

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**  
**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES**  
**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

**November 18, 1982**

The first meeting of the University Senate for 1982-83 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 18, at 3:40 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 134 voting members of the faculty, 49 voting members of the student body, 7 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 11 nonmembers.

President C. Peter Magrath presided.

**I. MINUTES FOR MAY 20**

**Action (3 minutes)**

*Approved*

**II. SENATE OFFICERS**

**Actions (3 minutes)**

The chairman of the Senate has designated the following as officers for 1982-83:

Parliamentarian—John Cound  
Abstracter and Clerk—Marilee Ward

*Approved*

**III. SCHEDULED MEETINGS DURING 1982-83**

**Information**

University Senate meetings are scheduled as follows: November 18, February 17, May 5, and May 19.

*Accepted*

**IV. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1982-83**

(These are in addition to those approved at the May 20, 1982, Senate meeting)

**Action (5 minutes)**

**EDUCATIONAL POLICY** Faculty: Lael Gatewood, Michael Root, Gloria Williams. Students: Fritz Herrman, Keith Jacobson (UMM), Michael Keck, Jerry Kohns, Martin Smith

**SOCIAL CONCERNS** Faculty: Sheldon Goldstein, Peter Jordan. Students: Katherine Gray, Anne Hunt, William McMonigal, John Nettle, Chidi Ogolo, Patricia Webster, Rhonda Wiitanen

**BUSINESS & RULES** Faculty: John Cound (ex officio), Bright Dornblaser, Bruce Nord (UMM), Marilee Ward (ex officio). Students: Christina Anderson, Mary Anderson

**PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE ALLOCATION** Faculty: Donald McTavish, Barbara Stuhler. Students: Jeffrey Goodrich, Forrest Seymour, 1 to be named

PLANNING Faculty: Richard Christenson (UMC), Bernadine Feldman, Chet Grygar (ex officio), Nils Hasselmo (ex officio), Al Linck (ex officio), Frank Sorauf, 1 to be named. Students: Steve Ansolabahr, Rhonda Wiitanen

EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS Faculty: Ken Egertson, Jim Perry. Students: William McKinney, Galen O'Connor, Alan Rosenauer, 2 to be named

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION Faculty: John Haygreen, Maurice Kreevoy. Students: Jane Friedmann, Scott Hanson, Jeffry Moser, Minh v. Tong

LIBRARY Faculty: Marion Brooks-Wallace, Reynold Dahl, George D'Elia, Brian Job. Students: Anthony Ayinde, Julie Iverson, Brian Thornton, 1 to be named

RESEARCH Students: Terry Brault, Mark Lacy, Ron Pobiel

SUMMER SESSIONS Faculty: Donald Harriss (UMD). Students: Kathryn Susag, 4 to be named

ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY APPEALS Faculty: Mary Corcoran, Marion Pour-El. Students: Kenneth Hayes, Catherine Klima, Mary Ann Lautzenhiser, William Nereson

*Approved*

### **INFORMATION:**

ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS Faculty: George Blake, William Carey (ex officio), Stuart Fenton, Al Linck (ex officio), Robert Odegard (ex officio), Stephen Roszell (ex officio), Lewis Wannamaker, Gayle Yates. Students: Wendy Harms, Marie Jarvis, Richard Slagle. Alumni: M. Elizabeth Craig, D. Wayne Jimmerson, Wallace Salovich, Ronald Simon, Penny Winton

ANIMAL CARE Student: Marilyn Peterson

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT Students: Gregory Sebald, 4 to be named

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES Faculty: Cleon Melsa (UMC) Students: Susan Granquist, Katherine Gray, Renee Rostner, Marisa Mackey, 1 to be named

SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED Faculty: Richard McDermott

SOCIAL CONCERNS Civil Service: Anne Knapp. Alumni: L. Steven Goldstein

EXTENSION & COMMUNITY PROGRAMS Alumni: Doug Ewald

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Students: Jane MacDonald, Nancy Nyberg (student chair), Lance Redfield (UMM), Dick Schwartz, 3 to be elected

CONSULTATIVE Faculty: M. Virginia Fredricks (81-84), Phyllis Freier (82-85), John Howe (81-84), Marvin Mattson (UMC) (81-84), Douglas Pratt (80-83), Paul Quie (80-83), Wesley Sundquist (82-85), Patricia Swan (chr.) (80-83), W. Donald Spring (UMM) (81-84), John Turner (ex officio). Students: Ron Bonaguidi (UMC), Barry Hogen (UMM), Dawn Hull (UMD), Anne Hunt, Julie Iverson, Dennis Kronebusch (UMW), Dave Lenander (student chair), Rick Linden, Kathy Watson.

FINANCE Faculty: Andrew Baily (Physical Plant & Space Allocation), Walter H. Johnson (at-large), F. Gerald Kline (Educational Policy), Thomas Scott (at-large), W. Donald Spring (coordinate campus representative), Wesley Sundquist (chr.) (Consultative), Anthony Zahareas (Research), 1 to be named (Faculty Affairs). Students: Patrick Gaughan (at-large), Rick Linden (Consultative), Paul Schulte (at-large), 1 to be named (Planning)

*Accepted*

## **V. PRESIDENT'S UNIVERSITY POLICY AGENDA 1982-83 (15 minutes)**

Upon the recommendation of the University Senate, the president is called upon to submit an annual policy agenda for the institution. This report responds to the Senate's request by outlining those major policy issues that, in the opinion of the president, warrant particularly close scrutiny during the upcoming academic year.

I. 1983-85 BIENNIAL REQUEST

The Board of Regents recently approved the 1983-85 biennial request. The specific items contained in the request were recommended by the budget executive after meeting with collegiate and unit heads as well as with faculty consultative groups. Over the next two-year period, the University will be seeking increases (other than for salaries) of approximately \$49 million. The number one priority will be faculty salary increases, although no specific increase figures will be recommended until consultations with interested parties are completed.

As in previous years, various central officers and faculty members as well as the president will devote considerable attention to securing the legislative request items.

II. 1983-85 CAPITAL REQUEST

The state's recent fiscal problems have prevented the sale of construction bonds even for projects that have already been approved by the state legislature. This has resulted in a delay in the construction of several University facilities. Consequently, the University's plan for capital construction was readjusted, with first priority being accorded to those projects for which appropriations have already been approved, but for which no bonds have been sold. This totals \$36 million. A second list of priorities, totalling \$52 million, has been identified as "critical" and will be presented to the 1983 legislature. Finally, we will also present the legislature a list of other "pressing" capital needs involving \$39 million in requested facilities and improvements.

III. CONSTRUCTION OF UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS

The reluctance of the state to sell construction bonds has exerted its most dramatic effects upon the University's Hospitals project. This is both because of the size of the facility and the consequences of continuing inflation. Several options have been examined, and at least one—the private financing of the facility—had to be rejected. In October, the regents approved additional short-term borrowing for continued construction of the facility and in November a plan will be presented to accommodate the total funding of the project.

IV. PLANNING ACTIVITIES

The second cycle of the planning process will commence during the fall of 1983. This round will build upon the framework and the priorities developed during the initial planning cycle. The focus will be upon the reexamination and rewriting, where necessary, of unit plans so as to ensure a compatibility between programmatic objectives and available resources. Specific attention will be given to the following efforts:

- 1) Refining and implementing unit priorities;
- 2) Generating budget flexibility;
- 3) Improving the efficient use of resources; and
- 4) Implementing institutional priorities identified during the initial planning cycle, namely,
  - promoting the development and transfer of high technology;
  - facilitating the use of computation and communication technology;
  - improving the student learning environment; and
  - expanding international education opportunities.

To facilitate the above objectives, the institutional planning statement will be updated, reflecting changes in the economic environment that have taken place since its initial adoption.

V. ADOPTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

For the past 22 months, negotiations have taken place between representatives of the Board of Regents and the unionized faculty at UMD and UMW. Such negotiations will continue as long as necessary to reach a mutually acceptable contract between the University and those faculty. Much progress has been made to date, although final agreement has not been reached on compensation.

VI. COMPLETION OF TASK FORCE REPORTS

As part of an experiment in joint Senate/administration policy analysis, a committee

was appointed to recommend steps that will facilitate the scholarly activities of the faculty. Among other issues, this committee, which is chaired by Professor Jack Merwin, is examining compensation, workload, clerical support, facilities, equipment, and similar factors that affect all faculty. A final report is expected during spring quarter, 1983.

#### VII. GRADUATE SCHOOL PROGRAM REVIEWS FOR 1982-83

1982-83 Program Reviews: American Legal Institutions, Anatomy, Biochemistry (2 departments), Business Taxation, Chemical Physics, Family Social Science (with CSRS), Germanic Philology, History of Science and Technology, Medical Microbiology, Microbiology, Pharmacology, Physiology, and Plant Pathology (with CSRS).

See Abstract of discussion.

### VI. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH COMMITTEE POLICY AND PROCEDURES AMENDMENTS (15 minutes)

#### MOTION:

That the Senate approve the amendments to the Regents' policy on standards and procedures related to the use of human subjects in research outlined below.

#### INFORMATION:

The following proposed amendments were approved unanimously by the Research Committee of the Senate on October 7, 1982.

Copies of the full document are available from Anne Munro (373-9895); only those portions for which amendments are proposed are printed below.

Two editorial changes have been incorporated in the proposed revised document:

(1) The Executive Secretary is now called an Administrative Assistant, and (2) male and female references have been eliminated.

**Deleted portions have lines run through them; additions are underlined.**

#### THE BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY ON STANDARDS & PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH

approved June 8, 1973; revision approved July 12, 1974; amended April 9, 1976; amended September 8, 1978

- I. Statement of policy of the University of Minnesota with regard to the use of human subjects in scientific research
- II. Principles governing the use of human subjects in research and summary of procedure
- III. Procedure for implementation of policy
  - A. Scope of activities to be covered by procedure
  - B. Important elements of the procedure
    1. Administrative structure, Committee on the use of Human Subjects in Research
    2. Panels and subcommittees
    3. ~~Executive Secretary~~ Administrative Assistant to the committee
  - C. Activities within the proposed structure
    1. Research protocol
    2. Conduct of research that falls within the scope of an approved research protocol or an expedited or screened for exempt status procedure
    3. Individual prior review of ~~non-protocol~~ research
    4. Application for review and approval of ~~non-protocol~~ research

5. Appeals of subcommittee or panel decisions
6. Complaints against investigators

## PART I

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

The present statement of policy was approved July 12, 1974, amended April 9, 1976, and amended September 8, 1978, by the University of Minnesota Board of Regents. The original statement of policy was adopted in November, 1966, and a revision of it approved in November, 1972.

