

MEM/166

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

Feb. 14, 1991

The second meeting of the University Senate for 1990-91 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 135 voting faculty/academic professional members, 51 voting members of the student body, 4 ex officio, and 15 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 1

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE

ROTC

Action (20 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following resolutions with respect to the current conflict between the University's equal opportunity and ROTC policies:

Whereas the University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs and facilities without regard to sexual orientation;

Whereas federal military regulations governing ROTC place the University's ROTC programs in conflict with this policy;

Whereas the Senate acknowledges various important benefits of ROTC programs; but

Whereas the Senate is also committed to defending the University's equal opportunity policy in its entirety,

Therefore be it resolved that the Senate reaffirm the University's equal opportunity policy in its entirety.

Be it further resolved that the Senate request the President and the administration to continue their efforts to place the issue of federal military regulations concerning sexual orientation on the national agendas of the appropriate educational associations and the Minnesota congressional delegation, with the objective of resolving the conflict on our campus, as well as at other universities.

Be it further resolved that those efforts be communicated to the University community for the purpose of illuminating the nature and importance of our equal opportunity policy.

Be it further resolved that if the conflict has not been settled by June 30, 1992, then the University will renegotiate its contracts with all ROTC programs on campus in accordance with the following resolution; at the same time, the administration will establish an oversight committee to oversee the fulfillment of the following resolution.

Be it further resolved that if the conflict has not been settled by June 30, 1993, then the University will begin the process of severing relations with ROTC, specifically by disallowing the admission of any new students into any ROTC program on campus; ROTC representatives may maintain a presence on campus, as long as that presence is maintained in such a way that the equal opportunity policy is not violated.

Be it further resolved that, pending approval by the Board of Regents, the University formally notify all ROTC programs on campus of this motion by June 30, 1991.

COMMENT:

The conflict in question can be summarized briefly. "The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation." However, ROTC regulations do not allow individuals with same-sex orientation to hold ROTC scholarships and to participate fully in the ROTC program—a program not only affiliated with, but also sponsored by, the University.

A similar motion to this one—but one that included no deadline for resolving the conflict—was passed overwhelmingly by the University Senate at its Fall 1989 meeting. In the meantime, efforts by the President and administration to have the relevant federal military policies defended or changed have gone unanswered. If anything, during the past year the military appeared to be even more determined to maintain its policies, without defending them publicly.

During the same period there has been an increased interest in the promotion and celebration of diversity within our own University community. And yet, at the heart of the University's commitment to diversity are our equal opportunity and affirmative action policies, the former of which is so clearly violated by ROTC practice.

To present the ROTC/equal opportunity conflict merely as a "policy" conflict, as we have done so often, suggest a symmetry: each policy conflicts with the other. But in fact we are currently allowing ROTC practice to violate our equal opportunity policy; while we have hesitated to practice equal opportunity in such a way as to challenge our ROTC policy. Why is this asymmetry tolerated?

To be sure, the ROTC-University affiliation is valuable; for instance, there are considerable benefits to the Nation and to the State from offering military education in conjunction with civilian education; moreover, the University and many students benefit from ROTC scholarships. To that extent, the ROTC/equal opportunity conflict is not just a policy conflict but also a conflict of values. Again, there may appear to be a symmetry—unmistakable values on both sides. But the question arises whether the values in question are equally fundamental to the role of the University as an educational institution.

To establish a deadline for resolution of this matter, rather than simply to require immediate conformity with the equal opportunity policy, is to acknowledge that there are indeed some important benefits of ROTC programs—benefits worth preserving. But to establish a deadline with the consequences stated above is to acknowledge that our equal opportunity policy is much more valuable to our educational mission than our ROTC policy. It is in addition a very clear message to members of the community that our University is strongly committed to equal opportunity. The deadline also represents a special urgency that the President and administration can hopefully communicate to leaders of other educational institutions, and to our congressional representatives, on behalf of continued efforts to get an appropriate response at the federal level.

The Social Concerns Committee extends to the President and administration, through the Senate Consultative Committee, its help in planning and implementing the resolution of this conflict.

WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Consultative Committee
JOHN BEATTY, Chr.
Social Concerns Committee

Approved

**III. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
PROGRAM REVIEW, UNDERGRADUATE & GRADUATE
Action (5 minutes)**

MOTION:

That undergraduate programs as well as graduate programs shall be uniformly and rigorously reviewed periodically; and the set of questions prepared by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (printed below), supplemented and modified as necessary to serve best in individual cases, shall be used as the basis for conducting the undergraduate portion of such reviews.

COMMENT:

On May 17, 1990, the Senate adopted the following statement:

All academic units shall be reviewed on a regular cycle (but no less than once every ten years). On the Twin Cities campus, the reviews will be conducted in a fashion to be determined jointly by the dean of the Graduate School and the dean of the college of which the unit to be reviewed is a part. The review shall be a cooperative effort between the two colleges.

The reviews to be conducted shall focus in equal parts upon undergraduate education (in those programs which offer undergraduate education), graduate education (in those programs which offer graduate education), and research, in addition to whatever other elements may be included in such reviews. Review teams, whether from inside or outside the University, shall be instructed to evaluate the undergraduate education, graduate education, and research programs in equal measure.

This policy is not intended to require reviews which will replicate reviews of units conducted by outside accrediting agencies; it is assumed that the University reviews required by this policy will be coordinated with accrediting agency reviews where appropriate.

INFORMATION:

The current resolution is intended to implement that policy statement by providing a set of questions to be used in the undergraduate portion of program reviews. The questions were developed by a subcommittee of SCEP and were reviewed extensively by the full committee.

QUESTIONS FOR USE IN PERIODIC REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

26 January 1991

The specific questions given were prompted by two overriding questions: (1) Does this department offer programs that are appropriate and of high quality? (2) Does it have procedures and resources that allow and assure that quality will be maintained, and that needed changes and improvements will be made?

