

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

*MBM*  
*M66*

APRIL 1, 1993

The third meeting of the University Senate for 1992-93 was convened in Cowles Auditorium, Humphrey Center, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 1, 1993, at 2:35 p.m. (immediately following the Twin Cities Campus Assembly meeting). Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 109 voting faculty/academic professional members, 27 voting student members, 1 ex officio member, and 9 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

-----  
**CONSENT AGENDA**

**Action**

Agenda Items I. through III. are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature and are offered as a "Consent Agenda" to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a Senator. A majority of the voting membership (112) is required for approval.

**I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 18, 1993**

**II. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
Computing and Information Systems Committee**

**MOTION:**

To amend the Senate Bylaws, Article III, Section 3, Computing and Information Systems Committee, as follows (new language is underlined; deleted language is ~~struck out~~):

**3. Computing and Information Systems Committee**

...

**Membership**

The Computing and Information Systems Committee shall be composed of 8 faculty/academic professionals. . . . Insofar as possible, members shall not rotate off the committee but shall serve at least until the continued existence of the committee is reviewed by the Senate in ~~1991-92~~ 1996-97.

**COMMENT:**

The 1991-92 review called for in the bylaws did not occur, except on an informal basis. The Committee on Computing and Information Systems was not disbanded, and in the last two years has had a full agenda and has been meeting frequently. It is the judgment of the Consultative Committee that the issues associated with computing are not going to diminish or disappear in the next few years and that the Senate should continue to have a faculty-student body to attend to these issues. The Computing and Information Systems committee, moreover, has been identified in the Information Technology Planning Process as playing a major consultative role as that planning proceeds, and the Consultative Committee believes it should continue to fill that role.

The Consultative Committee also believes that continuity on the Computing and Information Systems committee is important, given the history of events associated with computing at the University; it is thus proposed that current members of the committee continue to serve indefinite terms and that new members be appointed as

vacancies occur. The current members of the Computing and Information Systems committee are amenable to this proposal.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee

**III. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Attendance Policy**

**MOTION:**

To amend the Senate Constitution, Article III, Section 5, Removal for Neglect of Meetings, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

**5. Removal for Neglect of Meetings**

...

- b. A member of the Faculty Senate shall forfeit membership by neglecting three consecutive meetings of the University Senate. A member of the Student Senate shall forfeit membership by neglecting two ~~consecutive~~ meetings of the University Senate.

**COMMENT:**

The student members of the Senate Consultative Committee have asked that the Senate attendance rules be amended in order that they be able to remove students who attend meetings only sporadically, but who, under the present rules, cannot be removed from their position because they do not miss a sufficient number of consecutive meetings. The proposed language provides that missing any two Senate meetings will be grounds for removal.

Constitutional amendments require approval by two-thirds of the voting membership at one meeting or by a majority of the voting membership at each of two consecutive meetings. The motion received approval by a majority of the voting membership at the February 18 meeting and is being re-presented for a second vote.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee

DENISE TOLBERT, Chair  
Student Senate Consultative Committee

**DISCUSSION:**

*The Consent Agenda was approved 112 to 0 without discussion.*

**APPROVED**

---

**IV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**  
**Academic Professional Representation in the Senate**  
**Action**

**MOTION:**

To amend the Senate Constitution, Article III, Section 4a. Election of University Senate Members, as follows: [deletions are ~~struck-out~~; additions are underlined]

#### 4. Election of University Senate Members

- a. The elected representatives of the ~~faculties~~ faculty and academic professionals [this refers to academic professionals as defined by the Board of Regents--"Academic professionals generally parallel disciplinary faculty in having the requisite preparation and specialized knowledge in an academic discipline or field on which practice is based and in exercising independent judgment. These individuals are not engaged in full-time teaching and scholarly work, as are faculty, but rather are assigned to duties enhancing the research, teaching, and service functions of the University..."] to the University Senate shall be chosen by secret ballot by the ~~faculties~~ faculty and academic professionals of the several institutes, colleges, or schools of collegiate rank, as follows: ~~The regular members~~ faculty and academic professionals of each of these collegiate units shall include ~~faculty who are~~ professors, associate professors, assistant professors (including research associates), or instructors on full-time appointments (including research fellows) and campus-based academic professionals who hold holding continuous, and probationary, appointments. or Also included are campus-based academic professionals with fixed term terms of two years or more in length, or annual appointments having completed five years of service at the University. [Academic Professionals with fixed terms of two years or more in length and eligible to serve in the Senate prior to 1993 shall continue to be eligible.] These ~~faculty and academic professionals~~ shall jointly elect from their rank (professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and academic professionals) one University Senate member for the initial twenty of their regular members or any fraction of that number holding such rank and one additional Senate member for each additional twenty of the regular members or major fraction thereof. . . .

#### COMMENT:

The Committee on Committees was asked by the Senate Consultative Committee to review the rules on eligibility for academic professionals to serve in the Senate. In assessing the current policies, Committee on Committees assumed that the goal of the Senate was to continue eligibility of academic professionals who would have been given faculty rank and been eligible prior to the creation of the academic professional class. The current rule, established in 1983, states that those academic professionals who hold continuous (G), probationary (H), and fixed (J) terms of two years or more in length are eligible to serve.

In retrospect, the rule seems to fall short of what presumably was its goal. It defines as ineligible individuals who have worked at the University in faculty types of roles for long periods of time simply because they happen to be reappointed annually, yet it allows representation for individuals who have fixed-term appointments of two or more years from the time they begin to work at the University. In effect, the current policies deny certain long-duration members of the University community a privilege that they seemingly would have received before the academic professional job class was created.

The Committee on Committees and the Senate Consultative Committee believe that a better way of defining eligibility of individuals holding limited time academic professional appointments is in terms of their length of service to the University. Thus, they believe that once academic professionals holding limited-term appointments fulfill a five year length-of-service test of long-term involvement with the collegiate units' academic programs of teaching, research, and service, they should be eligible for Senate representation within their academic unit.

