 358
added
Final
Final

Those who prefer quarters:

EARLY SEPT.-EARLY MAY	64.1	64.7
LATE SEPT.-JUNE	25.4	25.3
DON'T KNOW	10.5	10.0

Those who prefer semesters:

EARLY SEPT.-EARLY MAY	75.3	77.4
LATE SEPT.-JUNE	18.3	16.6
DON'T KNOW	6.5	5.9

Those who have attended semester institution:

PREFER QUARTER	51 %	50.0
PREFER SEMESTER	38 %	40.2
DON'T KNOW	11 %	9.8

Those who have not attended semester institution:

PREFER QUARTER	70 %	69.4
PREFER SEMESTER	23 %	23.3
DON'T KNOW	7 %	7.3

Those who have attended semester institution:

QUARTER BEST TO REACH EDUCATIONAL GOALS	34.3 %	36.3
SEMESTER BEST TO REACH EDUCATIONAL GOALS	31.4 %	31.9
DON'T KNOW	34.3 %	31.9

Those who have not attended semester institution:

QUARTER BEST TO REACH EDUCATIONAL GOALS	55 %	55.4
SEMESTER BEST TO REACH EDUCATIONAL GOALS	16.4 %	16.9
DON'T KNOW	28.6 %	27.7

How informed are you about this issue?

	PREFER QTR.		PREFER SEM.		DON'T KNOW	
VERY INFORMED	55 %	56.5	41 %	39.1	4 %	4.3
INFORMED	48 %	44.1	42 %	47.1	10 %	8.8
SOMEWHAT INFORMED	62 %	61.4	32 %	32.4	6 %	6.2
UNINFORMED	71 %	71.4	18 %	18.0	11 %	10.5

Term Preferred

	Thesis Only	1-5 Credits	Over 5 Credits	Grad Student
QUARTER	11.1	56.8	65.2	41.7
SEMESTER	77.8	40.5	25.8	50.0
DON'T KNOW	11.1	2.7	9.0	8.3

Special thanks to people who made this survey possible:

Carlos Enriquez

Mary Jane Plunkett

Linda Hanson

Tim Pratt

Roger Harrold

Jeff Rugel

Thomas Jackson

Mark Sova

Claudia Kanter

Bruce Vahn

Liz Kranz

Allison Vanstone

John Lindstrom

Kimberly

Mike Loveless

Caroline

Ron Matross

Name: _____

Calendar Survey 1985

Attempts The opinion of the student body is that the

1 6 University should remain under the quarter

2 7 system. The Student Concerns Committee of the

3 8 MSA Forum conducted a survey of the Twin Cities

4 9 student body and discovered a very strong

5 10 preference for the quarter system and an early

 start-early finish calendar. Our sample of 500

 represents the winter of 1984-85 Twin Cities

 student body with the exception of law students

 since they already are on the semester system.

 Having the responses of 358 individuals gave us a

 70 percent return.

1. Are you registered at the U this quarter? _____

(1.) yes (2.) no

98.6 1.1

2. How many credits are you taking? _____

(1.) thesis only (2.) 1-5 cr. (3.) 6 or more

2.8 11.0 86.2

3. What is your age? _____

Mean: 24.4 years Median: 22.6

4. What is your gender? (1.) M (2.) F _____

53.4 46.0

5. What college are you in? _____

30-Ag	4.0	10-BiolSci	.6	05-DenHyg	
04-Dent	1.9	06-Educ	3.1	31-For.	1.2
19-G.C.	5.6	32-HmEc	2.8	17-CLA	36.4
02-Mgmt	3.1	11-MedSc	1.9	12-MedTech	.9
25-Mort Sci	.6	14-Nurs	.6	23-OT	.3
15-Pharm	.6	21-PT	.6	20-PubHlth	.3
07-IT	12.5	18-UC	.6	03-VetMed	.9
				08-Grad	18.7

6. What year in school are you? _____

Mean: 3.9 Median: 3.7

7. Where do you live during the academic year? _____

(1) dorm 14.2

(2) frat/sor 3.1

(3) parents' home 20.7

(4) apt. near campus 14.8

(5) apt. away from campus (commute) 19.0

(6) house near campus 5.3

(7) home away from campus (commute) 22.9

(8) other

8. Do you consider yourself a commuter student? _____
 (1) yes (2) no
 67.9 31.3
9. Do you have any post secondary school experience _____
 besides the "U"? (1) yes (2) no
 48.2 51.3
10. Have you ever attended a semester schedule _____
 institution? (1) yes (2) no
 32.8 67.2
11. Before this phone survey had you heard that _____
 the University is considering a switch to a
 semester system? (1) yes (2) no
 65.7 32.1
12. How well informed on this issue do you consider _____
 yourself?
 (1) very informed 7.4
 (2) informed 9.6
 (3) somewhat informed 41.1
 (4) uninformed 37.7
 (5) don't know 4.2
13. Which of the following academic term systems _____
 would you prefer?
 (1) A quarter system involving 3 terms 62.4
 of 10 weeks each.
 (2) A semester system involving 2 terms 28.7
 of 14-15 weeks each.
 (3) Don't know 8.9
14. Why would you prefer that system?

Please answer the following questions as they apply
 to you, using either the semester or quarter system.

15. Under which system would you best be able _____
 to study a variety of subjects?
 (1) quarter (2) semester (3) don't know
 78.6 12.9 8.6
16. Under which system would you best be able to _____
 study a particular subject in depth?
 (1) quarter (2) semester (3) don't know
 13.7 73.2 13.1

17. Under which system would you best be able to reach your educational goals? _____
(1) quarter (2) semester (3) don't know
49.4 22.0 28.5

18. Under which system would you best be able to pay for your tuition and books? _____
(1) quarter (2) semester (3) don't know
29.1 28.3 42.6

19. Which of the following academic calendar systems would you prefer? _____
(1) A system beginning early September and ending in early to mid-May? 68.8
(2) A system beginning in late September and ending in early June? 21.9
(3) Don't know. 9.3

Please answer the next questions as they apply to you, using either the early start/early finish system or the late start/late finish system.

20. Under which system would you best be able to find employment during the academic year? _____
(1) early start/early finish 49.6
(2) late start/late finish 11.8
(3) don't know 38.6

21. Under which system would you best be able to find employment during the summer? _____
(1) early start/early finish 78.6
(2) late start/late finish 6.2
(3) don't know 15.2

Please answer the following statements as they apply to you with: agree, disagree, or no opinion.

22. Taking a broad variety of courses is important to me. _____
(1) agree (2) disagree (3) no opinion
84.2 9.6 6.2

23. Intense study in a particular area is important to me. _____
(1) agree (2) disagree (3) no opinion
80.2 10.8 9.1

24. Obtaining summer employment is important to me. _____
(1) agree (2) disagree (3) no opinion
69.4 16.0 14.6