COURSES AND OTHER KINDS OF EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

1. Does the department have stated goals for its undergraduate major, minor, and service courses? Are the goals appropriate for the University of Minnesota?
2. Do courses offered by the department reflect these goals?
3. Are the courses appropriate in number and content?
4. Are courses offered frequently enough so that majors, minors, and other students can fulfill requirements in a reasonable time period?
5. Are course syllabi current and available?
6. Are there courses, or other vehicles, that provide undergraduates with opportunities to learn about the full range of courses, programs, and activities offered by the department?
7. Does the department offer courses or other opportunities for undergraduates to have laboratory, clinical or other applied experiences (where such experience is pertinent)?

8. Does the department offer appropriate service courses? Do they reflect the needs of students who enroll in them?

FACULTY

9. Are teaching loads and faculty-student ratios appropriate for faculty members who teach undergraduate courses?
10. Are faculty members' backgrounds and current interests related to the undergraduate courses they teach?
11. To what extent are survey and other large introductory courses taught by junior faculty and by senior faculty, respectively?
12. If teaching assistants teach undergraduate courses, what percentage of the courses do they teach? Does the department provide them with satisfactory preparation, supervision, and evaluation?
13. Is there evidence that faculty members who teach undergraduate courses have an interest in undergraduate education? Have they instituted innovative changes in courses? Have they sought funds to expand or revise programs? Who serves on undergraduate curriculum committees?

ADVISING

14. What is the nature of the department's advising program? Does it focus on procedures for registration and fulfilling requirements? Does it offer opportunities for students to learn about the nature of the field and related opportunities for employment? Does it help students assess their abilities and interests in relation to the field?
15. Do advisers have appropriate backgrounds?

THE USE OF FEEDBACK

16. How are courses evaluated?
17. How frequently are courses evaluated?
18. How is information obtained from evaluations used? Is it used to revise course material and procedures? Is it used for making promotion and salary decisions?
19. What information obtained from evaluations is made available to instructors and students?
20. Are courses reviewed to determine if the distribution of grades is appropriate for the range of students enrolled?
21. Are there mechanisms to evaluate the quality and availability of advising? To determine numbers of students who use it and the frequency with which they use it?
22. How is this information used to improve advising?
23. What mechanisms does the department have to obtain feedback from undergraduates? Do undergraduates serve on department committees? Is there an undergraduate student organization?
24. What other mechanisms does the department have to evaluate its students and curriculum? Does it survey students who have graduated to determine how well their education has served them? Does it survey persons who employ its graduates?

REWARDS

25. Are faculty members' contributions to undergraduate education respected and rewarded in a manner equivalent to the contributions they make to graduate education and research (i.e., salary, promotion, travel, program support)?

RESOURCES

26. Does the department have appropriately prepared and a sufficient number of faculty members to meet the goals of its undergraduate curriculum?
27. What is the faculty-student ratio? Is it appropriate?
28. Is there an adequate support staff (i.e., clerical, technical, teaching assistance)?
29. Are physical facilities adequate and conducive to learning? Are the classrooms, meeting rooms, laboratories, offices, and study space for undergraduates adequate?
30. Are equipment and supplies sufficient and available for undergraduate programs (i.e., laboratory equipment, audio visual equipment, library materials, and the like)?

31. Are there sufficient recurring funds for the maintenance and renewal of these resources?
32. Are there sufficient funds to support innovative programs for undergraduates?

OVERALL REVIEWS

33. Does the department have procedures for periodic review and revision of undergraduate programs other than the seven-year reviews required by its college?
34. If procedures do exist, are the reviews carried out, and is there evidence that they lead to program changes?

WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Consultative Committee
THOMAS CLAYTON, Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

Approved

IV. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

REALLOCATION Information

The following letter with regard to reallocation documents was sent by the Senate Finance and Planning Committee to Charles Casey, chairman of the Board of Regents on January 25, 1991:

The Honorable Charles Casey
Box 247
West Concord, MN 55985

Dear Regent Casey:

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning, at its meeting of January 15, 1991, voted (10 in favor, none opposed, with 2 student abstentions) to endorse in principle the reallocation documents provided to the Board of Regents at their January meeting. The Committee explicitly directed that I communicate to you its strong support for the actions the administration and Board of Regents are contemplating and urge that this plan, as it evolves in finer detail, not be abandoned.

The Committee wishes to express its strong support for the plan, as presently outlined. The Committee, of course, reserves the right, in the future, to qualify its support as more of the details of the plan become known. Virtually all Committee members, however, voiced very strong support for the broad outline of the plan which has thus far been made public. Some concern was expressed about the lack of detail in the allocation of funds to the system-wide initiatives, but the Committee will communicate additional views as the specifics become known.

Further details of our deliberations are, of course, available in the minutes of the meeting, which are now in your hands or will be shortly. You should know, however, that the Committee agreed with Gus Donhowe's view that if this plan starts to unravel in any major way it "will crash"—with very serious consequences for the University. I personally concur with Gus that the University will lose credibility with the State if this plan fails. In that event, there will almost certainly be no serious attempts at quality improvement for a generation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions.

Cordially,

Burton Shapiro, Chair
Senate Committee on Finance & Planning

Accepted

V. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

REALLOCATION

Information

STATEMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS ON RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION

The restructuring and reallocation plan proposed by the President is a bold, courageous plan to improve the quality of the University. It is a plan which derives from over a decade of instructional planning, an effort in which the faculty have been continuously engaged. We have been working to improve quality for some time now, and the results slowly begin to show: smaller classes, better advising, modern equipment in undergraduate laboratories, longer library hours, and improving student retention and graduation rates. It is essential that we provide the funds necessary to continue this progress until our performance is finally acceptable. This is what the taxpayers expect and what the students deserve.