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

1. To safeguard and respect fully the rights and welfare of the individuals ~~who are~~ involved as human subjects in such research
2. To accomplish this with as little obstruction as necessary to the furtherance of scientific progress through continuing investigation of ~~man in his environment~~ human beings in their environment
3. To assume an institutional responsibility for the implementation of these two objectives. In performance of this institutional responsibility, the University of Minnesota will:
  1. Provide for collegial review prior to initiation of all research involving human subjects (see Part III for a definition of these terms) carried on in the University or under its auspices through a Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research composed of institutional associates of the investigator who are independent of the investigator and who have no vested interest in the specific project of research. Collegial review will involve determination of:
    - A. The rights and welfare of the individuals involved as human subjects of research
    - B. The appropriateness of the methods used to secure an adequately informed consent for research involving human subjects
    - C. The risks of the research, excluding the effects of applying knowledge gained in the research
    - D. The potential benefits of the research
  2. Exercise continuing supervision of such research involving human subjects, to deal with changes in the procedures or emergent problems of the research which may alter the research with respect to the criteria for collegial review and prior approval
  3. Provide guidance and advice for the investigators on safeguarding the rights and welfare of the human beings involved in such research
  4. Assure that provision is made for professional attention and facilities to provide for the safety and welfare of human beings involved in such research
  5. Make and keep written records of all collegial reviews and decisions on the use of human subjects in such research, and require and keep documentary evidence of informed consent by human subjects of research where required

\* Human subjects include a living human conceptus. There shall be no "use of a living human conceptus for any type of scientific, laboratory research or other experimentation except to protect the life or health of the conceptus" and except in a situation where the proposed research or experimentation has been shown, by "verifiable scientific evidence, to be harmless to the conceptus." "Living" as used in this paragraph means "the presence of life, such as movement, heart or respiratory activity, the presence of electroencephalographic or electrocardiographic activity." (Minn. Stat. 145.421, Subd. 3 and Minn. Stat. 145.422, Subd. 1 and 2)

## PART II

### PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH AND SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES

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

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

#### PRINCIPLE 1.

Research procedures shall not involve the exposure of subjects to a physical or psychological or social risk that is appreciably greater than we normally take in the conduct of our affairs.

#### PRINCIPLE 2.

Research procedures shall not involve the disclosure of confidential information to other than the investigator(s) and research staff. ~~Procedures involving these prescribed features may be used only if appropriate precautions are taken. The precautions to be taken must be approved for a specific research project by an appropriate review Committee.~~

All research involving human subjects shall be classified into three categories and given different forms of review based upon the research procedures involved.

#### A. CATEGORIES OF RESEARCH

~~For purposes of review, research projects will be divided into two categories:~~

##### 1. Screened for Exempt Status:

Procedures previously approved by the Regents as those for which the risks to participants are less than or equivalent to those encountered in daily life and for which informed consent and prior review are not therefore required, or procedures for which prior review may infringe upon the rights of the investigator. (Procedures proposed for this category are listed in Appendix A.)

##### 2. Research Protocol/Expedited Review:

Those projects with research designs or types frequently used, and that either satisfy Principles 1 and 2 or embody precautions sufficient to justify general and continuing approval (Procedures proposed for this category are listed in Appendix B.), and

##### 3. Full Review:

All other research projects not included within the previous two categories.

##### 2. Those projects which involve the use of other than standard and accepted research designs and procedures, or which do not satisfy the requirements of Principles 1 and 2 and do not embody precautions which have received general and continuous approval by the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research as satisfying the purposes of Principles 1 and 2.

#### B. APPROVAL OF SPECIAL CATEGORIES NOT REQUIRING FULL REVIEW

~~In addition, a large number of activities involve human subjects at no risk appreciably greater than that encountered in daily life. It is expected that for projects of this type, the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research will develop a series of methodological protocols that specify situations involving little or no risk to human subjects. Once these protocols are approved by the Committee, they will be distributed to all departments and divisions at the University of Minnesota and each department and division has the option of submitting under these protocols. Individual projects that fall within the scope of a methodological protocol will not require independent review by~~

\* The concept of "research" and "human subject" is explicated in Part III of the procedure under Secion A, "Scope of activities to be covered by procedure." "Risks of daily life" are considered to be those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.

a review panel. Investigators will file a description of the project with the Executive Secretary to the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research for final administrative approval.

1. The Regents of the University of Minnesota may modify the Screened for Exempt Status list at any time. The University-wide Committee is expected to make recommendations to the Regents; the Administrative Assistant is expected to bring changes in the Department of Health and Human Services list of exempt categories of research to the attention of the University-wide Committee. (The first such list is presented in Appendix A.)
2. Research Protocol/Expedited Review projects shall be those that include projects with risks equivalent to those in daily life and for which there is substantial experience, thereby justifying less than complete Committee review. These shall be specified on a "Research Protocol/Expedited Procedures List" that can be modified by the decision of the University-wide Committee. (A preliminary list of such procedures is attached to this section as Appendix B.)

There are two sources of procedures for this list. First, the Department of Health and Human Services expedited list. It will be the responsibility of the Administrative Assistant to keep the Committee informed of changes in this list.

It is expected that for projects of the first type, ~~Second~~, interested investigators or departments are encouraged to develop a series of departmental summary protocols covering descriptions of specific research designs for research activities which involve methods procedures, and/or techniques unique to that a department or research program. Once these research program protocols are approved by an appropriate ethical review panel, individual projects that fall within the scope of a research program protocol will not require independent review by a review panel. As specified below, they may be approved following an expedited review by the Committee Chair or an experienced Committee member; a review panel decision is required for disapproval. Investigators will file a description of the project with the designated departmental reviewer who will forward the material to the Executive Secretary to the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research for final administrative approval.

### C. IMPLEMENTATION OF REVIEW

1. Projects screened for exempt status may be initiated after informing the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research of the intent to engage in research and receipt of notification that the procedure falls within an exempt from prior review category.
2. Projects that use procedures on the research protocol/expedited procedures list (singly or in combination with each other or with those on the screened for exempt status list) or modifications in projects previously approved by the Committee may be approved by a decision of a subcommittee chair or any experienced Committee member (at least one year of experience on the Committee) designated by the subcommittee chair. Disapproval of such projects requires a subcommittee decision.
3. Projects that do not fall within the scope of screened for exempt procedures or a research protocol/expedited review procedure must be submitted to a review committee for individual prior review and approval before the research is initiated. Such projects will be evaluated with regard to the rights and welfare of subjects at risk in the research. If the research procedure does not satisfy Principles 1 and 2, the risks must be weighed against the scientific importance and potential benefits of the research. In such a case the overriding importance of a piece of research may justify exceptions to the normal restrictions.

An investigator may in any case request that his a project receive individual prior review. Thus all projects and activities for which individual prior review is required by funding agencies will be subject to such review. Where standards and criteria more stringent than those specified in Principles 1 and 2 are prescribed by a funding

agency, the reviewing committee will, to satisfy requirements of the funding agency, use the standards and criteria so prescribed in evaluating the research or activities in question.

### PART III

#### PROCEDURE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY

- A. SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES TO BE COVERED BY PROCEDURE (unchanged)
- B. IMPORTANT ELEMENTS OF THE PROCEDURE (unchanged)
- C. ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE

##### 1. Research Protocol

- A. Content (unchanged)
- B. Approval of Research Protocols

... under this research protocol until the issue is resolved.

~~Methodological Protocols are developed and approved by the Executive Subcommittee on Policy, subject to review procedures in III.B.2.B above.~~

##### C. Research Procedure ~~Protocol~~ Handbooks

~~It shall be the duty of the Executive Secretary Administrative Assistant to maintain current protocol research procedure handbooks listing all approved methodological and departmental summary research protocols, expedited and screened for exempt status procedures.~~

##### 2. Conduct of Research that Falls within the Scope of an Approved Research Protocol or an Expedited or Screened for Exempt Status Procedure

It is assumed that investigators will develop research projects on the basis of scientific merit, and before conducting research with human subjects consult the ~~"Protocol Research Procedure Handbook"~~ to determine whether or not a research procedure falls within the scope of one or more of the screened for exempt status or expedited procedures or an existing research protocol.

In the event an investigator feels that all aspects of the research procedure fall within the scope of one or more screened for exempt status procedures, he or she is allowed to proceed only after informing the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects and notification that it has been determined that the proposed research procedures do fall within the screened for exempt status procedures. Such notification shall be provided the investigator within two weeks.

In the event that an investigator feels that his procedure falls within the scope of existing protocols, he will be obligated to file a form with the Executive Secretary describing the nature of the research and the subject population and listing the protocol that covers the research procedure. The investigator will be allowed to conduct the research immediately after filing the form with the Executive Secretary and receipt of written notification from the Executive Secretary that the research falls within the approved protocol. Annually, approximately ten percent of the projects filed under a given protocol will be reviewed for compliance. In the event that an investigator feels that one or more aspects of the research procedure fall within the scope of a research protocol/expedited category, he or she is obligated to complete a form to be filed with the Administrative Assistant stating the intent to initiate the research, the research protocol/expedited procedure(s) to be utilized, and a description of the research. This will then be brought to the attention of the chair or designated member of an appropriate review subcommittee for a timely review, not to exceed two weeks. The result of that review will be transmitted to the investigator. In the event the reviewer elects not to approve a project and to bring it to a subcommittee for review, the investigator will be offered a chance to respond to any concerns, and should expect a committee review within one month of the original application.

In the event that the investigator finds that his or her research procedure is not included within the scope of the Principles 1 and 2, several options are available to him. First, the investigator may submit the research procedure to the appropriate

review panel, within one month review and approval number of procedure review; however both a specific procedure would allow for the approved, utilization. A specific investment number of similar achieve approval. Any investigator project even if a screened for exempt

3. Individual Prior If an investigator does not fall within procedure, screened Procedure Handbook her research procedure review panel. They feel that the risk Principles 1 and If the review panel greater than specific evaluate the benefits research in comparison long-range effects possible effects risks within the

4. Application for F In order to obtain investigator or human subjects application.

- A. The principal project is
- 1) The
- 2) The
- 3) The
- 4) The subject information and
- 5) The procedure name

#### APPENDIX A A

SCR

These six categories guidelines (45 CFR F



review panel, which is obligated to provide a speedy review of the proposal, that is, within one month. Second, the investigator may submit a research protocol for review and approval which would allow, if approved by the review subcommittee, a number of procedural variations to be utilized in the future research without prior review; however, this procedure will take longer. Third, the investigator may submit both a specific project for approval, and a new research protocol for approval, which would allow for timely initiation of a specific project and, if the research protocol was approved, utilization of procedural variations in future research without prior review.