Finally, please note the added parenthetical statement about the academic professional class defining them to be "faculty-like" in their academic background, qualifications, and duties. To the extent that the class has been or will be changed to include individuals who are not faculty-like in their training and in their duties, such individuals should not be eligible for representation in the Senate.

Under the new criteria approximately 350 additional academic professionals would be eligible to participate in University governance (213 are currently eligible), increasing the number of senators by approximately 17. These figures are an upper bound and so is the estimate (based on the Constitution's 1:20 representative ratio) that this will add 17 additional senators.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee

GEOFFREY MARUYAMA, Chair  
Senate Committee on Committees

## **DISCUSSION:**

*Professor Maruyama presented the motion to change the eligibility requirements for academic professional representation in the Senate. He encouraged senators who had not had an opportunity to read the detailed commentary following the motion to do so. The floor was then opened for comments and/or questions. Seeing no hands, the President turned to the vote and the motion received 117 affirmative votes. As a constitutional amendment, the motion needed 148 affirmative votes at one meeting or 112 affirmative votes at each of two consecutive meetings. The motion will be brought back to the Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting for a second reading.*

**NOT APPROVED**

### **V. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Protocols for Student Evaluation and Peer Review of Faculty Teaching Contributions Action**

#### **PREAMBLE:**

On May 14, 1992, the University Senate adopted a policy on the Evaluation of Teaching Contributions by the faculty (see addendum). The purpose of this policy is to facilitate evaluation of teaching for purposes of promotion and salary decisions, by defining what shall constitute adequate documentation for peer review of faculty teaching contributions. In the final portion of the motion approved as a policy, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was directed to draw up and bring back to the Senate, for approval prior to implementation of this policy, "details of the required assessment of teaching." In particular, SCEP was to propose "protocols for peer review [of teaching contributions], timing of assessment activities, institutional procedures for ensuring the accuracy and confidentiality of the results, procedures for administering student evaluations, and procedures for interpreting numerically scored evaluations." In preparing the recommendations that follow, over the course of the fall and winter quarters, SCEP has consulted on an on-going basis with Anne Hopkins, Vice President for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering. We have also benefitted from the advice of Dallis Perry and Gary Jocelyn (University Counselling Services) and Darwin Hendel (Academic Affairs).

These protocols shall apply to student evaluation of courses having no more than two instructors. Units whose curriculum features courses with more than two instructors shall develop their own procedures for student evaluation of such courses.

Our recommendations are presented along an imaginary time line, beginning with the distribution of student evaluation forms in class, and concluding with the use of these and other materials by those who within given units are charged with making recommendations on promotion, and/or merit-based salary increases related to teaching. Paragraphs 1 - 4 deal with procedures for administration and analysis of student evaluations; paragraphs 5 - 8 deal with procedures for peer review.

If this final part of the teaching evaluation policy is adopted by the Senate, we envision that the use of student evaluations as described here would begin in Fall, 1993, and the full policy will be implemented by Fall, 1994.

#### **MOTION:**

That the Senate adopt the following protocols to implement its May 14, 1992, policy on evaluation of teaching contributions.

1. Directions given on student evaluation questionnaires will include the following statement:

"Your responses to this questionnaire are important because they will be used in tenure, promotion and salary decisions for your instructor. Your thoughtful written comments are especially requested, and may help your instructor improve future course offerings. The results of this

evaluation (including the evaluation forms) will not be returned to the instructor until after the final grades are submitted for this course."

2. The questionnaire will include the questions approved by the Senate (14 May 1992), plus space for additional items generated by the instructor or the unit. The form will ask for information on the student's major, gpa and class year, as well as whether or not the course is in the student's major and whether the course is required or elective for the student. There will also be a request, marked optional, for information on the student's age, gender, and race or ethnicity. [Note: Information about the class size and type (lab, lecture, seminar, etc.) will be included, but this information will be compiled elsewhere.]
3. Administering student evaluations will be the responsibility of each instructional unit. Student evaluations used in promotion and salary decisions will be administered at the beginning of a class period, during the last two weeks of instruction for the quarter. The evaluations will be handed out, completed, and collected without the instructor being present. It is suggested that a student be asked to hand out and collect the forms. Once collected, evaluations will be put in a sealed envelope or box and brought to the unit office, to be logged in and sent to the appropriate data processing center.
4. Each campus will determine the appropriate manner of administering and evaluating student evaluation forms. To facilitate tabulation of the results of standardized questions on the student evaluation forms, each campus administration will provide the instructor and the unit chair with a summary of the data; the original questionnaires will be returned to the instructor. This summary will include appropriate statistical characterization of the responses to each question and, where a statistically meaningful data base exists, comparison to the responses for the same question on a campus, college, department, and program basis. To make comparative analysis more meaningful, there will also be comparisons on the basis of class type (e.g., large lecture, small discussion, laboratory, upper or lower division, elective, needed to meet university or major requirements). As resources permit, other types of statistical processing and comparisons may be added at the request of faculty or instructional units.
5. To ensure that student teaching evaluation results are used with appropriate caution, tenure-home units shall be provided with a brochure summarizing current research on the meaning and usefulness of student evaluations (including questions of reliability and validity).
6. By fall quarter of 1994, every tenure-home unit shall have a policy on peer review of faculty teaching efforts and contributions to teaching, both for purposes of promotion decisions and for teaching-based salary increases. In keeping with the language of the Senate policy of 14 May 1992, each unit shall determine what documentation faculty must submit for peer review, and how to evaluate theses and dissertations as well as samples of graded student work. The documentation is to be used as a basis for evaluating the faculty member's knowledge of the subject matter as well as the quality of the faculty member's instructional activities. Each unit shall determine who shall have access to the documentation for purposes of peer review, and which materials will be retained for future reference.
7. The documentation should reflect what each unit determines to be an appropriately cumulative record of the faculty member's contributions to the educational mission of the university, beginning with the year of the implementation of this policy. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to update the documentation regularly. It is the responsibility of the unit to retain appropriate portions of this material, including cumulative summaries of student evaluations of the faculty member's courses. Each unit shall assume responsibility for maintaining the confidentiality of commentaries or conclusions based on the contents of the documentation.
8. It is expected that the documentation for each faculty member should contain an appropriately cumulative listing of courses taught by the faculty member, a comprehensive syllabus for each course, and examples of exams, assignments and handouts prepared by the instructor. Units may also wish to include a listing of undergraduate and graduate students undertaking independent study

under the supervision of the faculty member, information about student performance on certification exams, and a listing of other activities that pertain to the teaching mission of the unit (e.g. participation in teaching-related committee work or curriculum development, publication of textbooks or study guides, participation in programs like the Bush Faculty Development program, etc.). Finally, SCEP recommends inclusion of a one-to-two page self-assessment of the faculty member's teaching strengths and weaknesses. Faculty members have the option of adding any other materials they believe are indicative of their contributions to teaching.