The plan is bold because it comes before us when the economy is in recession and the state faces a projected \$1.2 to \$1.6 billion deficit for the 1991-93 biennium. The plan is courageous because it confronts us with the difficult choices of internal reallocation. Until now our improvements in quality have been bought with increased legislative appropriations and increasing tuition charges. At least for the next biennium, we cannot reasonably expect much more from these sources. If our progress is to continue, only internal reallocation remains, and as perverse as it may seem, the national economy and the expected status of the state's treasury provide the only conditions under which the hard decisions of internal reallocation are ever likely to be made. Public institutions are much like families in this respect. The best and only time for making hard choices on budgets is when the paycheck shrinks or stays the same.

Our record on internal reallocations is not particularly good. The last time the state faced hard times (1981-82) and cut the University's budget there was an across-the-board reduction for all programs. A mindless exercise for the most part, it sent a message that we could not, or would not, distinguish between programs on the basis of quality, centrality, efficiency and effectiveness and the other dimensions by which value is assessed. The results were as one might expect—morale fell, horizons contracted, and a general feeling of weariness settled over the campuses.

The Faculty Consultative Committee has spent four meetings discussing the reallocation process and proposal. Information has been shared as it became available and we have had extended discussions with the President and the Vice Presidents. Yesterday we voted approval of the following resolution:

Whereas, the restructuring and reallocation plan submitted by President Hasselmo to the Board of Regents on January 9, 1991, is consistent with and extends the principles and plans of Academic Priorities for the Twin Cities campus and the Strategy for Focus plans of three of the coordinate campuses, and

Whereas, the plan addresses the issue of quality, which has long been a faculty concern in the planning process, and

Whereas, the plan provides for significant improvement in undergraduate instruction, and Whereas, the plan calls for the University to improve the quality of its efforts in research, graduate education, and service to the state, and

Whereas, it is fitting for the University to initiate discussions and lead by example as the state considers the task of rationalizing higher education in Minnesota,

Therefore be it resolved, the Faculty Consultative Committee strongly endorses the objectives and principles of restructuring and reallocation and urges the Board of Regents to act favorably on the plan.

In conveying our resolution of support I stress two points:

1) The reallocation proposal is well founded on the planning process. It has purpose, integrity, and the important element of self-discipline which we have long needed.

2) It is essential that the plan remain intact. If any one of the major elements is removed, the closing of the Waseca campus, for example—for this is the most sensitive element politically—then the entire plan will fail, with serious adverse consequences.

The Faculty Consultative Committee is composed of faculty members from various campuses and colleges. The quality of an individual's service on the committee is judged by that person's ability to rise above the parochial interests of special constituencies in order to serve the entire University. In this respect we are not unlike the Board of Regents. As recently as 1988, three University presidents serving at the request of Governor Perpich's Blue Ribbon Commission wrote these wise words about boards of regents:

"For this reason we recommend that the Legislature, with the assistance of the Advisory Council, explicitly state as a matter of legislative intent that individual Board members represent all the people of the State, and no particular interest, ideology, or community."

It is ever our fate that we fall short of professed ideals. It is a cause for celebration when despite frailties and differences, we can join as one in support of a greater, higher purpose. The faculty believes that the plan now before us serves such a purpose and that the time to act is now. We urge the Board to speak with one voice in strong support of the restructuring and reallocation plan in order that we can get on with the business of making the University a better place to teach, to learn, and to serve.

WARREN E. IBELE
Professor, Mechanical Engineering
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

January 30, 1991

Accepted

VI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
REALLOCATION
Information

At its January 24 meeting, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy voted unanimously in favor of the sentiments expressed in a resolution to the effect that: The Senate Committee on Educational Policy expects to reflect individually upon the detailed recommendations when they are made available, but it strongly endorses President Hasselmo's reallocation plan in principle as the best means available for preserving and strengthening the University in the financially-straitened circumstances that prevail at present and may be expected to prevail in the foreseeable future.

WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Consultative Committee
THOMAS CLAYTON, Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

Accepted

VII. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
REALLOCATION
Information

The Student Senate Consultative Committee endorses the reallocation/restructuring proposal in its entirety, with the assurance that deans and chancellors notify the president of contact with the appropriate student bodies.

SHAWN TOWLE
Chair

Accepted

VIII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

REPORT BY CHAIR

(5 minutes)

See Abstract

IX. SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

REPORT

(10 minutes)

See Abstract

X. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(10 minutes)

See Abstract

XI. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(20 minutes)

See Abstract

XII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Information (2 minutes)

The following statement was adopted unanimously by the Finance and Planning Committee at its January 29, 1991, meeting:

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning, whose meetings were graced and enlivened by the presence of Senior Vice President Gordon (Gus) Donhowe, extends its deepest sympathy to Mr. Donhowe's family.

The Committee, the University, and the State of Minnesota have lost a good friend and a valued citizen. The meetings of the Committee were always made more interesting, more enlightening, and positive when Gus was present. Few individuals bring to their work the charm, wit, and intelligence as did Gus. The University has suffered the irreplaceable loss of an able colleague and devoted administrator. The Committee will feel his absence keenly.

WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Consultative Committee

BURTON SHAPIRO, Chr.
Finance & Planning Committee

Accepted

XIII. OLD BUSINESS

See Abstract

XIV. NEW BUSINESS

(5 minutes)

See Abstract

XV. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS AND STUDENTS

WALTER H. BROVALD

1928-1991

Walter H. Brovald, a truly unusual man and an outstanding educator, died January 25, 1991, from a massive heart attack. He was 62 and had been on medical leave from the University for the past two years. He was a mentor to thousands of students and a mainstay to Minnesota community journalists.