A specific investigator may choose any of those three strategies depending upon the number of similar projects he or she expects to conduct and the time pressure to achieve approval of the project.

Any investigator is free to request individual Committee review of any research project even if a research program protocol exists or it falls within the expedited or screened for exempt status categories.

3. Individual Prior Review of ~~Non-Protocol~~ Research

If an investigator wished to study a problem in such a way that a research procedure does not fall within the scope of an approved research protocol, expedited procedure, screened for exempt status procedure, listed in the "Protocol Research Procedure Handbook," he or she will be required to present a description of his or her research procedure and the justification for the research to the appropriate review panel. The review panel will be required to examine the proposal, and if they feel that the risks to the rights and welfare of the subjects are within the scope of Principles 1 and 2, they will approve the proposal.

If the review panel feels that the risks to the rights and welfare of the subjects are greater than specified in Principles 1 and 2, then the panel will be required to evaluate the benefits to be realized from the research and the importance of the research in comparison to the risks to the rights and welfare of the subjects. Possible long-range effects of applying knowledge gained in the research (for example, the possible effects of the research on public policy) will not be considered as among the risks within the purview of the panel's responsibility.

4. Application for Review and Approval of ~~Non-Protocol~~ Research

~~In order to obtain approval~~ To obtain a Committee review of any research, the investigator or investigators who wish to undertake scientific research involving human subjects shall prepare and have forwarded to the Administrative Assistant an application.

- A. The principal investigator shall prepare a written description of the research project indicating:
  - 1) The purpose of the project
  - 2) The nature of any procedures involving human subjects
  - 3) The risks involved to such human subjects
  - 4) The precautions which are to be taken to avoid risk to the human subjects—including the methods to be used in securing an adequately informed consent by the human subjects or their legal representatives, and the measures used to protect the confidentiality of the data.
  - 5) The provisions which are made for professional attention or facilities to provide for the welfare of subjects during . . . . . (no further amendments to Part III).

**APPENDIX A AND APPENDIX B ARE PROPOSED NEW SECTIONS**

APPENDIX A

SCREENED FOR EXEMPT STATUS PROCEDURES

These six categories are based, almost verbatim, upon the five provided in the new DHHS guidelines (45 CFR Part 46.101, (6)). The sixth category, C, included within D by DHHS,

relates to research on elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office. This procedure shall include all projects which involve only the following research procedures, singly or in combination:

- A) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings involving normal educational practices, such as:
  - 1) Research on regular and special educational instructional strategies, or
  - 2) Research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
- B) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement) if information taken from these sources is recorded in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.
- C) All research involving survey or interview procedures is exempt, without exception, when the respondents are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.
- D) Research involving survey or interview procedures with legally competent noninstitutionalized adults, except where all of the following exist:
  - 1) Responses are recorded in such a manner that the human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects,
  - 2) the subject's responses, if they became known outside the research, could reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject's financial standing or employability, and
  - 3) the research deals with sensitive aspects of the subject's own behavior, such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, or the use of alcohol.
- E) Research involving the observation (including observation by participants) of public behavior or legally competent noninstitutionalized adults, except where all of the following conditions exist:
  - 1) Observations are recorded in such a manner that the human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects,
  - 2) The observations recorded about the individual, if they became known outside the research, could reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject's financial standing or employability, and
  - 3) The research deals with sensitive aspects of the subject's own behavior such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, or use of alcohol.
- F) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or indirectly, through identifiers linked to the subjects.

#### APPENDIX B

#### EXPEDITED REVIEW PROCEDURES LIST\*

\* Printed in the Federal Register, Vol. 46, No. 16. Monday, January 26, 1981.

- 1) Collection of hair and nail clippings, in a nondisfiguring manner, deciduous teeth, and permanent teeth if patient care indicates a need for extraction.
- 2) Collection of excreta and external secretions including sweat, uncannulated saliva, placenta removed at delivery, and amniotic fluid at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor.
- 3) Recording of data from subjects 18 years of age or older using non-invasive procedures routinely employed in clinical practice. This includes the use of physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of matter or significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject's privacy. It also includes such procedures as weighing, testing sensory acuity, electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, diagnostic echography, and electroretinography. It does not include exposure to electromagnetic radiation outside the visible range (for example, X-rays, microwaves).

4) Colle  
an eight  
age or  
5) Colle  
procedu  
process  
6) Voic  
7) Mod  
8) The  
specim  
9) Res  
studies  
does no  
10) Res  
investig

**MOTIO**  
Th  
subject  
**COMM**  
Th  
Univers  
involve  
By and  
obstruc  
industri  
Th  
pursue  
the resp  
fifteen  
social a  
particip  
their in  
ate for  
or temp  
realizat  
cannot  
and we  
ordinar  
scope  
innocu  
Th  
welfare  
by prof  
problem  
rights a  
society  
reconc

- 4) Collection of blood samples by venipuncture, in amounts not exceeding 450 milliliters in an eight-week period and no more often than two times per week, from subjects 18 years of age or older and who are not pregnant.
- 5) Collection of both supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques.
- 6) Voice recording made for research purposes such as investigations of speech defects.
- 7) Moderate exercise by healthy volunteers.
- 8) The study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens.
- 9) Research on individual or group behavior or characteristics of individuals, such as studies of perception, cognition, game theory, or test development, where the investigator does not manipulate subjects' behavior and the research will not involve stress to subjects.
- 10) Research on drugs or devices for which an investigational new drug exemption or an investigational device exemption is not required.

**PATRICIA SWAN**  
Chair

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW PROCEDURE

##### **MOTION:**

That the University Senate approve the three amendments to the proposed human subjects review procedure as outlined below.

##### **COMMENT:**

There is a wide range of scholarly endeavors pursued by faculty and students at the University of Minnesota. For most of these pursuits, it is assumed that the individuals involved are responsible, mature adults that will treat others with respect and obey the law. By and large, they are allowed to pursue their scholarly interests with a minimum of obstruction and supervision, although in some cases safety standards, similar to those in industrial or other work settings, must be met.

This is not the case for a substantial minority of students and faculty. Those who pursue the empirical study of biomedical and human phenomena have not been accorded the respect and autonomy shown other scholars, other scientific investigators. For the past fifteen years a mechanism—a rather expensive and elaborate mechanism—has required social and biomedical investigators to prove that their scholarly work will not be harmful to participants or society PRIOR to its initiation. They have been expected to demonstrate their innocence in advance of opportunities for wrongdoing. Prior review may be appropriate for some research activity, as when there is a genuine threat to participants' well being or temporary deception precludes the use of informed consent. But there is a growing realization that it is not justified for much of social science research. Universal prior review cannot be defended either in terms of the practical consequences for the participants' rights and welfare or because it infringes upon the rights of investigators, often their rights as ordinary citizens. The revisions presented to the University Senate represent a shift in the scope of the procedures to eliminate the requirement for prior committee review of innocuous research or where prior review may infringe upon the rights of the investigator.

There is no question that the major issue is not solely one of protecting the rights and welfare of research participants. If this were the only issue it could easily be accomplished by prohibiting all empirical research on biomedical and behavioral phenomena. The major problem is arriving at an appropriate balance of three desirable objectives: respecting the rights and welfare of participants; respecting the rights of investigators; and ensuring that society receives the benefits of an expansion of knowledge. An emphasis upon the reconciliation of these three objectives is reflected in the procedures required by the federal

government for all DHHS sponsored research and the version adopted for all research\* at the University of Minnesota in:

- a) the structure of the committees (which include substantive experts to review the technical aspects of the research and representatives of the community to assist in decisions about the interest of participants and benefits to the greater society),
- b) a requirement that a risk (to participants)/benefit (to science, society) analysis be undertaken for research involving a significant threat to the well being or rights of the participants, and
- c) provisions for due process for investigators when their projects are rejected by the committee.

This discussion prefaces amendments proposed for the revisions being presented to the University Senate. Other committees that developed and reviewed these amendments have not adopted them (although the third was favored by a substantial minority of those members of the Human Subjects Committee that chose to vote). These committees appear to have assumed that it was inconsistent with an inferred objective of the human subjects review procedure as determined earlier by the Regents—to protect the participants from the actions of biomedical and behavioral science investigators.

But this has not been the sole objective of the procedure, as mentioned above, and it is appropriate for this body—representing the entire scholarly community of faculty and students—to make a different recommendation. The University Senate may choose to recommend to the Regents a change in the objectives of a procedure imposed upon faculty and student investigators of biomedical, social, and human phenomena. Such changes will not only show respect for the integrity of these colleagues, without any significant loss of protection for research participants, but reduce the burden of reviewing innocuous projects and allow more attention to the projects that justify prior review—where there are genuine risks for the participants.

To this end three amendments are proposed.

#### AMENDMENT ONE

Part I, first statement numbered "1"

- 1. To safeguard and respect fully the rights and welfare of the individuals involved as human subjects and investigators in such research . . .

Comment:

This makes explicit the implicit charge to the committee, to balance the rights and welfare of two categories of individuals—the participants and the investigators—and the interests of society. Although most of the procedure and attention is focused upon the interests of the participants, there are occasions when the investigator's rights are also an issue (e.g. requiring the study of elected officials to receive prior review by government employees).

#### AMENDMENT TWO

Part I, second statement numbered "1"

- 1. Provide opportunities for collegial review prior to initiation of all research involving human subjects . . .

Comment:

This is consistent with the basic thrust of the current revision, where substantial amounts of research, particularly related to social science, may not receive a full committee

\*Review of research not funded by DHHS is not strictly required if DHHS research is conducted at the institution, but universal application of the procedure is considered: "demonstration of willingness to afford human subjects protection;" "the Department feels strongly that public funds should not be awarded to institutions which are unwilling to demonstrate their dedication to this principle." (FEDERAL REGISTER, 26 January 1981:8369)

review. Yet the opportunity for a timely review is made available for any research project upon request by any student or faculty investigator.

### AMENDMENT THREE

Part II, Section C. IMPLEMENTATION OF REVIEW, paragraph 1

1. Projects screened for exempt status may be initiated after informing the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research of the intent to engage in research and receipt of notification that the procedure falls within an exempt from prior review category.