9. This policy is not meant to exclude continued use of other mechanisms for peer review that may already be in place in academic units, such as classroom visitation.
10. Two years after this policy goes into effect, and periodically thereafter, both the overall implementation of the policy, and the value of its constituent elements (e.g. the standardized student evaluation mandated by the Senate in May of 1992) will be reviewed by SCEP, so as to bring to the attention of the Senate any changes that may seem needed.

**COMMENT:** (numbers correspond to the numbered paragraphs of the protocol).

1. It seems important to let students know the uses to which the evaluation forms they fill out will be put.
2. From SCEP minutes, February 11, 1993:

"A continued concern was the possibility that anonymity of students would be jeopardized by the use of identifying information, especially demographic information, especially in small classes. The Committee deliberated for some while on this issue. Points of view ranged from making provision of this information optional--with a warning that students in small classes might endanger the anonymity of the response if they provide the demographic information--to simply making it optional and leaving it at that, on the grounds that these are university students and no one can MAKE anyone fill out ANY of the surveys. In terms of possible subgroup analysis, validity will be dependent on the number of students who fill out the forms and who identify themselves by race/gender/age. (The real issue, as one Committee member observed, is race/ethnicity, because in many small classes there may not be more than one or two minority students.)

"The Committee concluded, however, that these data should be requested, because the information obtained can be useful to instructors in demonstrating how different groups respond to his/her teaching--and possibly affect the teaching. The information should be sought because it can make a difference: problems with different race/gender/age groups can be identified and addressed.

"The Committee also agreed that other personal information--class year, GPA, major, and whether the class was elective or required--should be requested and NOT identified as optional, because these factors have been shown in prior research to have an effect on student evaluations.

"Student members of the Committee all expressed satisfaction that the privacy interests of students would be served by these proposals."

At its March 11 meeting, devoted to a consideration of reactions to the February 11 draft, the Committee noted that Measurement Services is developing a form on which demographic information would be detached before the forms are returned to the instructor. The Committee also endorsed a suggestion that Measurement Services write the program for sub-group analysis in such a way as to inhibit sub-group analysis for courses in which there are fewer than N members of a given sub-group enrolled in the course--5 seemed an appropriate number.

3. As was brought to our attention by those with whom SCEP consulted, studies indicate that the results of student questionnaires may be quite different if the instructor is present while the forms are being filled out.

4. SCEP recommends against calculation of statistical norms on a University-wide basis, because of significant differences in mission among the several campuses and collegiate units.
5. This addition to the February 11 draft was prompted by comments from colleagues in Psychology.
6. Department and college administrators should be held accountable for timely assessment of the evaluative materials assembled for each faculty member. However, for peer review of the documentation for the purpose of promotion or of teaching-related merit pay increases, the faculty in each unit should be free to decide whether they want their dean or head or chair to take responsibility for assessing the quality of teaching, on the basis of the materials, or whether they prefer that the evaluation be done by an advisory group from within the unit or college.
8. This paragraph draws on language in the policy adopted last year. The peer review process outlined here revolves around the evaluation of a streamlined version of what is called a teaching portfolio. In the full sense of the term, not proposed here, a teaching portfolio "goes beyond traditional quantitative teaching evaluations to capture the uniqueness of individual efforts. Teaching portfolios prompt reflective practice and, when made public in the company of other portfolios, can contribute to collective standard setting . . ." (V. M. Littlefield, in Faculty Development 5 (2), Winter 1992.
9. Some departments and colleges already have in place, or may consider initiating, classroom visitation or analysis of videotaped classroom instruction as another method of assessing instructional quality. When used correctly, these can be very effective for improvement of instruction, but they may be less appropriate as tools for personnel decisions. We strongly encourage units that wish to make use of these forms of evaluation to take advantage of established procedures for the appropriate conduct and interpretation of these reviews. This policy does not include procedures for direct observation of classroom teaching, nor does it list classroom observation as a mandatory part of peer review.
10. One issue that will need looking at is whether there should be verbal anchor points for all seven numerical values for the five standardized questions, not just for the highest and lowest values.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee

JAMES TRACY, Chair  
Educational Policy Committee

**ADDENDUM:**

Policy on Evaluation of Teaching Contributions  
(Adopted by the University Senate May 14, 1992)

1. The teaching performance of all faculty, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, must be subject to evaluation. The frequency and intensity of this assessment will vary. Probationary faculty are already subject to an annual retention review that includes an evaluation of their teaching. All tenured faculty who wish to be considered for a salary increase based on teaching must submit for review evidence of their recent contributions to teaching, including items of information listed below for peer review (Recommendation 2). In addition, faculty to be considered for a teaching-based salary increase must submit written student evaluations for at least one section of each of the courses taught during the previous year; a more accurate assessment of a faculty member's overall performance would include evaluations for at least one offering of each of the courses taught by the instructor during the period since his/her last teaching-based salary review, and all offerings of a course if it was significantly modified from one quarter to another.

Students must be made aware that their ratings will be used in making personnel decisions. A small number of questions common to all courses throughout the university will be used in the student evaluations of instructors. The use of common questions provides one means of making judgments on teaching effectiveness university-wide, and allows calculation of statistical norms. It is important to stress that this type of information







include a specific estimation of student effort by the instructor to determine whether the course credit is appropriate. Periodically, student survey and student interview data relating to student effort should be used as additional data in determining the appropriate course credit, so that any adjustments can be made. A summary of the instructional unit's student effort reviews shall be submitted to the appropriate college for evaluation on an annual basis. To achieve consistency across the University, the results of each college evaluation process shall be forwarded to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for appropriate review.