Professor Brovald earned his master's degree from the School of Journalism and Mass Communication in 1968 and stayed on as a faculty member. He taught reporting, editing, advertising and community journalism. He was business adviser to student publications, director of undergraduate studies, chairman of the scholarship and internship committees, and was acting director of the Journalism School for one year in the early 1980s.

His impact on students was broader than any other faculty member by virtue of his teaching and advising roles. In 1970, he restructured J1, Introduction to Mass Communication, and was the principal teacher in this class for 15 years. In the mid-70s, when the School established enrollment limitations and a formal admission process, Professor Brovald became adviser to all premajor students. He continued in this role for 12 years, counseling over 4000 would-be journalism/mass communication students.

Professor Brovald's area of expertise was community journalism. He wrote a regular newsletter for the Minnesota Newspaper Association, a recent copy of which was the 394th edition. He also published other newsletters for journalists: *From a Former Editor's Brown Study*, *The Gryphon*, and *Speaking of Words*. He read almost every weekly newspaper published in the state and wrote hundreds of postcards to reporters and editors, commenting on their work. In response to one of these postcards, former Governor Elmer L. Andersen wrote: "It is a wonderful thing you do, in going through so many papers and then spotting particularly good items and sending out a postcard recognition. Those postcards are treasured by the people who receive them; it's so personal, you are so highly regarded, and then you take time to make individual comments. It is a remarkable contribution to stimulating and motivating journalists."

Born in Necedah, Wisconsin, Professor Brovald grew up in Eau Claire, and graduated from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1949 with a degree in English. He worked as an editor and general manager at the Stanley, Wisconsin, *Republican*. In 1954, he bought the Cadott, Wisconsin, *Sentinel*. During his 12 years as publisher, he received 56 state and national newspaper awards, winning first place awards in nearly every category. In 1958, he became the youngest publisher to hold office in the Wisconsin Press Association and in 1961 was elected president.

Professor Brovald is survived by his wife of 40 years, Lil, and a brother, Loyd Brovald, of Moraga, California. The family suggests that contributions to a Walter H. Brovald Memorial Fund be sent to the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Minnesota.

A memorial service on January 29 was attended by more than 100 faculty colleagues, former students, professional colleagues, and friends. Testimonials were made to the high esteem in which Professor Brovald was held as a teacher, scholar, and friend.

GUS DONHOWE

1929-1991

The University of Minnesota has lost a tough leader and a devoted friend. On behalf of the President's Cabinet and the University administration, I want to express our deep sorrow to the family of Gus Donhowe, and I want to express to them our lasting gratitude for sharing this remarkable man with an academic community he loved as a student, as a citizen, and these last two years, as senior vice president for finance and operations.

Some in the University community may think of Gus' University connections only in terms of these last two years (surely the most productive administrative tenure in memory) capping a career in business, government and public service that included The Pillsbury Company, the State Department of Finance, Fairview-Southdale Hospital and the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission. Many know, however, that Gus, Ruth and their children have been part of the University community for many years, living in a University neighborhood and surrounded by University friends.

I have often said that hiring Gus was the best decision I ever made. He'd look properly modest...and then agree. I'm convinced that accepting the University position was his best decision, even though he took a large cut in pay to take on an enormously tough job. The truth is that he loved public service and relished the challenges of improving the University of Minnesota.

When I had the pleasure of announcing Gus' appointment on February 1, 1989, I made the comment that the assignment required "a person who comes down sprinting," and Gus surely did that. He immediately took on the comprehensive overhaul of financial management called for by the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission and the legislative auditor. Most importantly, Gus elevated the assignment beyond solving the immediate problems. He initiated a quality management program, first throughout his finance and operations units and then throughout the University. That work is not finished, but Gus put it in motion and gave it momentum. We will carry it through.

The list of other Donhowe accomplishments is lasting testimony to his leadership, creativity and credibility. He spearheaded creative new approaches to employee health insurance, athletic facilities, research facilities, space management, the heating plant and the entire structure and process of University planning and budgeting.

Gus Donhowe was the key to restoring trust and cooperation between University and state government, and he was, most obviously, the key to our restructuring and reallocation efforts. In these, Gus will be most sorely missed, but it is in these efforts where his discipline and inspiration will be most influential to his friends and colleagues charged with carrying on.

I have lost a dear friend and my closest adviser. I know better than anyone how much he has meant, as an individual, to the progress we have made. But I also know how deeply he believed in this University and the primary importance of institutional commitment. I know his advice would be to get on with the unfinished agenda he has left us, and that is certainly the best way we can honor one of the most important leaders in the history of the University.

Nils Hasselmo, President

FRANCES E. DUNNING

1921-1990

Frances E. Dunning, RN, MEd, associate professor emeritus and retired assistant dean of students in the School of Nursing, died in her home of cancer on December 20, 1990.

Professor Dunning, a native of New York City, graduated from St. Luke's Hospital School of Nursing there in 1943. She earned a bachelor's degree in nursing education from Teachers College at Columbia University in 1949 and a master's degree in nursing education from the University of Minnesota in 1952.

She joined the Army Nurse Corps in 1943 and served as a first lieutenant, stationed in England, until her discharge in 1945. She returned to St. Luke's as a night supervisor from 1946 to 1949. She was an instructor at St. Luke's Hospital School of Nursing in Denver from 1949 to 1953 and assistant educational director there from 1952 until she joined the University of Minnesota School of Nursing faculty in 1954.

She was promoted from instructor to assistant professor in 1956 and to associate professor in 1973. In 1976 she became assistant director of student affairs. She was in charge of recruiting, admissions, and student affairs.

She was well respected by students and peers as a master teacher and supportive mentor and counselor. "I think that throughout all her years the characteristic that most describes her is her integrity," said Marilyn Gustafson, instructor.

She retired in 1988 for health reasons.

Survivors include brothers Preston Dunning, Highland, Indiana, and Edward Dunning, Columbus, Ohio.

JOHN F. PERRY, JR.