Part III, Section C. ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE, Subsection 2, second paragraph

In the event an investigator feels that all aspects of the research procedure fall within the scope of one or more screened for exempt status procedures, he or she is allowed to proceed only after informing the Committee on the Use of Human Subjects and notification that it has been determined that the proposed research procedures do fall within the screened for exempt status procedures of the intent to conduct research with a screened for exempt status procedure. Such notification shall be provided the investigator within two weeks.

Comment:

This change amounts to an implementation of an intermediate category of "screened for exempt status" procedure (chosen by a large minority of voting Human Subjects Committee members). The procedure would allow any investigator to proceed with research in an exempt category after notifying the Human Subjects Committee that the project was under way, using a form that is yet to be designed. This would provide for a systematic record of all research involving human subjects, ensure that investigators had an obligation to keep in touch with the Human Subjects Committee and at the same time minimize the work of the staff in reviewing and responding to applications—thus reducing delays and complications for the research process. Compared to the attention now given to the ethical issues and welfare of participants in social science, the "educational" benefits of having investigators receive prior clearance from a clerical staff member are likely to be quite modest.

Further, even the recommended amendment is more restrictive than the procedures allowed by the new DHHS regulations, which do not call for any contact between investigators conducting research in the exempt categories and an IRB (Institutional Review Board). This was due to the virtual lack of any evidence, much less systematic reports, of complaints from or negative consequences for participants in much of social science research, particularly those using the procedures outlined in the proposed exempt categories. This is consistent with the experience at the University of Minnesota where about 400 social science projects receive prior review each year.

**PAUL REYNOLDS**  
Faculty Member

*Professor Reynolds' first two amendments were withdrawn, the third defeated, and the original motion was approved.*

## VII. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### HIGHLIGHTS OF 1982-83 SENATE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Many interesting and important items will be discussed within committees of the Senate this year. Some of these will result in reports and/or motions on the agenda of the Senate later in the year. Among the items currently being examined by committees of the Senate, as well as the name of the committee(s) involved, are the following:

- University teaching policy: assessment of implementation to date of recommendations in 1978 SCEP Report to the Senate on Developing and Encouraging Excellence in Teaching (Educational Policy)
- Financial exigency planning (Planning)
- Academic professional personnel representation in the Senate, including the basis for determining a unit's number of representatives (Business and Rules)
- Review of the work of the task force on developing University-industry relationship policies
- Investigation of alleged surveillance of foreign students and scholars (Social Concerns)

**PATRICIA SWAN**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## VIII. PLANNING COMMITTEE

### PLANNING POLICY

#### Action (10 minutes)

Upon reviewing the first planning cycle, we recommend to the Senate the following policy statements:

#### **MOTION 1:**

Each academic program to be reviewed shall be given the opportunity to see the information that pertains to it and to supply any additional information judged to be important.

#### **INFORMATION:**

It is inherently difficult to incorporate a review process within the planning activities of a unit, since any program judged less worthy is judged so within the context of all the programs for which the unit is responsible. Therefore, every effort should be made to be sure that the information upon which the initial relative judgments are made is complete before the process starts.

#### **MOTION 2:**

All collegiate units of the University should establish for the second planning cycle a faculty and student group that represents the faculty and students during all aspects of the planning cycle, if such a group is not presently in existence. Each group should play an important role in the ranking of programs within its unit and in the establishment of unit priorities.

#### **INFORMATION:**

Such groups play various roles during the first planning cycle. In some units (e.g. CLA) these groups took a direct role in the process; in other units (e.g. CBS) they set the criteria by which the administration of their unit ranked the programs and they later reviewed the appropriateness of the decisions with respect to these criteria. Such a group serves to furnish faculty and student input, to communicate the planning process to others, and to legitimize the final plans.

#### **MOTION 3:**

In the future round of planning, central administration should only accept collegiate unit plans derived using procedures consistent with motions 1 and 2 above.

**IRWIN RUBENSTEIN**  
Chair

*Approved*

**IX. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY  
APPEALS COMMITTEE  
ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

This is a brief statement regarding the work of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals Committee, 1981-82.

The Committee met once to review its charge and relationship to other units in the grievance procedures at the University of Minnesota. Carol Pazandak generously assisted in that process. The recent publication on grievance procedures was subsequently sent to each member.

One case was received late in the spring quarter. A committee was appointed chaired by Dr. Dworkin, and including Elizabeth Grundner and J. Lawrence Mitchell. Their recommendations regarding this case have been forwarded to Acting President Kenneth Keller.

Patricia Swan, in her capacity on the Senate Consultative Committee, met with the chair of the Appeals Committee regarding the need to review the various aspects of the grievance process at the University. The direction in which she appears to be moving is indicated and it is expected the Appeals Committee will be involved as necessary in that process.

In the course of the year the chairman received a few phone calls regarding jurisdiction of the Appeals Committee. In all such instances, the chair referred the caller to other units in the grievance process.

**MIRIAM SELTZER**  
Chair

*Accepted*

**X. ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE  
ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

The major inspection program conducted by the Animal Care Committee was completed by last year's committee. The previous inspection team, which consisted of members of the committee plus a research animal resources veterinarian with advanced training in laboratory animal medicine, had conducted inspections of both conventional laboratory animals such as those for biomedical research and food and fiber animals that are used in agricultural research and education. This year the committee's efforts were directed towards the facilities with the most chronic animal care problems as determined by the committee inspection and in concurrence with the results of the U.S. Department of Agriculture inspections.

In addition to the three scheduled meetings, one special committee meeting was held with the Office of Academic Affairs to discuss and give recommendations on chronic violators of the requirements for quality animal care as specified in the *Guide and Care for the Use of Laboratory Animals*. The chair also participated in a meeting with the Office of Academic Affairs and administrators from the collegiate units and departments representing the major problems.

The committee's recommendation in this matter which was accepted by administration was that the responsibility for animal care in one facility would be changed from departmental to central management. Another facility was closed to animal usage due to physical deficiencies which were uncorrectable. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, which had implied legal action against the University, accepted the changes made and did not proceed in action against the University.

The committee continued to monitor the progress of proposed state and federal legislation restrictive to animal availability and use in teaching and research activities. During the past year, legislation was introduced in the House Science, Research, and Technology Subcommittee (HR6245). The intent of the bill is to provide for the following:

1. Sponsors research into the development of research, experimentation, and testing which does not require sacrifice of live animals and to exploit non-animal methods of experimentation and testing. Up to \$45 million would be authorized over a 3-year period to meet these objectives.
2. Requires accreditation by a government or private accrediting agency of all NIH awardees.
3. Requires assurance from research entities to include an establishment of an Animal Care Committee which will review research protocols, inspect facilities, provide investigator and technician training, and establish reporting systems. The committee must include a DVM and a noninstitutional member representing animal welfare interests.
4. Provides modified definitions for animals, research entities, and conscious animals.
5. Provides for agency review of grant proposals.

This legislation was reviewed by the Animal Care Committee and position was communicated to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology.

The committee also prepared the annual progress report from the University to the National Institutes of Health. This report is based upon the committee's program of past inspections and evaluations of the University's animal facilities as required by NIH policy.

The activities of the University Animal Care Committee have continued to increase the awareness of the faculty and staff to the standards of animal care, which has improved the overall quality of the University facilities. On the whole, persons responsible for facilities evaluated by the committee or U.S. Department of Agriculture have been cooperative and they have responded promptly and positively to suggestions for improvement of their facilities and programs.

During the next year the committee must prepare for the next complete inspection program of all University animal facilities. This will include the development or revision of all inspection forms and tabulation of research facilities. The next complete assurance statement that is required by the National Institutes of Health is due in 1985. Therefore, all facilities will need to be inspected starting in 1983.

Beginning in 1983, there will be an enormous expenditure of time required by committee members, the chair, and research animal resource veterinarians who will participate in animal facility inspections and writing of the evaluation reports. If one person, the chair, were to coordinate all animal inspections within one academic year, it would require approximately 75 percent of an individual's time. In addition, inspection programs of all facilities would require a budget which supports the necessary expenditures associated with this type of mandatory program.

During the past year, the committee has corresponded with administrators of collegiate units suggesting that animal facilities be accredited by the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC). This program is recognized and accepted by NIH and could be used as a substitute for the committee's inspection program. It is interesting to note that the most recent proposed federal regulations and a bill pending in the U.S. House of Representatives (HR6245) mandate accreditation of all animal facilities of NIH awardees by such an accrediting association. The committee will therefore continue to recommend that collegiate units with animal use programs, and in particular the health science units that receive NIH grants, give strong consideration to applying for AAALAC accreditation and that the University administration provide support toward this effort.

**KENT A. REES**  
Chair

*Accepted*



## XI. FINANCE COMMITTEE

### ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82

The Senate Finance Committee, as specified by the Senate constitution, consists of 7 members designated by other Senate committees (who do double duty), and 2 faculty members and 2 student members at large who are appointed by the Senate Consultative Committee with the approval of the Senate.

Members and alternatives who served on this committee during 1981-82 were: Tracy Allen, Fraser Hart, John Howe, Walter Johnson, Hugh Kabat, Stan Lehmborg, Rick Linden, Gail Lorenz, Betsy Loushin, Irv Rubenstein, Tom Scott, Don Spring, Pat Swan, and Tony Zahareas. Vice President Keller represented the budget executive in discussions at all committee meetings.

The committee held a total of 29 meetings from September 1981 through August 1982. Six of these were held jointly with the Senate Consultative Committee and one was held with the Senate Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee.

Major items of discussion included: (1) the criteria to be used in the 1981-83 biennial budget reductions and the relationships of unit planning to these reductions; (2) the financing of faculty salary increases; (3) the establishment of new tuition rates; (4) the 1982-83 budget plan; (5) the 1983-85 biennial request to the legislature; and (6) the capital request to the legislature.

Three interim reports were submitted to the Senate on December 3, February 18, and May 20. Since the submission of the last interim report, the following major items were considered.

#### 1. Tuition Rates for 1982-83 (by colleges):

The committee supported a plan whereby slight adjustments were made to lessen the increase in tuition for lower division students and to add slightly more increase to tuition for students in units where enrollment demands are high and where budgets were somewhat protected from reductions. The Regents did *not* support a differential in tuition of this basis.

#### 2. Individual College Budget Plans for 1982-83:

The budget plans for the colleges were examined to see what portion of reductions were to come from low priority programs and what other type of reductions were made. About 25% of the reductions were in low priority areas; in most units, reductions were primarily in teaching positions. CLA reductions included several teaching assistant positions. Health Science units took a significant portion of cuts in supplies and expenses. A more detailed analysis is in progress.

#### 3. Biennial Request for 1983-85:

The committee examined the request for compatibility with the priority statements and began a discussion of priorities.