#### COMMENT:

The Senate Committee of Educational Policy (SCEP) has discussed the various policies of the Senate in defining course credit through its history and their impact on types of learning experiences and realistic student effort. We have been guided by well-established ideas of educational efficiency which rejects "seat time" as a measure of learning and by the need to assure that students have a fair knowledge of the time commitment necessary to complete a University course of study in an appropriate number of years. Throughout most of its history, the Senate policy was that first passed in February 16, 1922 which equates one credit to "three actual hours of work, one recitation hour or one lecture hour being assumed to require two additional hours of preparation, and one laboratory period of three hours equivalent to a lecture or recitation period in the necessary preparation. Other work . . . should be indicated on the basis of one credit for each three hours of work."

SCEP is essentially recommending a return to the historical policy which still permeates much of faculty and student thinking about appropriate course credit. This policy was reaffirmed when the Senate voted that normal courses should carry either 4 or 5 credits in 1970. At that time the Senate also passed the statement that: "It should be noted that the policy equates the number of credit hours with the total number of hours of student effort. The policy does not equate the number of credit hours with the number of classroom hours per week." The historical Senate policy was radically changed in 1989. At that time linkage of course credit to student effort was abandoned with the policy: "there generally be a one-to-one ratio between the number of credits awarded for completion of a course and the number of hours per week that the course meets. In the case of laboratory courses, it is understood that one laboratory meeting per week shall be the approximately equivalent of one credit. This general policy explicitly recognizes that there are sound pedagogical reasons why some courses and some subjects may deviate from this one-to-one standard; this policy does not bar such variations."

SCEP believes that the 1989 policy gives the wrong message to both faculty and students as to the primary function of courses at the University. It assigns educational value, credit is the currency, to "seat time". We know that learning takes place only when students are intellectually engaged (so-called "active learning") with a subject. While class time can be one vehicle for this engagement, most people require other types of intellectual effort to learn efficiently. The appropriate ratio of class time to other learning efforts depends dramatically on the subject matter and techniques to be mastered. It is certainly not valid to assume that a one hour class has more educational value than a laboratory of any length. Because credits are sometimes equated with educational cost and determination of faculty effort, the current policy can have the unintentional effect of discouraging sound educational policy. Clearly, a course in which students are given feedback on a significant body of written work takes a large amount of faculty effort and entails a large cost. Another unintentional consequence of the 1989 policy is that it removes the information which would give students an indication of the faculty's estimation of the amount of time required to complete a course with a desired result. The information that a class meets four times per week is available in the appropriate bulletin and class schedule so, under the 1989 policy, the number of credits gives no additional information. Information giving other institutions information about the student effort required by a course and allowing students to budget time for that course is now given nowhere.

SCEP understands the need to standardize the meaning of credits offered by different subject areas. The one-to-one class meeting to credit is certainly easy to implement from this point of view. However, for the reasons outlined above we believe that this method of standardization is inappropriate. It is appropriate that the faculty teaching a course have an awareness of the amount of effort being required of the students and that the University be able to review that assessment of effort. We urge that the Senate adopt the suggested policy which essentially returns to the historical basis upon which the University has awarded credits.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee

**DISCUSSION:**

Professor Tracy also presented the motion with respect to class hour-credit ratio. He referred senators to a copy of the 1989 policy which was distributed at the door. During the course of the past year, he said, the SCEP came to the conclusion that the 1989 policy gives the wrong message to both faculty and students as to the primary function of courses at the University. It assigns educational value, credit is the currency, to "seat time." The proposed policy would restore the definition of a credit to its status prior to the 1989 policy (i.e. a credit means three hours of work, including one hour of classroom time) and proposes a procedure whereby the expectations demanded of students in terms of work can be periodically reviewed. Professor Tracy referred senators to the detailed commentary accompanying the motion and opened the floor for comments and questions.

Supplementing Professor Tracy's remarks, one senator called the Senate's attention to the original 1922 policy on class hour-credit ratio which equated one credit to "three actual hours of work, one recitation hour or one lecture hour being assumed to require two additional hours of preparation, and one laboratory period of three hours equivalent to a lecture or recitation period in the necessary preparation. Other work . . . should be indicated on the basis of one credit for each three hours of work." In 1970, the course-credit module was changed from three to four. At the same time some recognition was given to the fact that it was the total student effort, regardless of how spent, that should be counted toward the credit. Some units went forward in good faith and rearranged their classroom materials and instruction so that the four credits represented an honest educational effort on the part of the student, and the workload was increased. There were, however, some units that made no changes and course credit was simply changed from three to four credits. Perhaps, one person suggested, that might have been the impetus in developing the 1989 policy. Even the 1989 policy recognized that there are sound pedagogical reasons why some courses and some subjects may deviate from the one-to-one standard and did not bar such variations.

A number of questions were raised: 1) What are the points in the procedures for ensuring educational quality in terms of the new teaching assessments and how would these preclude the abuses which occurred earlier? 2) How will this approach to quality control be communicated to the students who enroll in our courses and to the general public which pays part of our salaries? 3) What is the anticipated implementation date, if the policy is approved?

Professor Tracy responded that, odd as it may seem for a historian to say, he believes it is a mistake to base future policy on the slender reed of historical understanding. The SCEP agreed it was important to arrive at an understanding of what it means to say "one hour of credit is worth three hours of effort," without attempting to prejudge the question of what did or did not happen at the time the University changed from the three credit to the four credit module. It is the SCEP's feeling that one of the first steps should be determining the expectations for students and to understand the student point of view (e.g. faculty and students may have differing opinions as to the length of time it takes to do certain activities). With regard to implementation, Professor Tracy said, there are two ways to view it: 1) a University organized from the top where there is a strong presence monitoring activities; and 2) a University that percolates up from the departmental level where units carryout the responsibilities.