1923-1990

Dr. John F. Perry, Jr., professor of surgery and chief of surgery at St. Paul-Ramsey Medical Center, died of colon cancer at age 67 on October 30, 1990. Ill for the past six months, he had resigned his position in July.

Born in Lubbock, Texas, Perry earned his B.A. in 1944 and M.D. in 1947, both at the University of Texas. After interning at the University of Pennsylvania, he began his surgical residency at the University of Minnesota in 1951 and completed his Ph.D. in 1958. He then became, in quick succession, an instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor in the Surgery Department, but left the University in 1961 to go into private practice with a group in North Dakota. He took over as chief of surgery at St. Paul-Ramsey (then Ancker Hospital) in 1962, and was named a full professor of surgery at the University in 1965. From May 1985 to August 1989, he also served as medical director at St. Paul-Ramsey.

During nearly three decades at St. Paul-Ramsey, Perry spearheaded aggressive surgical intervention on behalf of trauma victims. He pioneered the "Room 10" concept, an emergency operating room modeled after the Korean War's front-line M.A.S.H. units.

An able researcher, Perry developed several procedures in partnership with Dr. David Root that are now standard emergency room protocol throughout the nation. For example, for incoming trauma patients who are unconscious, he instituted diagnostic peritoneal lavage to rapidly assess the existence and extent of internal bleeding. Previously, because emergency room staff had no way of knowing about possible internal injuries in multitrauma patients, countless died. In 1963, he established St. Paul-Ramsey's Burn Unit, the first of its kind in the Midwest, which has won nationwide acclaim.

Perry helped train hundreds of surgeons. In 1989, he received the Owen H. Wangenstein Award for Excellence in Teaching. This "Faculty Teacher of the Year" honor is bestowed each spring by the Surgery Department residents, based on their interactions with more than forty surgeons at six Twin Cities hospitals. The August 1989 edition of *The Cutting Edge* noted how much Perry relished "the stimulus of residents and interns." Governor Rudy Perpich proclaimed October 25, 1990, as "Dr. John F. Perry, Jr. Day" in recognition of his contributions.

Perry's bibliography lists more than 160 published articles, monographs, and book reviews. He was a member of numerous medical societies, committees, and boards. In addition, he was president of the St. Paul Surgical Society, Minnesota Surgical Society, and Minnesota chapter of the American College of Surgeons. He was also vice president of the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma.

In his honor, the Dr. John Perry Fellowship in Trauma Surgery has been established by St. Paul-Ramsey Medical Center. It will provide a stipend to the University's Surgery Department residents in the trauma program at St. Paul-Ramsey.

John Perry will be sorely missed by students, residents, colleagues, and those of us fortunate enough to be called friends. He was frequently identified as one of the outstanding teachers in the Surgery Department. Through his clinical and research efforts, he elevated Ramsey Medical Center to a premier level of national and international recognition in the field of trauma. Because of the advances made under Dr. Perry's leadership, hundreds of trauma victims diagnosed and treated at Ramsey are alive and thriving today.

He is survived by his wife, Genevieve Quist Perry; son, John F. Perry, III, of Spokane, Washington; mother, Beatrice Perry, and sister, Katherine Mawk, both of San Antonio, Texas; and nephew Dr. John R. Mawk of Portland, Oregon.

ALDERT VAN DER ZIEL

1910-1991

Aldert van der Ziel, professor emeritus of electrical engineering, died Sunday, January 20, 1991, after a long illness.

A native of the Netherlands, he earned a doctoral degree in physics from the University of Groningen. He received honorary doctorates from the University of Eindhoven, the Netherlands, and the University of Toulouse, France.

Aldert immigrated to Canada in 1947 and taught at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver for three years before joining the University of Minnesota faculty in 1950. He retired from teaching in 1980 but continued to do research and serve as an adviser until his death. He had advised more than 70 Ph.D. candidates and written 11 books.

From 1969 to 1988 he held a joint appointment with the University of Florida in Gainesville and spent several weeks each year working on research projects there.

Aldert's research specialty was the phenomenon of electrical noise that is most familiar in the hissing sound coming from a detuned radio. The phenomenon is present in different forms in all electrical devices. His research led to more sensitive electronics, microwave systems, and optical detectors.

In 1975 Aldert received the Vincent Bendix Award from the American Society for Engineering Education for excellence in engineering research. In 1980 and 1984 he received gold medals from the Institute for Electronics and Electrical Engineering for his contributions.

Aldert is survived by his wife, Jantina; son, Jan; daughters, Cornelia and Joanna Beachy, and eight grandchildren. Memorials are directed to the A. van der Ziel Fund-Department of Electrical Engineering at the University of Minnesota.

STUDENTS

MICHAEL A. ANDERSON, College of Liberal Arts

MONI BINDRA, Graduate School

JUDITH J. COOK, General College

BRETT D. NELSON, College of Liberal Arts

JANITA M. SELLNER, Graduate School

CASAIE TURNER, Extension Classes

ERICK WELDY, College of Liberal Arts

MARGARET MARY YURICK, Education

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the University Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 135 voting members of the faculty/academic professional staff. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 1

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The University Senate was called to order by President Nils Hasselmo following the Assembly meeting in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus. Coordinate campuses were linked by phone. The November minutes were approved.

ROTC Program. John Beatty, associate professor of ecology, evolution, and behavior and chair of the Social Concerns Committee, reintroduced an item discussed at the last meeting calling for withdrawal of the University of its ROTC programs because of discrimination against homosexuals, unless the conflict with the University's equal opportunity policies could be settled by 1993. The committee acknowledged that there were some important benefits to ROTC affiliation, including the training of officers in a civilian setting. However, Professor Beatty explained that gays and lesbians, while they could enroll in ROTC courses, were denied the honor of serving as officers by the Department of Defense. He emphasized that the University's commitment to the ideal of equal opportunity was far more fundamental to the University's educational mission than its sponsorship of ROTC programs. As a further argument in favor of the resolution he explained that the military was very explicit about why it prohibited homosexuals from participating, and he read the relevant section in the regulations which declared that homosexuality was "incompatible with military service" and "(would) seriously impair the accomplishment of the military mission." It listed a number of reasons for making that statement, which Professor Beatty asserted were groundless. In fact, he said, evidence to the contrary was to be found everywhere. He contended that the Defense Department avoided being accountable by refusing to defend its policy publicly, while perpetuating unfounded notions of the moral and social inferiority of homosexuals.

Aric Nissen, Student Senate chair, reported that the Student Senate supported the resolution 41 to 2, stating that discrimination at the University would not be tolerated in any form. He urged that, if the resolution were passed, senators should personally contact their legislators and lobby in behalf of the change.

Robert Jacobsen, student, reported that Suzanne Denevan, Minnesota Student Association (MSA) president, regretted that she could not attend, as her trial before the Student Behavior Committee for participation in a protest demonstration last spring was in progress. She had asked him to inform the Senate that the MSA had unanimously approved the resolution. Mr. Jacobsen emphasized that the resolution was not intended as retribution against ROTC, which provided many valuable benefits. He said the Defense Department could not be intimidated, and it would be a long time before the University would have power over the federal government. Many had been working unsuccessfully to change the federal policy, including President Hasselmo and various national educational organizations, he noted, but the Defense Department refused to discuss the matter. He cited several instances at the University where students had been barred from the program on the basis of their sexual orientation, and said they were indeed treated like second class students. The decision, he said, came down to which was more important—the Department of Military Science and the scholarships that it provided or the equal opportunity policy. He suggested that scholarships could be replaced but equal opportunity was irreplaceable.

Hans Weinberger, professor of mathematics, observed that there were two other programs that violated the policy: Department of Men's Athletics and Department of Women's Athletics, which give scholarships on the basis of gender.

Warren Ibele, professor of mechanical engineering and chair of the Consultative Committee, reported that his committee had approved the resolution without dissent. He urged the faculty, student body, and the Social Concerns Committee to make a good faith effort to set the matter right. He observed that he was given almost daily a vast array of petitions on other subjects but not one that would allow him to address the Defense Department or the Minnesota congressional delegation. He maintained there should not be any procrastination; the optimum would be to have the ROTC remain on campus and to have it open to all.

Tim Wolf, student, held that there was a difference between discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and comparing that with athletics departments' policies. The issue, he

said, was whether the University would allow an exclusive society, whether based on race or gender or sexual orientation. Jon Brekke, student had two concerns: whether the University was working with any other institutions toward a common deadline so the University would not be strung out to dry and lose the valuable ROTC program, and a concern about the timing of the proposal in view of the current preoccupation of the Department of Defense with the war in the Persian Gulf. President Hasselmo responded that the University was working closely with the University of Wisconsin, and other institutions had passed similar resolutions with deadlines, but none had as yet had the approval of their governing boards. The University would, he said, continue to try to coordinate its efforts with other institutions.

Shawn Towle, student, asked President Hasselmo whether he would bring the issue to his board if it were approved by the Senate; the president said he would respond during his comments later in the meeting. Megan Thomas, student, picked up on the Persian Gulf situation, noting that the United States was alleged to be there to defend democracy and freedom—a defense that was being carried out by an organization that was not democratic. Also there were correlations to the Vietnam War era. Clearly, she said, the United States and the University should be able to say that they do not discriminate. The vote was then taken. A division of the house was requested; the parliamentarian ruled that the request should have preceded the vote. The chair then accepted the request and the totals were 151 in favor, 12 opposed.

Program review, undergraduate and graduate. Thomas Clayton, professor of English and chair of the Educational Policy Committee, described the proposal as a facilitating policy that was in the spirit of the undergraduate initiative and he hoped the body would find it contributing to a good cause. It was necessary, he said, to give to undergraduate education the emphasis that it had not formally had previously, although informally in most cases there were Graduate School reviews of departments. In May 1990 the Senate had approved a statement on how the reviews should be conducted and his committee had been asked to provide a series of questions for use in the reviews—not to be a definitive policy or the Ten Commandments. It was understood they could be supplemented or modified in certain cases. The motion was then approved unanimously.

Reallocation. Statements of support from the Finance and Planning, the Faculty Consultative, and the Educational Policy Committees for the restructuring and reallocation plan proposed by the president were received for information. With regard to the Student Senate Consultative Committee endorsement, Mr. Towle explained that his committee had asked for assurance that deans and chancellors notify the president of contact with the appropriate student bodies.

Consultative Committee report. Warren Ibele, chair, reported that the draft report on health care benefits was being discussed by various groups; the Liberal Education Task Force had scheduled a series of fora for the Twin Cities campus; and the Gerberich committee proposals concerning extension of the probationary period would appear in the next docket and be sent to senators. With regard to the restructuring and reallocation proposal, he reminded the Senate how difficult it had been to draw up such a document for a public institution long engrained in service of all kinds, including performing an increasing number of projects at the request of the governor or the legislature or interested groups of citizens. For a time, the University had been the only institution to fulfill that role, but beginning with World War II as the system of higher education in the state expanded, it became evident that the University could share its responsibility with others. However, he said, that was a hard task to bring off. It meant not only choosing between good and bad programs but between programs that were good and those that were more important and stood in a particularly advantaged position. He said the president's conduct had been a source of inspiration to many on the faculty, and he commended the openness with which he had conducted the process. He had been available to legislative committees, to faculty and student committees, to groups of interested citizens, and often under very uncomfortable circumstances. He had been always patient and uncommonly courteous but forthright in his presentation of the University's case. He cited minutes of the Finance and Planning Committee containing the University's position and what was at stake for the state as outlined by the late Vice President Gordon Donhowe. The minutes had been sent to legislative leaders, one of whom complimented the

University for taking its courageous position and suggested that to be successful a strong and supportive faculty was needed. The Senate then joined Professor Ibele in a rising expression of appreciation and support for the president's leadership—with extended applause.

Academic Affairs Vice President report. Leonard Kuhi, senior vice president and provost, said he had been asked to comment on what he had learned during his first year at the University. First, he had observed that the University had a rumor mill that was a major industry and second that, "If they don't get you on substance, they will get you on process." Moving on to reallocation, he thanked the Senate for its strong support through its committees of the process and its program, involving as it did the reallocation of \$60 million—\$21 million coming as new money, \$6.4 million from the proposed closing of the Waseca campus, \$8.9 million from central administrative services, including physical plant and operations, and the rest from individual colleges and other units. He wanted to make a strong point from the academic side of the house, namely, that when the plan was being put together, the guiding principle had been to increase the quality of all that the University did, especially what it did for its students, who would be the ultimate winners in the reallocation process. The academic priorities document had been used as a guide, he explained, but it was found that it did not go far enough. Clearly, in recent years the University had expanded its student body and its programs to an unreasonable and unmanageable size, he said, and the main units handling most of the undergraduate students simply did not have the resources to meet their basic needs. To provide the needed resources, \$4.5 million would go to the College of Liberal Arts and \$3 million to the Institute of Technology, not as blank checks but following review of proposals from those units that would ensure improvement of quality of undergraduate programs.

As to the College of Education, which would make a major reallocation contribution, most of it would come from a 10 percent "down-sizing" of the college, he said. Statistics indicated that the state produced in over 400 educational programs at 27 institutions twice as many teachers as there were jobs available. He explained that a program change called for doing away with most of the four-year undergraduate licensure degrees and a move instead into a program in which a student would have a regular baccalaureate degree followed by a year and a half of pedagogical programs in the college. He said it was felt that the plan would produce much higher quality teachers and that the approximate 10 percent of teachers that the University produced for the state would end up being the leaders in major educational reform that was needed in the state.

One area that was not yet clearly defined in the reallocation program was the so-called system-wide initiatives, which involved the undergraduate initiative, increasing research support, increasing programs to promote diversity, and so on, he said, all of which would cut across all colleges and all campuses. Some that were already in place, he explained, were the common entry point, improvement in the admissions process, an enrollment policy that would try to shape the freshman class of the future, change in the advising structure, a strengthened advising network, improved classroom and study space, addition of many smaller classes, and addition of the new preparation standards. The bottom line, he said, was to improve drastically the graduation rate, which was a national disgrace at about 8 percent after four years at the University, which he said was a reflection of the level of preparation of those coming to the University and the quality of the programs and services provided. He pointed out that both issues needed drastic addressing and an effort was being made to ensure that there were no artificial barriers to prevent timely progress by the student toward a degree. Preparation standards would go into effect in the fall, so performance would be evaluated later.

He expressed appreciation for the resolutions of support for the reallocation process and urged everyone to review carefully the report of the Howe Task Force and to participate in the open fora. He reported that he had started a cooperative effort with his counterparts at the other systems of higher education in the state. A major agenda item was to look at transfer issues, especially relating to the community colleges and transfer to the University. Finally, he hoped that everyone could look at what the University had done with the generous allocation of funds that the state had given to all of the state systems of higher education; in his view it had not been spent wisely.

President's report. President Hasselmo expressed the deep sense of loss sustained in the death of Senior Vice President Gordon Donhowe, who, he said, was a wonderful friend and contributor to the University, leaving a legacy that would stand it in good stead in the years to come.

As to the state's financial situation, he said the governor would be making his recommendations on February 20 for the next biennium, and it was important that the University hold fast and continue to make its case with the legislature, the governor, and the citizens of the state concerning the enormous contributions the University was making to the state by going ahead with its reallocation process. He said the University should not overreact to information that came occasionally before a decision was made. On tuition, a matter of great concern to students, he said he had no profound insights but the University would continue to try to keep it as low as possible. Tuition levels were being discussed with the legislature and the governor's office, and Vice President Marvalene Hughes was working with the student leadership to share information, he said. On salaries, there had been no invitation to ask for increased funding but, if one did occur, the request would be made for both faculty and staff monies to maintain the most important resource of the University. The preliminary request for programmatic improvement funding had been withdrawn, he reported, in order to highlight salaries as the top priority.

He reported briefly on his recent appearance before the NCAA Infractions Committee, where he was impressed with the thoroughness with which the University had prepared its case and the honesty and forthrightness of Men's Athletic Director Rick Bay and his coaches. He thought the case was well made for the University, including institutional control over intercollegiate athletics. He indicated that there might be some penalty because of the Darville impact on the football program.

He said he was continuing efforts with other institutions with regard to the ROTC issue, including consideration of recourse to legal action. He said he would be taking the resolution passed that day to the Board of Regents for discussion at the earliest opportunity. He noted with distress a recent racial incident and said he was heartened by the way that faculty, staff, and students had rallied behind the University's commitment to provide a supportive environment for all members of the University community. Every step was being taken to identify the perpetrators, he said, and to have them brought to justice. He said he had participated with other chancellors and presidents at the invitation of the Minneapolis Foundation in a Minnesota Manifesto—a restatement of the fundamental principles that should guide the way that higher education acts in providing fairness and equitable treatment to all members of society. It would be effective if it would result in mobilization of the community to take continuous and concerted action to meet the challenge, he said, and he called on the entire University to stand firm on the issue.

Graduation rate. The president was asked by Woods Halley, professor of physics and astronomy, about the focus on the graduation rate as a measure of quality in undergraduate education. The president said it was a situation that had been frequently discussed. He observed that it could be an indication of unnecessary obstacles being placed in the way of students. However, the University would not necessarily have to have a rate similar to that of a residential campus composed primarily of 18- to 20-year olds. Retention rates between the first two years appeared to be improving, which he attributed to the preparation requirements and access to courses in a timely fashion. Improvement measures, he said, did need to take into consideration the University's particular type of student clientele.

Mission Statement. Darby Laing, student, asked about the status of revision of the mission statement. President Hasselmo said he had received some comments before the February 15 deadline, but he decided to extend that date and would come back later in the spring with proposals.

Memorial. Burton Shapiro, professor of oral sciences and chair of the Finance and Planning Committee, presented a tribute to the late Senior Vice President Gus Donhowe, which was followed by a moment of silence by the Senate. Shawn Towle asked that participants salute Mr. Donhowe in their personal way.

Energy Policy. Aric Nissen, chair, reported that at its February 7 meeting the Student Senate had approved unanimously an energy policy proposed by MPIRG that urged the

University to review its current policy, to practice efficiency and conservation, and to work to implement renewable energy systems. He said he would be bringing it to the Consultative Committees and the Senate, after conferring with the authors of the bill.

Following a moment of silence for departed faculty members and students and approval of the November Faculty Senate meeting minutes, the Senates were adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 1990-91 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, February 7, 1991. Coordinating campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 43 voting members of the student body. Aric Nissen, chair, presided.

- I. Call to order
- II. Agenda—approved
- III. Minutes for Nov. 1—approved
- IV. Chair report—Aric Nissen
 - a) Objectives of meeting date separate from University Senate: discuss items, form unified student position, avenue for new issues, noncompromising of attention
 - b) Alarm expressed over the state's momentum on tuition and view of students
- V. Vice Chair report—Randy Heuer
 - a) Advantages of separate meeting date
 - b) Need for an outline of Vice Chair duties in the constitution
- VI. Student Consultative Committee Chair report—Shawn Towle
Issues: Racial harassment (Time Out Program)—specific incidents have not been discussed; reallocation plan—could not take a position because sufficient detail was not available and criteria were unclear; University mission statement
- VII. Legislative Director—Jennifer Alstad
 - a) Issues: tuition, legislative agenda, and organization of students on each campus prior to Lobby Day. Legislative agenda includes tuition, financial aid, part-time grant program, child care, reciprocity, human rights MSPAN-2000, scholarship funding proposal.
 - b) Activities: Lobby Day, Feb. 20; recruitment of students and organizations; schedule of meetings, hearings, and press conference; rally. List of legislators is available. Lobbying tactics (e.g. phone banks) were described.
- VIII. SSCC attendance policy (information only) to go to SSC for action (on Feb. 14 Senate agenda)
- IX. ROTC resolution for debate and action (on Feb. 14 Senate agenda)
Proposed friendly amendment: In the lead sentence of motion, the substitution of "Department of Defense" for "ROTC" will be submitted to the Clerk of the Senate before the meeting.
Items discussed: dollar cost to the University and efforts and results of efforts at the national level.
GAPSA representative supported, but noted that Law School representatives had raised the issue of constitutionality. It was believed that the University does have the power to enact a resolution. It was noted that the University NROTC unit is being closed down by the Department of Defense.
Motion as amended was approved for forwarding to the Clerk of the Senate.

X. Reallocation

SSCC resolution in support of the principles of reallocation but not the proposals was discussed (on Feb. 14 Senate agenda). There has been no conversation with the Vice President for Student Affairs. In response to the observation that quality of teaching was not included in the goals, it was noted that chancellors and deans would be asked to discuss the particulars as the proposal affects each of their units. The proposed general additions and cuts for units have been published, and the units themselves would have the responsibility for accounting for their use where additions are made. Senate Committee on Educational Policy has a line-by-line listing by department showing individual cuts and where monies would go; committee has reviewed it. SSCC had not had time to examine it before they were asked to take a position.

No public discussion has been held on the need for the Waseca campus; proposal calls for its closing.

A motion to extend debate was approved.

It was noted that the President had asked only for endorsement of the principles; some thought there should have been more input from students instead of letting the administration do all the controlling. Concern was expressed about the future of General College and the related problem of access to the University.

Vote: 20 to reject the reallocation motion; 19 to not reject; 4 abstained.

Majority and minority opinions would be delivered to the Senate, and the student body would be told why it was rejected.

A move to reconsider was not brought by the prevailing side.

XI. Educational Policy Committee motion for undergraduate and graduate program review was approved (on Feb. 14 Senate agenda).

XII. MPIRG energy resolution: There is need for a sustainable energy policy to make Minnesota a model for the nation by (1) reviewing its current energy policy; (2) practicing energy efficiency and energy conservation; and (3) implementing renewable energy systems. The University of Minnesota should (1) make carpooling, bus-riding, biking, and walking as financially attractive and as convenient as driving to the University; (2) incorporate state-of-the-art efficiency standards into new buildings; (3) use solar electricity where it is reasonably cost effective; (4) provide University vehicles with fuel efficiency standards of 65 miles per gallon or more; and (5) educate the University community on energy issues.

A senator observed that the University is already doing all but No. 4, although the cost-effective requirement renders No. 3 all but useless. The mile-per-gallon vehicle requirement should be more realistic. Implementation of proposals would be the next step.

Approved.

XIII. Meeting format

Most favored separate meeting date from that of the University Senate. Need to consult with GAPSA and Continuing Education and Extension representatives regarding the time, which is inconvenient for some.

XIV. Moment of silence for deceased students Moni Bindra, Judith J. Cook, Brett D. Nelson, Janita M. Sellner, Cassie Turner, Margaret Mary Yurick.

XV. Lobby Day, Feb. 20, at Capitol; Rally on Northrop Mall, Feb. 13 (tentative)

XVI. Adjournment