#### 4. Capital Request for 1983-85:

Most of the college priority statements neglected to mention planning for space needs and priorities. The capital request is based on priorities from the previous request plus needs identified during the planning process.

#### Consulting:

The committee wishes to comment that the frequent meetings held this year did indeed improve the timeliness of consultation. Vice President Keller, chairman of the budget executive, was in attendance and consulting with the committee for 28 of the 29 meetings. We commend him for his commitment to consultation. Certain difficulties in consulting encountered during the year were mentioned in the interim reports.

**PATRICIA SWAN**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## XII. LIBERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

### ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82 (final)

The Committee on Liberal Education (CLE) was charged with establishing a "floor" requirement in liberal studies for all University baccalaureate curricula. Additionally, CLE was responsible for determining the effects of the floor requirement policy in order to recommend to the Senate such changes in the policy as seemed appropriate. The CLE also was charged to initiate other policy proposals or actions designed to improve the quality of undergraduate education at the University.

#### Studies of the Liberal Education Requirement:

The committee continued to give attention to the two studies of the liberal education requirements that were begun during the 1980-81 academic year. Analysis of the compilation of the liberal education requirements as promulgated by the colleges was begun; analysis of the courses taken by a sample of graduates was continued.

#### Foreign Languages and International Studies:

The report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Languages and International Studies was presented to the CLE and was discussed with a view to possible modifications in the floor requirement.

#### Horace T. Morse-Amoco Foundation Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education:

For the seventeenth consecutive year the Morse-Amoco Award was presented to faculty members who were nominated by their colleges and selected in an all-University competition by a subcommittee of CLE. The 1981-82 selection committee included James Anderson (CLE student member); R. Glen Berryman (professor of accounting and previous award recipient); Robert Owens (professor of English, UMD, and selection committee chair); Mariah Snyder (associate professor of nursing and CLE faculty member) and Robert Sonkowsky (professor of classics and non-CLE faculty member). This year 13 nominations were received from 11 colleges, with the award and a \$1,000 honorarium presented to Kathleen Mae Accola, assistant professor of nursing, School of Nursing; Thomas C. Buckley, associate professor of social and behavioral sciences, and associate dean, General College; Thomas Clayton, professor of English, College of Liberal Arts; W. Clough Cullen, professor of animal health technology, University of Minnesota, Waseca; Shirley N. Garner, associate professor of English, College of Liberal Arts; Roland L. Guyotte, assistant professor of history, University of Minnesota, Morris; and Archibald I. Leyasmeyer, associate professor of English, College of Liberal Arts and faculty director, University Without Walls.

An award certificate and the honorarium were presented to each recipient at the appropriate college commencement ceremony. Award recipients were honored at a meeting of the Board of Regents.

A special event this year was a presidential reception and award ceremony held in February to honor each of the 102 recipients of the Morse-Amoco Award and to present each previous awardee with a sculpture symbolizing the striving for excellence that the award symbolizes. The cast bronze sculpture was created for award recipients by the late Katherine E. Nash, former professor of studio arts, and a 1975 Morse-Amoco recipient. The 1981-82 awardees received the sculpture at their respective award ceremonies this spring and the sculpture will be presented together with the honorarium and certificate to all future awardees.

#### Small Grants Program:

The Small Grants Program was established by CLE in 1967 to stimulate the improvement of the undergraduate experience. In the fall round of the 1981-82 Small Grants Program, 47 proposals totaling \$110,851 were received and 27 proposals totaling \$36,424 were funded. In the spring round, the committee received 54 proposals totaling \$107,546 and funded 33 proposals totaling \$49,468.

The CLE Small Grants subcommittee for the fall 1981 round included Richard Skaggs (chair), Arthur Walzer, Veronica Wood, and John Paulson (student member). Serving on

the spring 1982 subcommittee were Richard Skaggs (chair), Eugene Allen, Veronica Wood, and John Paulson (student member).

During the 1981-82 year the committee responded to a recommendation by the Committee on Committees that CLE be eliminated and its responsibilities and activities assigned to other Senate committees or to administrators. In discussions with the Committee on Committees and the Committee on Educational Policy, the members of CLE expressed the view that the committee serves important purposes and should therefore be maintained as a separate Senate committee. The arguments advanced in favor of continuing CLE were not accepted and at the May 20th, 1982, meeting the University Senate approved a motion to eliminate the Committee on Liberal Education.

**F. T. BENSON**  
Interim Chair

*Accepted*

### **XIII. PHYSICAL PLANT AND SPACE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

This committee was newly created this year. We began by reviewing current principles, policies, criteria, and problems related to physical facilities planning. We reviewed the *Minnesota Facilities Model*, which provides critical management information for planning new physical facilities. It will also provide useful information for decision-making about space reallocation, but such decisions will also be influenced by factors other than "best fit" between needs and space, because space is always tight.

We explored the process whereby proposals for new facilities become incorporated into the University's biennial capital request to the legislature. The capital request evolves slowly. The University cannot suddenly jettison the backlog of requests it has submitted to the legislature in previous years, and new requests must be melded into the existing list. These requests must be realistic in line with resources and overall program priorities and fiscal possibilities, which may not always coincide with immediate actual needs. Future proposals for new facilities will be generated by the planning process and program decisions. Unit plans are expected to include assessments of the current state of their physical facilities and to identify their needs for new facilities to support their program recommendations. The budget executive will apply the same six criteria (quality, connectedness, integration, uniqueness, demand, and cost effectiveness) that apply to the entire planning process in establishing priorities for the capital request. The budget executive will establish priorities for three separate stages for each campus: 1) development of plans, 2) preparation of working drawings, and 3) construction. Approval of the first stage normally will imply automatic approval of the second and third stages in successive capital requests. The vice president for academic affairs will instruct units to begin preprogramming for facilities that are included on the priority lists. Proposals must be prepared in accordance with the detailed "Building Pre-Program Informational Packet" that has been developed by the Office of Physical Planning. Late summer and early fall appears to be the critical period for consultation with central administration about the biennial capital request.

Current budgeting has deemphasized capital needs because academic needs are more pressing. The capital request for 1983 is a trimmed-down version of the previous request. It includes those items that are consistent with planning priorities. The need for each item is clearly demonstrable, and the size of the total request is constrained by state finances, not by pressing needs. Critical work on many items has already been authorized, but the state has not yet sold bonds to fund the work. Continued deferral will be increasingly expensive. The most urgent item is "repairs and betterment." All buildings require regular renovation after they reach an age of ten years. It would be useful if the legislature could be sold on the idea of a standard formula that could be applied automatically, as has happened elsewhere. Renovation and refurbishing of buildings that must remain occupied is far more expensive than renovation of unoccupied buildings, but the University has no space that

can be used temporarily while buildings are being renovated.

We have discussed the general problem of space allocation and reallocation, but we have not yet been able to get a handle on it, because the allocation and reallocation of space involve a complex calculus of trade-offs.

The future agenda of the Committee should include:

- 1) examination of the program planning statements of individual units to ensure that their implications for space and facilities needs have been clearly identified;
- 2) consultation with central administration during the establishment of priorities for and the actual preparation of the biennial capital request; and
- 3) exploration of the vexed area of space allocation and reallocation.

**JOHN FRASER HART**  
Chairman

*Accepted*

#### **XIV. PLANNING COMMITTEE**

##### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

The committee met 9 times between October 29, 1981, and May 14, 1982. The members were Steve Ansolabehere (student member), David Berg (ex officio), Bernadine Feldman, Chet Grygar (ex officio), Nils Hasselmo (ex officio), John Helmbergger, Richard J. Ilkka (Morris), Gail Lorenz (student member), Van Mueller, Betty Robinett (ex officio), Irwin Rubenstein, and Frank Sorauf.

The major objective of the committee's activities this year was to study the involvement of faculty and students in the planning process and to suggest ways in which this involvement might be improved.

In early December the committee passed a motion recommending that the Senate Consultative Committee hold open hearings on the program priority statements. A series of open forums were held after several of the regular meetings of the Senate. These forums offered an opportunity for faculty and students to comment on unit plans and the administration to answer questions concerning aspects of the planning process.

During the spring term, the committee reviewed the planning processes and vertical communication within three major units of the University. Meetings were held with several of the deans, department heads, and faculty members of the College of Liberal Arts, the Institute of Technology, and the Medical School.

Our review of the planning process during its first cycle leads us to suggest the following policy recommendations on planning to the Senate:

1. This committee recommends that when a unit reviews its programs each program to be reviewed be given the opportunity to see the information that pertains to it and to supply any additional information they judge to be important.

It is inherently difficult to incorporate a review process within the planning activities of a unit, since any program judged less worthy is judged so within the context of all the programs for which the unit is responsible. Therefore, every effort should be taken to be sure that the information upon which the initial relative judgments are made is complete before the process starts.

2. All units of the University should establish for the second planning cycle a faculty and student group that fully represents the faculty and students during all aspects of the planning cycle. This group should be large enough to be representative. In particular, they should play an important role in the ranking of programs within units and the establishment of unit priorities. Such groups played various roles during the first planning cycle. In some units (e.g. CLA) these groups took a direct role in the process, in other units (e.g. CBS) they set the criteria by which the administration of their unit ranked the programs and then they reviewed the appropriateness of the decisions with respect to these criteria. Such a group serves to furnish faculty and student input, to communicate the planning process to others, and to legitimize the final plans.

3. In the future rounds of planning, central administration should only accept unit plans derived using procedures consistent with the prior two recommendations.

**IRWIN RUBENSTEIN**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XV. STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

The full committee met five times during the past academic year. In addition, committee members from the Twin Cities campus, forming the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Student Academic Support Services Committee, held one joint meeting with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) to begin the discussion on the possibility of reinstating the grade of F.

This committee was established under the new Senate constitution with a somewhat different focus than its predecessor, the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations. This was its first year of operation. It is an advisory committee to Student Support Services, and a communication link with the faculty governance structure via the Consultative Committee. A great deal of meeting time this year was devoted to informing committee members of the new responsibilities of the committee, and of the general functions and activities of Student Support Services. The committee also took up two major issues, both of which attracted a good deal of campus attention:

The F Grade: The committee received a proposal from an ad hoc Registrar's Advisory Committee for some changes in the current grading system. It was widely reported that we were considering "reinstating the F," but the real problem was with another letter, the N. In committee discussions it became quite clear that 1) the N was a problem because it could mean two quite different things, either non-completion or unsatisfactory completion of a course; and 2) the relation of the N to the GPA was being understood in several quite different ways by students and by the various academic units. Because a matter of policy was involved, a joint committee was formed from the Twin Cities members of our committee and SCEP, with a SCEP member as chair; a summary of their work will be found in the SCEP annual report.