One senator queried whether it was timely for the University to change the policy given the national discussions on workload and the University's precarious position with the legislature. Professor Thomas Clayton, member of the SCEP, responded that the committee felt strongly that the policy needed to be changed even if it did not seem to be politically expedient to do so.

One senator suggested changing the standard credit from "four" credits, meeting three hours per week, to "three" credits, meeting three hours per week; thus preventing increased faculty workloads and the need for additional teaching assistants.

At this point, the policy statement as presented was approved by a majority of those members present and voting.

**APPROVED**

**VII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Endorsement of Minnesota Human Rights Legislation**  
**Action**

**MOTION:**

That the University Senate endorse the following Resolution:

RESOLUTION

That the University Senate supports the legislation authored by Representative Karen Clark and Senator Allen Spear adding "sexual or affectional orientation" to the list of protected classes in the State of Minnesota Human Rights Act.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee

**DISCUSSION:**

*Because of the recent developments at the Legislature and the likely passage of the bill to add sexual or affectional orientation to the list of protected classes in the State of Minnesota Human Rights Act, the Senate Consultative Committee withdrew the motion.*

**VIII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Beginning with a legislative update, the President said the University has been engaged in extensive discussions with legislators on a variety of issues. Presentations have also been made that lay out the achievements of the University in teaching, research, and outreach, such as:

- 10,981 students were graduated in 1991-92
- 75 percent of incoming freshmen this year had fulfilled all preparation requirements as compared to 17 percent in 1985 under the same rules
- the sponsored research budget grew by 17 percent last year to a total of \$273 million
- the U of M was recently ranked "third" in the country in total research and development expenditures by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*
- over one million contacts with citizens of Minnesota were undertaken by the Minnesota Extension Service last year alone

The news from the Legislature, the President said, appears more positive than earlier forecasts in light of the more positive revenue projections received in March. It does not appear the House is going to recommend a reduction in the base budget and there is discussion of some inflationary funding being provided to the University. The House has also discussed additional funding for the State Financial Aid system and especially strengthening the part of the system that addresses the needs of low income students. At this time, the President said, it is not clear what position the Senate will take.

On the issue of tuition, President Hasselmo said, the University needs to ascertain what are reasonable tuition rates for students in different parts of the University. It must look at the balance of tuition and financial aid and specifically at different types of students--where can the University rely more on financial aid and increase tuition and where does it need to keep tuition rates low. There already is extensive work underway on this issue, the President said, with task forces in place on all four campuses.

Work is also underway in the area of public-private partnerships. A task force has been appointed to review current policies and practices and will be bringing recommendations to the President soon.

The President turned briefly to the issue of outreach, noting that the Outreach Council, at work for over a year, will soon be making recommendations regarding structuring, defining, and investing in appropriate outreach

activities at the University.

As part of the planning process, President Hasselmo said, units have been asked to identify 4 and 6 percent base budget reductions as a way of identifying positive and negative priorities. The University is continuing with the reallocation plan adopted in 1991 and is approximately half-way through the \$58 million reallocation.

Last, the President talked about the proposal to introduce four-year degrees in twelve different areas at UMC. It is felt, he said, that through tuition income from third and fourth year students, a viable four-year curriculum can be provided. The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) has currently approved four of the twelve programs and five additional programs seem to be looked upon favorably. There are three programs that have been questioned by the Higher Education Coordinating Board staff and negotiations are in progress among individuals at Crookston, Bemidji, and the HECB staff regarding those programs. It is important for the University community to understand that the University is launching, on a five-year experimental basis, a new type of applied, strongly employment related, bachelors education program.

## IX. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

### Question:

The Governor's budget proposal articulates a philosophy of funding for higher education which is significantly different from that understood in previous years. In addition to recommending a lower level of funding than the University has requested, the Governor's proposal promotes the privatization of public higher education, recommends that funding be attached to the student rather than the institution, and proposes the elimination of state subsidies for professional education, particularly targeted at certain groups in this instance, but broadly applicable to students pursuing degrees that could be considered professional.

Please articulate the position of the administration of the University with respect to these issues raised by the Governor's proposals:

1. Using market analysis to determine the price of tuition in targeted programs
2. The privatization of public higher education
3. Attaching funding to the student rather than the institution

### Response:

The University has over a long period of time used market considerations in setting tuition, looking both at the market in terms of demand for certain types of graduates and in terms of ability of students to pay, and the University's competitive situation vis-a-vis comparable programs. The result is that in some programs students pay a considerably higher percentage of the cost of instruction than in others. The alternative to this kind of market approach would be to tie tuition strictly to the cost of instruction which seems to lead to unreasonable results. The market is also looked at in terms of the mix of tuition and financial aid. Different types of students may respond differently to different mixes of tuition and financial aid.

The question, President Hasselmo said, raises the important issue of the public responsibility to finance educational opportunity. Some argue that higher education only benefits the student, suggesting the student should bear the full burden of the costs of having that opportunity. Clearly, education has great benefit to society and society must invest in educational opportunity. That is why public institutions receive a direct investment from the State. Financial aid is an investment the State makes to provide access, which is quite different from the investment that it makes directly to education. The basic rationale for financial aid is to avoid economic barriers to access to higher education.

**Question:**

What is the University's position on House File 513 (Steam Plant)?

**Response:**

House File 513 involves a bill to block the development of the steam plant through the Foster-Wheeler contract that the University has signed. The University has opposed the bill and believes it to be an infringement on the constitutional right of the Board of Regents to make decisions for the University of Minnesota. The steam plant proposal, he reminded senators, came forward after two years of deliberations and received strong support by the Board of Regents. Included in the proposal, President Hasselmo said, is a clean coal technology component whereby the University would seek federal funding for the development of clean coal technology.

**Question:**

Is it possible to comment on faculty salary increases for the next academic year?