Credit Transfer: This issue appears to recur periodically; it has to do with the loss of credit on transfer between colleges on the Twin Cities campus, and on transfer between various campuses of the state higher education system. Admissions and Records provided us with a clear and detailed report on specific instances of courses that failed to transfer for credit. The committee concluded that, while some clerical errors had been made, the decisions on transfer of credit were nearly always reasonable. However, we need to do a better job of informing students on this matter, and particularly on the reasons for which a particular course was not given credit. It is advisable that copies of all current transfer of credit policies be kept in one central location, accessible to all of the University.

**THOMAS KRAABEL**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XVI. SUMMER SESSIONS COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

Discussions of the committee throughout 1981-82 continued to focus on the role of the Summer Session and led ultimately to the establishment of a subcommittee to explore the matter in greater depth with a report to the parent committee to be made in the spring of

1983. Members of the subcommittee include: James Terwilliger (chair), F. Thomas Benson, John Clark, Greg Fox (UMD), Richard Hey, Edwin Stueben, Roger Upson, Paul Weiblen, Bright Dornblaser (ex officio) and Willard Thompson (ex officio). Among the topics to be reviewed are the administrative structure and relationships with academic units, the basic of support, role of the Summer Session director, and policies and procedures.

Members of the committee noted the continuing erosion of funding for the Summer Session, much of it as a result of retrenchments which the University has been forced to undergo. At the same time, they invited attention once more to major inequities in funding of the Summer Session which have existed over time. These include: (1) maximums of instructional salaries; (2) failure to make contributions toward retirement on instructional salaries paid by the Summer Session; (3) minimal funding for supplies, expenses, and equipment provided by academic units; and (4) minimal funding of administrative costs incurred by academic departments serving the Summer Session.

Committee members received a report on a survey of student opinion conducted by the Measurement Services Center in the 1980 Summer Session which underlined once more ways in which the Summer Session serves students as a fourth quarter. With almost 70 percent of the students enrolled in the 1980 Summer Session being those who were enrolled in one or more terms of the academic year and the great majority of courses offered being from the basic department curricula, the Session becomes an extension of the academic year. At the same time, for significant numbers, including in-service teachers from throughout the state, and for many other "summer only" students it serves vital needs. Reasons for attending the Summer Session reported by students in the survey further underlined its importance as a fourth quarter of study. These included: "to complete credits for graduation requirements before the next academic quarter"—19.5%; "to make up prerequisite courses essential to my major program"—16.7%; and "to take courses that I was not able to schedule in the regular academic year"—15.6%.

Committee members also received a preliminary report of a survey of faculty opinions undertaken in the summer of 1981. Most faculty members were very satisfied with their teaching experience in the 1981 Summer Session. Slightly over one half indicated they were "very well satisfied; quite certain that I did what I should have." The primary reason given by faculty for teaching in the summer was to increase annual income. Many of the faculty members who responded to the survey said that they found special enjoyment in teaching in the summer. Besides the extra income, they cited stimulating students, chances for professional growth, and a more relaxed situation as the principal advantages.

In an effort to stimulate development of innovative courses in the Summer Session, an instructional development program was introduced in the 1982 Summer Session. Members of the faculty were invited to submit proposals for innovative courses to be offered in the summer of 1983. Those whose proposals were approved by a selections committee were funded in the 1982 Summer Session to develop course materials. Proposals were received from 56 faculty persons, with 21 being approved by the subcommittee. Total funding of \$50,000 was allocated for development of the 21 courses in the 1982 Summer Session.

Members of the committee noted with regret abandonment of the interdepartmental course, Interplay, which has been offered in the preceding three Summer Sessions. While highly successful from the standpoint of faculty who participated and students who enrolled, the course did not generate sufficient enrollments to justify its cost.

The Summer Sessions Committee noted with deep regret Professor Thompson's planned retirement as director of Summer Sessions at the end of the 1983 Summer Session, after 20 years of outstanding leadership of one of the University's most important educational programs.

Committee members for the year were Thomas Benson, Elizabeth Bonney (student), Audrey Grosch, Richard Ilkka, Willard Thompson, Paul Weiblen, Mary Young, and Bright Dornblaser (chairman).

**BRIGHT DORNBLASER**  
Chairman

*Accepted*

## **XVII. ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

The All-University Honors Committee met on November 4, 1981, and February 9, and May 3, 1982.

Recommendations made by the committee included two for an honorary doctorate degree, twelve for Outstanding Achievement Awards, and one for an Alumni Service Award. In addition, the committee evaluated a named chair in health services teaching and research. The committee also recommended the naming of the following buildings and facilities:

Twin Cities campus: Business Administration Building to be changed to Management and Economics Building

Duluth campus: Administration Building to be changed to Darland Administration Building; Industrial Education Building to be changed to Voss-Kovach Hall; Computational Laboratory to be changed to Cecil Meyers Computational Laboratory; Junction Avenue Apartments I to be changed to Cuyuna Hall; Junction Avenue Apartments II to be changed to Mesabi Hall; and Home Economics Building to be changed to Montague Hall

Crookston campus: Skyberg Annex to be changed to Lee Hall

Additionally, the committee recommended that a new laboratory in Boynton Health Service be named the Bond Laboratory (for Safe Handling of Hazardous Materials).

The committee is presently re-evaluating the policies and procedures of the University honors and recognition program.

**CAROLINE M. CZARNECKI**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XVIII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT**

How will a faculty settlement at Duluth and Waseca potentially affect budgets on other campuses? For example, will any extra funds which are needed be generated by retrenchment at the campus needing the funds?

Russell K. Hobbie  
IT Faculty Member

A number of my colleagues in the School of Physics and Astronomy have asked me to raise a question about the information contained in the November 1 Special Edition of *BRIEF*. It is our understanding that average raises on the Twin Cities campus for the two year period 1981 to 1983 amount to 16.2%, but that the administration has offered to negotiate with UMD and Waseca on the basis of 20.2% for the same period. Is this correct, and if so, how do the proposed salary averages compare with the Twin Cities faculty excluding the Law School, the Medical School, and the Administration?

*BRIEF* also states that the negotiating team has offered to complete a peer comparison salary study of five peer institutions (presumably for Duluth and Waseca). Can you tell us which institutions these are, and whether a similar study is planned for the Twin Cities campus in relation to its peer institutions?

Ed Ney  
IT Faculty Member

See Abstract of the discussion.

## **XIX. OLD BUSINESS**

none

## **XX. NEW BUSINESS**

none

## **XXI. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS**

### **JOHN BLACKMORE**

1913-1982

Professor John Blackmore died September 18, 1982, in San Diego after a long illness at the age of 69. Dr. Blackmore, after graduating from Washington State University, completed master's degrees at the University of Maryland and Harvard University. He worked briefly for the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a junior statistician before serving during World War II in the Pacific with the navy. After the war he worked for the Tennessee Valley Authority and returned to Harvard to complete his Ph.D. in agricultural economics. He joined the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in 1954 and was director of the Farm Management and Land Reform Section. He returned to the United States as head of the Department of Agricultural and Food Economics at the University of Massachusetts and in 1964 came to the University of Minnesota as professor of agricultural economics and the first director of international agricultural programs. He remained in this position until 1976 and retired from the University in 1979.

As director of international programs John Blackmore laid the foundations for the University of Minnesota's current involvement in international agriculture. For example, the successful development of our program in Morocco dates back to 1968 when John Blackmore first visited that country. He had a clear vision of the role of higher education and of land-grant universities in an increasingly complex and interdependent world. At the national level he was a leader in the development of this understanding. He had a deep concern for the poor and hungry of the world and an unwavering commitment to the idea that "the fate of the empires depends on the education of youth." He was a founding member of the Association of U.S. University Directors of International Agriculture Programs and in June 1982 was the first recipient of the AUSUDIAP Distinguished Service Award for International Agriculture.

John Blackmore was highly instrumental in the passage of the Title XII legislation. Today's broad involvement of U.S. universities and international agricultural programs owes much to his pioneering work. John Blackmore will be remembered as an educator and as a leader who helped develop our hope for a better future for mankind.

### **RAYMOND D. McCLURE**

1923-1982

Ray McClure taught at the University of Minnesota for over thirty years. For ten of these years (1964-74) he carried the additional responsibility of director of composition, a task which he performed with uncommon dedication and tact. He was regarded by his students as an excellent teacher. He combined a wide-ranging knowledge and love of English literature with a gentle manner and wry wit that was wonderfully appropriate in a teacher and scholar whose favorite author was Chaucer. The esteem in which he was held by colleagues is evident in a warm letter of thanks addressed to him when he stepped down as director of composition, signed by fifty-four members of the senior and junior English Department staff.

Born and educated through high school in Indianapolis, Ray took his B.A. degree, after serving in the armed forces during World War II, from De Pauw University in 1948. He came to Minnesota the following year and here spent his entire academic career. Despite serious physical handicaps, complicated by pulmonary tuberculosis contracted while he



was in the army, he maintained a ready cheerfulness and openness toward students and colleagues alike, and served faithfully and well as an ex officio member of the department's governing council during his ten-year term as director of composition. In recent years a series of operations related to a congenital spinal problem obliged him to take leaves of absence and contributed to his untimely death at the age of 58 on July 26, 1982. His dedicated teaching, his informed literary intelligence, his steadiness and humor will be missed. No more apt summary of Ray's life and achievement could be found than in the words of his beloved Chaucer regarding another scholar: "And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche."

WILLIAM R. McEWEN  
1911-1982

William R. McEwen, professor emeritus of the Department of Mathematical Sciences at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, died July 27, 1982, after losing a three-week long battle against a succession of disorders. He is survived by his wife, Dorothy; by his children, William, Claudia, Audrey, Alice, Alexander, and John; and by six granddaughters.

Born August 21, 1911, in Duluth, Minnesota, Professor McEwen graduated from Central High School in that city in 1927. After travelling about the country for a few years working at a series of jobs, he returned to Duluth and obtained his B.S. degree in mathematics from the Duluth State Teachers College in 1935. He taught English, mathematics, and physics at the high school level in Forest Lake and Duluth, Minnesota, for two years before entering the University of Minnesota. There he served as a teaching assistant while working toward his M.A. in mathematics. Upon getting this degree in 1939, he was promoted to instructor and began teaching full time while simultaneously beginning his thesis work under Professor Dunham Jackson. This work had scarcely begun when the second World War interrupted everybody's plans. With his technical training and his prior service as a summer reservist in the field artillery, he was a prime candidate for induction as an artillery officer but was instead deferred to teach mathematics to the officer candidates who were then receiving instruction on the Minneapolis campus. He was promoted to assistant professor in this capacity in 1942. His deferment from military service at that time and under those circumstances testifies to his skills as a teacher. While his position preserved him from such hazards as the combat that claimed his brother's life in the Pacific theater, it did, however, delay the completion of his degree work until 1947. At that time, he accepted a position as associate professor and head of the Department of Mathematics at the newly formed University of Minnesota, Duluth. In 1949, he was promoted to professor. Five years later he was selected to be chairman of the Division of Science and Mathematics, a post he was to occupy with distinction until UMD's reorganization into colleges in 1974.

Those who knew McEwen during his term as an administrator remember him as being able, efficient, and absolutely trustworthy. While he could be blunt almost to the point of rudeness towards anyone—subordinates or superiors!—whom he suspected of distracting him from the pursuit of that special excellence in the sciences that he was to leave to UMD as a memorial to his administrative farsightedness, he had, nevertheless, a deft administrative touch. In particular, he had a knack at helping disputing parties discover areas of agreement that he could use to create positions and policies that everyone could support.

McEwen's children and, later on, his grandchildren were undoubtedly the chief joys in his life but he was also an avid reader, a competition-class bridge player, a devotee of anagrams, crossword puzzles, and other word games, a hunter, a singer, and an accomplished participant in the sport of curling. His professional interest and accomplishments were equally wide-ranging. He was listed in *Who's Who in America* and in *American Men of Science*. He was a member of the Minnesota Academy of Science, Sigma Xi, Gamma Alpha, and the Mathematical Association of America and was, in fact, president of the North Central Section of the last-named organization during 1948-49. In addition to his thesis work on orthogonal polynomials, McEwen published on focal points and focal loci, he did research on permanents, and he served as consultant for the Directorate of Research Analysis, USAF, Almagordo, New Mexico. (He earned a certificate of commendation for

work he did in the area of operations research on behalf of the Directorate during the early 1960's.) As a lifelong fan of puzzles and other challenging problems, he took particular delight whenever professional publications printed his elegant solutions to the problems they had posed.

After stepping down as an administrator in 1974, Dr. McEwen resumed full-time classroom teaching until his retirement in 1980. During those few years, he managed to convince a whole new generation of students that he was indeed a master teacher. As a mathematician, he would have asked for proof of such a claim and, as it happens, tangible proof now exists! Acting entirely on their own, UMD mathematics and computer science students purchased a bronze plaque and had it mounted on the wall in their lounge area. On it is engraved, "In memory of William R. McEwen. He graced the minds of many with the gift of knowledge."

## XXII. ADJOURNMENT

# FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

The first meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1982-83 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 18, at 4:50 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 134 voting members of the faculty, 7 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 6 nonmembers. President C. Peter Magrath presided.

## I. SCHEDULED MEETINGS DURING 1982-83

### Information

Faculty Senate meetings are scheduled as follows: November 18, February 17, May 5, and May 19.

*Accepted*

## II. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1982-83

(These are in addition to those approved at the May 20, 1982, Senate meeting)

### Action (5 minutes)

FACULTY AFFAIRS Faculty: Robert Gustafson

JUDICIAL Faculty: Dale Dahl, Martin Dworkin, William Flanigan, Arnold Ismach, Donald MacEachern, Paul Murphy, Peter Robinson

TENURE Faculty: Richard Phillips, 1 to be named. Students: William Nereson, 1 to be named

*Approved*

## III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### HIGHLIGHTS OF 1982-83 FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Many interesting and important items will be discussed within Faculty Senate committees this year. Some of these will result in reports and/or motions on the agenda of the Senate later in the year. Among the items currently being examined by committees of the Senate, as well as the name of the committee(s) involved, are the following:

- Review and revision of the 1973 Tenure Code including relationships to financial exigency (Tenure Committee)
- Grievance procedure review University-wide (Consultative, Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals, Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, Judicial)
- Maternity leave policy revision (EEOW, Faculty Affairs)
- Sick leave policy revision (Faculty Affairs)
- Senate salary improvement goals—relationship to biennial request and budgeting (Faculty Affairs)
- Review of the work of the Committee on Faculty Workload (Consultative)

**PATRICIA SWAN**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## IV. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

### FACULTY SALARY ALLOCATIONS, BINDING ARBITRATION

In early September 1982, as a result of press reports, the Faculty Consultative Committee became aware of the fact that the UEA (Duluth and Waseca) had requested that the Board of Regents and the UEA submit their unresolved issues to binding arbitration. One major unresolved issue proposed for settlement through arbitration was that of a principle governing the allocation of faculty salaries. The new principle, apparently being urged by UEA, was that of equalization of faculty salaries by unit norms. This principle would dictate that salaries would be adjusted so that the norms of faculty salaries would be equal from unit to unit; specifically, the case in question was that of the bargaining units at Duluth and Waseca and the Twin Cities faculty. However, the press reported that the Board of Regents had responded that *principles* governing faculty salary adjustments should not be established by an outside arbitrator.

In late September the Faculty Consultative Committee, as the result of press reports and contacts from outside political sources, realized that strong political pressure was being brought to bear to get the Regents to change their position. The Faculty Consultative Committee believed that there was real danger that the principles governing faculty salary allocations by the Board of Regents would be submitted for arbitration. We realized that any binding decision by an arbitrator would directly affect all of us in as much as we were all faculty members whose salary allocations were governed by principles subscribed to by the Board of Regents. We did not believe we should be silent in the face of the pressures being brought to alter the ways in which the University faculty's salaries would be allocated.

Therefore, on Thursday, September 30, we passed the resolution printed below and transmitted it to the president and directly to each member of the Board of Regents. The resolution represents the collective thinking of the Faculty Consultative Committee and is written to accommodate the diverse views of the committee. It is a resolution to which each member of the committee subscribes. We report it to the Faculty Senate so that you will know the exact action taken by the committee and that you might have the opportunity to discuss it with us.

#### RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

September 30, 1982

In the belief that—

- Standards of excellence and merit should be applied to individual faculty members, regardless of geographic location or unit membership.
- The principle of equity is also fundamental to a just schedule of remuneration, and such equity requires that individual faculty members who make equal contributions to research and teaching should, at least in the long run, receive equal compensation.
- If the University of Minnesota is to maintain its standing as one of the great universities in the nation, the principles applied in faculty remuneration must remain sensitive to market forces. Indeed the salary norms on all of the University campuses must be responsive to the actual competitive pressures that are placed upon the institution so that the best research and teaching can be attracted and retained.
- The institutions considered to be peers for salary comparisons must be governed to a commanding extent by nationally-set norms. The best standards are those established by the America Council on Education and the American Association of University Professors. These organizations have set up, on the basis of mission and role, the peer-group institutions with which the coordinate campuses and the Twin Cities campus are, respectively, comparable. The well-being of the University requires that the institution follow the nationally-established norms, rather than permitting an individual campus to create its own classificatory standards.
- Equalization of faculty salary norms by an arbitrary, riveted formula based on category will lead to the unwarranted dissipation of resources which will reduce the capability of

the *entire* University to respond to its mission, including especially its graduate training and research functions.

- Reward on the basis of merit and equity—so essential to the strength of the University—is such a crucial principle that it should never be left to the decision of an outside arbitrator who, according to customary practice, will be inclined to compromise on the issue.

Therefore we strongly urge the members of the Board of Regents and the president of the University to continue to resist the equalization of salary norms and to stand by their decision *not* to submit the issue to binding arbitration.

**PATRICIA SWAN**  
Chair

See Abstract of the discussion.

## **V. OLD BUSINESS**

none

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

none

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

### **ABSTRACT**

The University Senate was called to order at 3:40 p.m. in 25 Law Building on the Minneapolis campus by President C. Peter Magrath. Duluth, Morris, Crookston, and Waseca campuses were linked by telephone. Neal Vanselow, new vice president for health sciences, was introduced and welcomed with a round of applause. Minutes of the last meeting, officers, the year's meeting schedule, and memberships on committees were approved.

*President's University 1982-83 Policy Agenda.* President Magrath presented his annual policy agenda, remarking that the University was presently transfixed by the state's fiscal situation, and that the real issues will have to do with the quality of the state and the quality of the University of Minnesota in the next decade. He said he had grave concern for the entire University community and would continue to be open for discussion at future meetings during the year as events unfold.

*Human Subjects in Research Policy.* Patricia Swan, professor of food science and nutrition and chair of the Consultative Committee, introduced David Giese, professor, General College, and chair of the Business and Rules Committee, who noted several editorial changes in an amended statement of policy and procedures related to the use of human subjects in research. John Sauk, professor of oral pathology and genetics, then addressed the amendments. He explained that they were needed to bring the University in compliance with new federal regulations. Anthony Zahareas, professor of Spanish and

Portuguese and chair of the Research Committee, confirmed that his committee supported the amendments but was opposed to amendments to be proposed by Paul Reynolds, professor of sociology. Mr. Reynolds then urged the Senate to approve the proposed document regardless of its vote on his proposed amendment. That amendment, he said, would change the procedure for research in "innocuous" areas, where an intermediate category of screened-for-exempt status would be created which would allow an investigator to proceed with research after notifying the Human Subjects Committee that the project was under way and submit a form which the committee would design, thus reducing delays in the research process. William Hanson, professor of philosophy, maintained that it would be difficult to stop research once begun if it were judged not to fall in the exempt category. Richard Sykes, associate professor of speech-communication, commended the efforts of Mr. Reynolds but maintained that the procedures as outlined provided protection to both subjects and investigators, especially legal protection. Mr. Reynolds pointed out that there was nothing in his amendment that would preclude an investigator from asking for review. The Reynolds amendment was then defeated, he withdrew two others that he had proposed, and the proposed policy was approved.

*Planning Policy.* Irwin Rubenstein, professor of genetics and cell biology and chair of the Planning Committee, recommended three motions having to do with planning procedure at the University. Ms. Swan reported the Consultative Committee believed the consultative process last year had been uneven and had therefore endorsed the proposals as a way to improve it. They were approved without further debate, and Ms. Swan requested President Magrath, who had supported the action, to report to her committee when it became apparent that Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow were prepared to implement the proposals.