**Answer:**

The University, President Hasselmo responded, has made as strong a case as it can at the Legislature for at least inflationary increases for faculty and staff. The Governor originally proposed salary freezes for all State employees, which would include the University, but it is hoped that will not happen. If the University does not receive any funding from the State for salary increases then it will need to evaluate whether to increase salaries through reallocation. The President's personal view is that he would find it very difficult to accept a total freeze on salaries for the next biennium. The University was the only major entity in the State that experienced a freeze in the first year of the last biennium.

## X. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Newly-elected Faculty Consultative Committee members, Professors John Adams, Robert Jones, and Geoffrey Maruyama, received a warm round of applause after being introduced by Professor Mario Bognanno.

1992-93 has been a dynamic year, Professor Bognanno said, and the committees of the Senate have been overwhelmed with the number of demands placed on them. Over the course of the past months various committees of the Senate have produced for the University a Faculty Workload Policy, a Faculty Compensation Policy, a University Grievance Policy, a policy relating to parental leave for faculty, and numerous protocols designed to harmonize the nature of the relationship between the governance system and the administration. One important protocol entitled "Administrative Response to Senate Actions" provides a mechanism for follow up on actions taken by the Senate; the results of which will be reported to the Senate as a regular agenda item at each meeting.

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) has endeavored to work hand-in-glove with the administration as it addresses issues of accountability, economic concerns, etc. One recent endeavor was the joint appointment of a task force by the President and the SCC to investigate and evaluate supercomputing issues. The governance system has also been brought into the University's planning process by the Administration. The chairs of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Finance and Planning Committee have been asked to work with a small group of individuals to lay out an "agenda for planning."

Other important issues under discussion by the Consultative Committee include: 1) faculty salaries, 2) review of the membership and responsibilities of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, and 3) review of the recommendations of the Select Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Concerns.

Professor Bognanno ended his report by thanking all committee chairs and members for their outstanding work.

## **XI. OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

## **XII. NEW BUSINESS**

**NONE**

## **XIII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY**

### **FACULTY**

**Santiago A. Cuneo**  
**1899-1993**

Professor Santiago A. (James) Cuneo, formerly of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, died March 12, 1993, at age 93. Founder of the Institute for Hispanic American Studies at the University and Professor of Spanish language, Latin American Literature, and Hispanic civilization and culture, Cuneo began his University affiliation in 1941. Professor Cuneo earned a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Nebraska in 1932.

A native of Pergamino, Argentina, Cuneo had many interests beyond his contributions to the scholarly community. He served as a staff member for the Argentine team at the Olympic Games in Los Angeles in 1932. He worked for the J. Walter Thompson advertising agency, and as editor for several speciality magazines in Buenos Aires. He served as president of the International Institute in St. Paul, and as a delegate to the UNESCO conference in 1956 at Denver. Cuneo was widely recognized for his abilities as a leader and educator.

Cuneo's love for Argentina and his passion for broadening intercultural communication was well known to devoted friends and students. Memorials should be sent to the Student Project for Amity Among Nations funds at the University of Minnesota, or the Alzheimer's Association.

**Izaak M. Kolthoff**  
**1894-1993**

Izaak Maurits Kolthoff was born in Almelo, Holland on February 11, 1894, and died in St. Paul, Minnesota on March 4, 1993. He entered the University of Utrecht, Holland, in 1911. His first scientific paper, on acid base titrations, appeared in 1915, and this was followed by a host of papers and several books. By 1927, at age 33, he had a world-wide reputation and was invited to become Professor of Chemistry at the University of Minnesota, where he remained until his retirement in 1962. At that time, he had published about 800 papers and several books; after 1962, about 150 more papers until his health failed a few years ago.

This research, covering about a dozen areas of chemistry, has been recognized by many medals and memberships in learned societies in this country and abroad, including the National Academy of Sciences and the Nichols Medal of the American Chemical Society. To the general public, he was best known for his work in synthetic rubber, carried out during World War II and for some years after. Early in this war, the government established a comprehensive research program at the major industrial companies and several universities, including Minnesota. Kolthoff quickly assembled a large research group and made major contributions to the program.

Many of his graduate students went on to successful careers in industry and academic life, and the latter in turn trained many more. In 1982, it was estimated that about 1,100 Ph.D. holders could trace their scientific roots to him. When the American Chemical Society inaugurated an award for excellence in teaching in 1983, he was the first recipient.

Besides his scientific work, he was active in promoting international understanding, and especially during

the war years, in rescuing colleagues from oppressive regimes. He had broad cultural interests and traveled the world over.

He never married, and is survived by relatives in Holland and Israel.

**Vaughn Larson**  
**1931-1993**

Dr. Larson was a native from Mondovi, Wisconsin. He grew up on a farm and attended the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire and Florida State University. He enlisted in the Air Force and served for 4 years, including tours of duty in Korea and Japan. He enrolled at the University of Minnesota in 1955 and earned his DVM degree in 1960. He was in private practice for one year in Evansville, Wisconsin then returned to the University of Minnesota to complete a Ph.D. degree. While Dr. Larson was completing his Ph.D. degree, he worked as an associate scientist in the medical department of the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island, New York for one year. After completion of his Ph.D. degree in 1968, Dr. Larson joined the College of Veterinary Medicine faculty as an assistant professor. He became a full professor in 1974. Early in his career, Dr. Larson studied leukemia in cattle, helping identify the virus that causes the disease. He taught in the College of Veterinary Medicine for more than 25 years. He was well respected by students, interns and residents training under him. At the time of his death, he was director for the Veterinary Medicine degree program. Dr. Larson was 61 at the time of his death and is survived by his wife Bunny and son Vince.

**William Delmar Munro**  
**1916-1993**

William Delmar Munro, Professor Emeritus of Computer Science, died of pneumonia on January 20, 1993 after an almost year long battle with cancer. He was a pioneer in the computer field and made a major contribution toward bringing the University into the modern computer era. Professor Munro was born in Cedaredge, Colorado. After graduation from the University of Colorado at Boulder, he came to Minnesota for graduate work in the College of Science, Literature and the Arts' Department of Mathematics where he completed his Ph.D. in 1947. Dr. Munro was appointed an Assistant Professor in the Institute of Technology's Department of Mathematics in 1947. He was promoted to Associate Professor in 1959 and to Full Professor in 1965. His research interests lay in numerical analysis and the applications of computing machinery to the solution of problems in the physical and engineering sciences. He developed courses in his area of expertise that ultimately formed a basis for a curriculum in computer science. He co-authored several early textbooks in that field. He played a leading role in expanding the I.T. Mathematics Department's Numerical Analysis Center into an all University Computer Center that by 1967 was ranked among the best in the nation. Professor Munro was one of the people who understood that for the University to obtain full benefit from its computing facilities a graduate program in computer science was needed and he strongly urged the establishment of such a program. When the program came into existence in 1967, he was appointed the first director of graduate studies and served in that capacity until his retirement in 1987. During his tenure as director of graduate studies, the graduate program in computer science grew to be one of the largest and most successful graduate programs in the University. He was indefatigable in pursuing the welfare of graduate students and served as an advisor to dozens of them. Munro felt the need of a budgetary department to support the graduate program in computer science and when such a department was formed, beginning its independent existence in 1970-71, he was appointed associate head. He also served in this capacity until his retirement. Among his other professional activities, he worked as a Project Engineer at Honeywell during the war years of 1942-45. He was a visiting mathematician at U.C.L.A. in 1957-58 and a visiting professor at Johns Hopkins University in 1959-60. He also served as a consultant to numerous industrial organizations. Bill Munro enjoyed camping and loved the North Shore of Lake Superior. He and his family visited the lakeshore several times a year for thirty years. He was proud of his Scottish heritage and had visited the ancestral home of his branch of the Munro Clan. He was a skilled woodworker and carpenter. He is survived by his wife, Anne; a son, Douglas, of Minneapolis; daughters Margaret, of Minneapolis, and Victoria of St. Paul; a sister, A. Evelyn Munro, of Minneapolis; and two grandchildren.



**Stanley D. Tonge  
1935-1933**

On March 10, 1993, Dr. Stanley Tonge passed away tragically of a heart attack. Stan touched all of us in many different ways as a colleague, friend, advisor, teacher and mentor. Dr. Tonge was born in Seattle and had lived in Duluth since 1987. He was a Marine veteran of the Korean War. He was a CPA and an Assistant Professor in the UMD Department of Accounting. Before moving to Duluth he had taught at universities in Missouri, Virginia and Kansas. He received his doctor of business administration degree in 1988 from Memphis State University. He was a member of the American Accounting Association, American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and Minnesota Council of Accounting Educators. He was Director of College Relations for the Lake Superior Chapter of Internal Auditors and adviser to the UMD Accounting Club. He was an honorary member of Beta Alpha Psi, Beta Gamma Sigman, Delta Mu Delta and Phi Kappa Phi. Dr. Tonge is survived by his wife, Cynthia; two sons, Edward and John; his mother, Bette Tripp; two brothers Larry and Danny; and two grandchildren.

**XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

**Martha Kvanbeck  
Abstractor**

APRIL 1, 1993

The fourth meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1992-93, was convened in Cowles Auditorium, Humphrey Center, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 1, 1993, at 4:05 p.m (immediately following the University Senate meeting). Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 109 voting faculty members. Professor Benjamin Liu, Vice Chair of the Senate, presided.

**I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 18, 1993****Action****APPROVED****II. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE TO FACULTY SENATE ACTIONS****Information****A. Faculty Workload Task Force Report**

approved by: the Faculty Senate on November 17, 1992  
the Administration on January 6, 1993  
the Board of Regents on January 8, 1993

**B. Amendments to Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure re Parental Leave**

approved by: the Faculty Senate on December 10, 1992  
the Administration on December 22, 1992  
the Board of Regents on March 12, 1993

**C. Amendments to U of M Policies and Procedures for Dealing with Academic Misconduct**

approved by: the Faculty Senate on December 10, 1992  
the Administration on December 22, 1992  
the Board of Regents on January 8, 1993

**ACCEPTED****III. OLD BUSINESS****NONE****IV. NEW BUSINESS****NONE****V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

**Martha Kvanbeck**  
**Abstractor**

April 1, 1993

The fourth meeting of the Student Senate for 1992-93 was convened in Cowles Auditorium, Humphrey Center, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 1, 1993, at 11:45 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 27 voting student members. Mr. Thomas Lopez presided.

### I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

#### Action

#### DISCUSSION:

*The agenda, as amended, was approved.*

APPROVED

### II. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 18, 1993

#### Action

APPROVED

### III. REPORTS

#### Information

**Student Senate Chair** Mr. Thomas Lopez, Student Senate Chair, told senators that considerable time and effort has gone into a proposal to change the way student lobbying efforts are organized at the University of Minnesota, discussion of which is under item VI. on the agenda. It is important, he said, that all student senators take this issue back to their colleges and discuss it broadly with their fellow students.

**Student Senate Vice-Chair** Mr. Love Goel, Student Senate Vice-Chair, reported that the first Lobby Day, held on March 18, was well attended. Approximately 60 students alone from UMD participated, representing the largest student turnout from UMD in recent years. Student leaders had an opportunity to meet with a number of legislators from both the Senate and the House, including Speaker Dee Long, and were encouraged by the support they received. Of primary concern to students was the issue of tuition and keeping increases below 5 percent. The next Lobby Day is scheduled for April 16, and Mr. Goel urged all student senators to attend and to encourage other U of M students to participate.

**Legislative Director** Mr. Martin Conroy, Legislative Director, told senators that he and Mr. Lopez met with student leaders from other public higher education institutions in the State to discuss common issues such as higher education funding, tuition, and lobbying efforts. Mr. Conroy and others have been cautiously watching the developments at the Legislature. Tentative projections have been released, he said, by the working groups of the House Higher Education Committee, which include a 1.5 percent tuition increase for 1993-94 and a 5 percent tuition increase for 1994-95. Even though this appears favorable, Mr. Conroy reminded senators that student leaders are concerned about actions the Senate might take, which are not clear at this time, and by the position the Governor has taken on higher education. He distributed a list of legislators on the Minnesota Higher Education Finance Committee and strongly encouraged students to express their concerns to them.

Next, Mr. Conroy reported on House Bill 513, which is a bill to block the steam plant proposal approved by the Board of Regents last year. If the bill is approved and the steam plant proposal is blocked, it could cost the University \$20 million per year, Mr. Conroy said, and students should be concerned about possible tuition increases to offset the expense. Mr. Conroy has asked the author of the bill, Representative Phyllis Kahn, to include a rider that would prevent the University from funding such an expense through tuition increases. He asked the Student Senate for guidance as he works with the Administration and the Legislature on this issue.

After some discussion, which focused primarily on the lack of information available to students on this issue, the following motion was moved:

The Student Senate takes no position on House Bill 513 regarding the University of Minnesota's steam plan proposal

[Before a vote was taken on the motion, a quorum was called. A roll call determined that a quorum was not present and, therefore, no further action could be taken. Discussion of agenda items, however, continued.]

**Student Committee on Committees Chair** Mr. Michael Whitt, Student Committee on Committees member, reported that an all-University governance orientation for 1993-94 representatives and an appreciation banquet for current representatives is being organized for Saturday, May 15, 1993. The Student Committee on Committees is concerned about attendance at committee and Senate meetings and is preparing a set of recommendations for consideration by all campuses.

#### IV. STUDENT SENATE BYLAWS

##### Discussion

*Since this item had been presented to the Student Senate at its February 18, meeting, Ms. Tolbert immediately opened the floor for discussion. Hearing no comments or questions, she said the Bylaws will appear on the May 20, Student Senate agenda for action.*

#### V. CLASS HOUR-CREDIT RATIO

##### Information

*Mr. Michael Handberg briefly reviewed the class hour-credit ratio motion that will be presented at the University Senate meeting later in the afternoon. One senator inquired whether student members of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) supported the proposal and Mr. Handberg responded that they did. The SCEP believes that the definition of course credit should be based on learning effort and not "seat time," which was used as the measure of learning in the 1989 policy. Mr. Handberg said it is his impression that the implications of the proposal are greater for faculty than for students and encouraged students to support the motion when it comes up for vote at the full Senate meeting.*

#### VI. SLAC/UMCHE PROPOSAL

##### Discussion

*Mr. Eric Nissen told senators that the University of Minnesota Coalition of Higher Education (UMCHE) was formed by a group of individuals concerned about higher education in the State. It is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that believes change is necessary if students are to attain their goals of lowering tuition, reducing class size, and seeing highly qualified teachers and programs at the University of Minnesota. Its primary activity will be lobbying. Several concerns were raised about the organization, including issues related to accountability; funding; and membership, particularly on the organization's board. It is the intent, Mr. Nissen said, that students will control the organization and the composition of the board and that members will be elected by the student population. The organization will be a coalition of student associations with two representatives from each campus and two at-large representatives serving on the board.*

*One senator asked about duplication of services and effort by MSA and other existing organizations. In Mr. Nissen's opinion the effort not only needs to be duplicated, but increased a hundred-fold. Student lobbying efforts are not well organized at the University and should be, he said. A number of initiatives should be undertaken, such as tracking voting records, distributing policy papers, developing a voter guide, tracking students by legislative district, establishing emergency response teams, etc.*

*Another individual noted that the proposal calls for rotation of staff and questioned the rationale for that. Mr. Nissen responded that the positions requiring continuity would be the executive director and the legislative director who would both be accountable to the Board of Directors. The authors of the proposal believe the internship positions should be rotated to be broadly inclusive of students.*

*The focus of the UMCHE should not just be at the legislature, said one senator, but also internally, especially with regard to the Administration.*

*A number of senators expressed concern about the size of the budget (approximately \$144,000) and questioned whether students would be willing to support the organization through the mandated student service fee. Mr. Nissen responded that if the UMCHE succeeds in lowering tuition by just two-tenths of one percent after one year of effort, students will have recovered their investment. The returns, he argued, are well worth the investment.*

*The University of Minnesota is behind the times in its student lobbying efforts, argued another. The University of California system spends at least five times what the UMCHE is asking for and the Minnesota State University System spends approximately \$250,000. The University of Minnesota has a student lobbying budget of approximately \$9,000. Statistics show that organized student lobbying efforts are effective and the U of M needs to move forward in this area.*

*In Minnesota alone, the State University system, the community college system, and the technical college system all assess fees for system-wide student associations that provide lobbying efforts at the State Capitol and in Washington, D.C. The University of Minnesota has no national lobbying effort. It is also unique in that the total funding of its student lobbying efforts is less than one percent of the funding at other systems within the State. This puts the University at a distinct disadvantage with the other State systems.*

*Mr. Nissen was commended for his hard work and commitment to establishing the UMCHE. When asked how the organization would be affected when the present leadership leaves the University this spring, Mr. Nissen responded that a transition team has already agreed to work with new student leaders until the program is on solid ground; probably through next fall.*

*The first step will be to request funding support from the Student Services Fees Committees on each campus and, if successful, to present the proposal to the Board of Regents. It was hoped that the proposal could have been voted on by the Student Senate at its present meeting; however, because a quorum was not present, no action could be taken.*

## VII. STUDENT SENATE REPRESENTATION

### Discussion

*Senator Sales distributed a handout showing the various options for counting students (head count, fulltime, full-time equivalent, and full-year equivalent) for the purpose of determining Senate representation. Also indicated were the number of senators each college would be eligible for using the four methods at a 1000:1 ratio and a 500:1 ratio. The Senate Constitution currently requires Student representation be determined by using fulltime figures at a ratio of 1000:1. However, the Senate Office has discovered that for a number of years head count figures have been used, which has given students an inflated number of representatives. The Graduate School, Ms. Sales noted, would be the most disadvantaged if fulltime figures are used rather than one of the alternative methods. The Committee on Committees is reviewing the issue and will be making a recommendation to the Senate Consultative Committee later in the month. It is hoped that a resolution will be ready for the May 20 Senate agenda.*

## VIII. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

## IX. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

## X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Martha Kvanbeck  
Abstractor