*Faculty Salaries.* Russell Hobbie, director, Space Science Center, had submitted a question to the president with regard to the effect on other campuses of a faculty settlement at Duluth and Waseca, where union negotiations were taking place. Edward Ney, Regents' professor of physics and astronomy, had asked about the accuracy of a recent news item on the percent increase offer being made to those campuses. He also asked whether the negotiating team had offered to complete a peer comparison salary study and, if so, whether such a study was planned for the Twin Cities campus in relation to its peer institutions. The president reminded the Senate that negotiations were still taking place with the University of Minnesota Education Association so there were some areas on which he could not comment. He said that settlements would not affect other campuses, that additional funds for UMD and UMW would be generated from intra-campus resources, and that the salary settlements that were being proposed to UMEA were based on exactly the same principles as those used in funding salaries on the other University campuses. With regard to percent increases under consideration in the negotiations, the president indicated that figures quoted should reflect only those "comparison units" on the Twin Cities campus. He was unable to comment on the peer comparison because it was an area that was "still on the table." However, he said no such study was contemplated for the Twin Cities, Morris, or Crookston campuses. Kenneth Keller, vice president for academic affairs, then presented some visuals. (Tables are published at the end of this Abstract.) Mr. Ney maintained that in his area, physics and astronomy, salary increase figures were below those being negotiated at Duluth; Mr. Keller invited him to go over the figures with him so he could prove otherwise.

1981-82 Annual Reports by committees were accepted, the Senate rose in silent tribute to three deceased faculty members, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m., after which the Faculty Senate convened.

The president called the Faculty Senate to order. Additions to committee memberships were approved, and highlights for future agendas were presented.

*Faculty Salary Allocations, Binding Arbitration.* Patricia Swan, professor of food science and nutrition and chair of the Consultative Committee, reported that her committee had sent a resolution to the Regents and the president urging them to continue resistance to equalization of salary norms in the Duluth negotiations and not to submit that issue to

binding  
was not  
stay ou  
the con  
industri  
promoti  
been ac  
that sho  
under a  
ics and  
principle  
then su  
would w  
Keller c  
The

Twin Cit  
UMD\*\*  
Morris  
Crooksto  
Waseca

\*Model  
Educatic  
astronom

\*\*Medici

Data So  
81 All Fu  
model g  
mathemat

1981-82  
1982-83

Compo  
Adjust

\*Special

binding arbitration. Alan Hooper, professor of genetics and cell biology, maintained that it was not appropriate for the Senate to interfere. Ms. Swan said her committee had wanted to stay out but when the Regents decided to take a position with regard to salary allocations, the committee decided all faculty members were affected. Mario Bognanno, professor of industrial relations, asked whether the committee had looked at other matters such as promotion, tenure, and teaching loads. Ms. Swan admitted that those subjects had not been addressed but that information had not been readily available. She asked whether that should be done. Mr. Bognanno responded that all such things were matters falling under academic freedom. Wesley Sundquist, professor of agriculture and applied economics and Consultative Committee member, responded that the resolution dealt with a principle—that if a principle were raised that turned on the areas Mr. Bognanno named, then surely the committee would consider it appropriate. Ms. Swan said her committee would welcome further comment on the matter. Mr. Bognanno requested copies of the Keller charts for the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

**MARILEE WARD**  
**Abstractor**

**Table 1**  
**1980-81 AVERAGE CASH SALARIES**  
**ALL CAMPUSES-9 MONTHS**

	Full	Associate	Assistant
Twin Cities*	\$33,015	\$23,724	\$19,423
UMD**	30,231	23,436	19,088
Morris	29,644	22,265	18,219
Crookston	—	22,820	19,593
Waseca	—	—	18,285

\*Model group includes CLA, Home Economics, IT (science and mathematics only), Education, General College, CBS, and SOM. (Science includes chemistry, physics and astronomy, astronomy, geology and geophysics, and computer science.)

\*\*Medicine and Dental Hygiene are excluded.

Data Sources: UMD, Morris, Crookston, and Waseca salary averages are from *the 1980-81 All Funds Academic Salary Analysis*. Collegiate averages included in the Twin Cities model group are also from this source. The salary averages for the science and mathematics departments are from the *1980-81 Departmental Salary Data*.

**Table 2**

	Surrogate Unit Base Increase	Offer to Bargaining Unit
1981-82	10.99%	11%
1982-83	7.0% ?	7%
		1.3%*
Compounded Adjustment	$1.1099 \times 1.07 = 1.188$ 18.8%	$1.11 \times 1.07 = 1.88$ 18.8%
		$1.188 \times 1.013 = 1.203$ 20.3%

\*Special merit and retention fund not effective until last pay period in 1982-83.

**Table 3**  
**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**  
**SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC SALARY AND PROMOTION INCREASES**  
**1981-82 BUDGET**

	Department	Number	Combined Promotion and Salary Increases		
			Total Amount	Average Amount	Average Percent
	Institutional Support:				
11XX	Administration	35	\$165,115	\$4,718	11.09%
13XX-15XX	Other Institutional Support	12	40,184	3,348	9.71
12XX	Student Services	55	176,152	3,203	11.45
	Academic Support				
16XX	Computer Services	10	45,700	4,570	11.16
17XX	Center/Educational Development	3	9,600	3,200	10.15
18XX	Libraries	95	216,320	2,277	9.70
19XX	Other Academic Support	121	478,327	3,953	10.75
	Instructional:				
20XX	Liberal Arts	504	1,430,719	2,839	10.46
21XX	Institute of Technology	323	1,143,533	3,540	11.79
221X-223X	College of Agriculture	247	1,005,442	4,071	12.31
224X	College of Forestry	27	120,988	4,481	13.58
225X	College of Home Economics	51	175,720	3,445	12.03
2405,241X-244X	Medical School	650	1,783,282	2,745	9.15
245X	School of Public Health	38	166,850	4,391	11.33
246X	College of Pharmacy	30	101,032	3,368	11.08
247X	School of Nursing	30	80,328	2,678	10.45
23XX	School of Dentistry	88	309,951	3,522	10.17
2407	Mortuary Science	4	12,450	3,113	11.39
25XX	College of Biological Sciences	72	239,562	3,327	10.71
26XX	Veterinary Medicine	74	268,367	3,627	10.44
27XX	Continuing Education/Extension	30	87,375	2,913	11.79
28XX	Law School	26	158,902	6,112	11.89
29XX	Humphrey Institute	10	31,201	3,120	10.23
30XX	Education	159	526,829	3,313	11.15
33XX	Business Administration	70	291,586	4,166	12.89
34XX	Morris	84	216,303	2,575	10.96
36XX	General College	49	133,381	2,722	11.29
—	Waseca	11	33,055	3,005	10.31
—	Duluth Medical School	37	142,775	3,859	13.06
—	Duluth Central Administration	14	57,562	4,112	11.00
—	Crookston	63	147,076	2,335	10.03

**Notes:**

1. Data supplied to academic affairs from Budget Office 11/16/82, and data are from printed budget report DPC-P029.
2. Waseca only includes non-instructional units; collective bargaining units are not included.
3. Duluth does not include collective bargaining units.
4. When the Twin City Model is analyzed (which is the surrogate for UMD), the overall weighted average is 10.99. The data for the entire University are 10.90, which includes escrow amounts for collective bargaining units.



11.09%  
9.71  
11.45  
11.16  
10.15  
9.70  
10.75  
10.46  
11.79  
12.31  
13.58  
12.03  
9.15  
11.08  
11.33  
10.45  
10.17  
11.39  
10.71  
10.44  
11.79  
11.89  
10.23  
11.15  
12.89  
10.96  
11.29  
10.31  
13.06  
11.00  
10.03

**Table 4**  
**Cash Salaries**  
**1981-82 vs. 1974-75**

	9-10 Month Faculty					11-12 Month Faculty				Weighted Mean <sup>1</sup>
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor		
<b>MINNESOTA</b>										
1981-82	\$36,343	\$25,646	\$21,096	\$18,363	\$43,162	\$34,239	\$28,485	\$23,317	\$31,533	
1974-75	22,744	16,541	13,374	11,042	27,044	21,672	18,843	14,900	20,034	
Seven Year Increase-\$	<u>13,599</u>	<u>9,105</u>	<u>7,722</u>	<u>7,321</u>	<u>16,118</u>	<u>12,567</u>	<u>9,642</u>	<u>8,417</u>	<u>11,499</u>	
-%	59.8%	55.0%	57.7%	66.3%	59.6%	58.0%	51.2%	56.5%	57.4%	
<b>OTHER BIG 10 PUBLICS-MEDIAN</b>										
1981-82	\$36,074	\$26,513	\$21,935	\$17,433	\$44,289	\$33,438	\$27,434	\$20,963	\$31,526	
1974-75	22,883	16,786	13,961	11,367	28,051	22,295	19,221	14,150	20,463	
Seven Year Increase-\$	<u>13,191</u>	<u>9,730</u>	<u>7,974</u>	<u>6,066</u>	<u>16,238</u>	<u>11,143</u>	<u>8,213</u>	<u>6,813</u>	<u>11,063</u>	
-%	57.6%	58.0%	57.1%	53.4%	57.9%	50.0%	42.7%	48.1%	54.1%	
<b>18 AAU PEER SCHOOLS<sup>2</sup>-MEDIAN</b>										
1981-82	\$37,442	\$27,283	\$21,935	\$17,265	\$45,906	\$34,553	\$27,818	\$21,540	\$32,412	
1974-75	23,261	17,085	14,111	11,105	28,379	22,428	18,987	14,268	20,635	
Seven Year Increase-\$	<u>14,181</u>	<u>10,198</u>	<u>7,824</u>	<u>6,160</u>	<u>17,527</u>	<u>12,125</u>	<u>8,831</u>	<u>7,272</u>	<u>11,777</u>	
-%	61.0%	50.7%	55.4%	55.5%	61.8%	54.1%	46.5%	51.0%	57.1%	
<b>9 SUNBELT SCHOOLS<sup>3</sup>-MEDIAN</b>										
1981-82	\$35,867	\$27,839	\$21,637	\$16,850	\$42,988	\$35,830	\$28,632	\$21,728	\$31,894	
1974-75	22,566	16,785	13,765	10,543	26,768	20,669	17,503	12,419	19,588	
Seven Year Increase-\$	<u>13,301</u>	<u>11,054</u>	<u>7,872</u>	<u>6,307</u>	<u>16,220</u>	<u>15,161</u>	<u>11,129</u>	<u>9,309</u>	<u>12,306</u>	
-%	58.9%	65.9%	57.2%	59.8%	60.0%	73.4%	63.6%	75.0%	62.8%	

<sup>1</sup>Weighted by U/M rank and term distribution.  
<sup>2</sup>Big 10, Chicago, Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, Pittsburgh, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Cal-Berkeley.  
<sup>3</sup>Alabama, Arizona, Georgia, Houston, North Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia.