

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES (April 11)

April 18, 1991

The third 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 (except UMD, where the connection was not made) were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 132 voting faculty/academic professional members, 37 voting members of the student body, 2 ex officio, and 11 members. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 14

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP, 1991-92

Information

In the recent election to fill faculty vacancies on the Senate Consultative Committee, Mario Bognanno (Management) and Shirley Zimmerman (Human Ecology) were elected for 3-year terms (1991-94), Continuing members include W. Andrew Collins (Education), Amos Deinard (Medical School), Paul Holm (Crookston), Norman Kerr (Biological Sciences), Thomas Scott (CLA), Charlotte Striebel (IT), and James Van Alstine (Morris).

Accepted

III. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1991-92

Action (5 minutes)

The constitution provides that a vice chair shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring quarter for a term of one year from among its members.

Associate Professor Karen Seashore Louis was elected

IV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED COMMITTEE

HANDICAPPED PEOPLE, SERVICE POLICY & PROCEDURES

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following proposed revision of Policies and Procedures on Access of Disabled People (additions are underlined; deletions, crossed out)

POLICY 1: (formerly Policy 6)

The University community will prohibits and actively discourages discrimination against disabled people. by developing Toward this end, the University community will develop skills and resources to promote sensitivity and awareness of disability issues.

Procedure: Special training will be provided to acquaint all members of the University community with the legal mandates that relate to disabled people's education and employment. This training will be provided through a collaborative effort of the following offices: Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, Academic Personnel, Special Employment Programs, and Disabled Student Services. The training will create the requisite attitudes, knowledge, skills, and resources to accommodate the broad range of students, staff, and applicants with disabilities.

POLICY 2: (formerly Policy 1)

The University is committed to becoming establishing a barrier-free environment for all disabled people, and will reverse develop and coordinate policies and procedures, and fund services concerning on access to employment, academic programs, co-curricular activities, and facilities.

Procedure: The University will have a Senate Coordinating Committee on Disability Issues which shall be composed of at least 7 faculty/P&A members, 2 students (at least one graduate and one undergraduate), 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Faculty, P&A, and student members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. Civil service members shall be appointed by the president in consultative with the Civil Service Committee. The duties shall be to 1) advise the president and administrative offices on University-wide issues regarding access to its programs and facilities and on the structure and provision of services for disabled students, faculty, and staff; 2) educate the University community to the special concerns of its disabled members; 3) consult with the administrative committees providing coordination of programs and services; 4) bring concerns to the Senate Consultative Committee and recommend such actions or policies as it deems appropriate; and 5) submit an annual report to the Senate.

POLICY 3: (formerly Policy 2)

The president and administrative officers will provide leadership and resources in the area of improving access for disabled people at the University of Minnesota and will be responsible for implementing the principles of equal access to the University at the University of Minnesota.

Procedure: Creating a barrier-free environment for disabled people requires a coordinating authority at a high administrative level who has direct links with the president as well as with the academic, health-related, physical plant, and student personnel units of the University. The coordinating authority will be appointed by the president. Each coordinate campus will have a working committee to address physical, program, and employment access issues. The Twin Cities campus will maintain three committees, one for physical access, one for program access, and one for employment access. These committees will report to the central coordinating authority. For purposes of communication and coordination, the chairs of the three working committees on the Twin Cities campus and (on a rotating basis) one of the chairs of the working committees on the coordinate campuses will be appointed as ex officio member to the Senate Coordinating Committee on Disability Issues.

POLICY 4: (formerly Policy 3)

Disabled people will have maximum opportunity to participate in all University programs, services, and facilities.

Procedure: To realize this commitment and to fulfill legal requirements the University will organize its disability services in a way that promotes self-determination and engages the entire campus community in access issues. Disabled Student Services (Student Affairs), Academic Personnel (Academic Affairs), and Special Employment Programs (Finance & Operations) will be designated as liaisons for disabled students, faculty/P&A, and civil service staff respectively. These units will be responsible for ensuring that the Univer-

sity meets its obligations to disabled people as mandated by Federal and State statutes. (These three offices will be responsible for disseminating information about the needs and abilities of disabled people and the nature of available campus and community resources.) These three offices will provide and/or coordinate information, referral, advocacy, education, consultation and accommodations (i.e., sign language interpreters, readers, curriculum modifications, course substitutions, time extensions, work site modifications, job restructuring, etc.). Academic and work adjustments will be made on a flexible and individual basis. Where needed accommodations in assessment procedures cannot be provided or the effectiveness of a given accommodation is questionable, decisions should err on the side of increasing rather than decreasing opportunities for people with disabilities. Faculty and staff are expected to encourage disabled students and employees to make needs for accommodations known and then make the appropriate adjustments for those with documentable disabilities.

POLICY 5: (formerly Policy 4)

Requesting assistance or identifying oneself as disabled is to be voluntary, ~~as mandated by Federal and State Statutes~~ and in order to respect the independence, rights, and dignity of disabled people.

Procedure: The University, as mandated by Federal and State Statutes, will invite disabled people to bring their accessibility needs to the attention of faculty, supervisors, or staff so that accommodations can be arranged. Such invitations will be included in college bulletins, class schedules, various employee orientation manuals, and all other official University publications. In addition, faculty will be required to include on their course syllabi, the following statement: "Students with disabilities that affect their ability to participate fully in class or to meet all course requirements are encouraged to bring this to the attention of the instructor so that appropriate accommodations can be arranged."

POLICY 6: (formerly Policy 5)

The University will treat data on disabled people with maximum confidentiality in accordance with data privacy laws. No information will be collected for administrative purposes except that essential for program development, implementation, and ~~affirmative action programs~~ as required by law.

Procedure: University Personnel, Academic Personnel, Student Support Services, and Disabled Student Services will develop procedures for maintaining confidentiality on disabled faculty, staff, and/or students who have identified themselves as having a disability and submit these procedures to the Senate Coordinating Committee on Access of Disabled People for review.

POLICY 7:

University administrators, faculty, and staff will actively foster inter-institutional cooperation to collect, develop, and disseminate knowledge about creating barrier-free environments for disabled people.

Procedure: Disabled Student Services, Academic Personnel, Special Employment Programs, Physical Plant/Physical Planning, and other units as they are identified, will actively seek "best practices" and "state-of-the-art" information from parallel institutions, nationally and internationally, to keep all units of the University well informed.

POLICY 8:

The University will ~~maintain a firm commitment~~ to support departments and units that provide appropriate accommodations for students, faculty, and staff with disabilities.

Procedures: The University, through central administration, will provide financial support to units that will offset ~~extra~~ costs connected with accommodating educational and employment needs related to disability.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Services for the Handicapped has spent the last three years reviewing 1983 policies and procedures in keeping with the principles of the University of

Minnesota; being sensitive to the needs of all students, staff, faculty and guests with disabilities.

The committee believes that these recommendations meet societal and regulatory demands that should be recognized for all who interface with the University system. The committee is presenting these recommendations for modification in both policy and procedures for system-wide direction of the University, programs, faculty and staff.

The committee senses the need to address student, faculty, and staff of all campuses and guests of the University in structurally and philosophically being prepared for all who touch the University.

Through a supplemental state appropriation beginning in the 1979-1981 biennium, the University was able to strengthen its support service programs for students with handicaps and has increased its capacity to meet reasonable resource needs as mandated by equal opportunity legislation for people with disabilities. Structural modification of University facilities has progressed to the point where most academic programs are accessible—some actually barrier-free. Enrollment of students with handicaps in many programs has significantly increased. Students with severe and/or hidden disabilities (i.e., learning disabled, head injuries, psychological conditions) are being admitted to courses of study which they have not often pursued in the past. Because of this, there is a great need for the University to revise system-wide policies that will provide better direction to programs and faculty who work with disabled students.

The committee's recommendations are being presented as a significant step toward meeting this need. We believe these recommendations are in keeping with the principles of University governance and they clarify the University's teaching mission as it applies to students with disabilities.

The previous Committee on Services for the Handicapped set forth a comprehensive and far-reaching plan of action for developing and providing services to people with disabilities. Our committee has approached its policy development by subjecting the recommendations of the 1979 report (Reynolds Committee Report) to an intensive review. Our committee has approved, refined, or revised those recommendations where deemed necessary and appropriate. We have used economic feasibility and reasonable efforts as important criteria in its evaluation and revision of the Reynolds report. In addition, we have reclassified the recommendations on the basis of whether they concern policy or procedure.

These policies are clearly needed. Faculty and student committees have spent five years carefully developing policies which are workable for students, staff, faculty and guests of the University of Minnesota. They are feasible from an economic standpoint, compatible with general University policies, and are socially responsible.

WARREN IBELE, Chair
Consultative Committee
CORINE T. ELLINGHAM, Chair
Services for Handicapped Committee

Approved

V. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT BY CHAIR

(5 minutes)

See abstract

VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(10 minutes)

See abstract

VII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

Concerns about rising tuition, which are currently widespread across campus, are particularly relevant for the Medical School. The average loan debt for graduate medical students this year will exceed \$48,000. The most significant criticisms expressed by students during the analysis for last year's accreditation of the Medical School involved the cost of their education. Medical School tuition at the University of Minnesota is the highest of any state school in the country. Additionally, recent changes in federal administration of student loan programs have decreased availability of affordable loans and deferment for loan payments during residency.

The net effect of the above factors is threatening the mission of our Medical School. If significant action is not taken soon, incentives for medical students to practice in underserved areas (such as rural Minnesota) and in needed primary care specialties will decrease even further. Furthermore, talented Minnesota students will be increasingly drawn to other medical schools and we will also have more problems attracting qualified minority students.

What will be done to address the issues related to tuition in the Medical School?

Tim Huisken, Student Senator

Under what conditions, other than the closing of units, can a University administrator transfer tenured faculty across units? Who is responsible for providing the necessary funds for such transfers? What are the rights of faculty in the designated receiving unit to accept or reject a proposed tenured faculty member? Do you believe that the faculty in the designated receiving unit should consider issues like funding, fit, unit priorities, and so forth in their voting, in addition to the individual's qualifications and credentials? In the event of a faculty vote of non-acceptance, who has the final authority for the decision?

**Chap Le, Vernon Weckwerth, Carolyn Williams
Faculty Senators, School of Public Health**

See abstract

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

none

IX. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

none

X. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS AND STUDENTS

MITCHELL V. CHARNLEY

1898-1991

Mitchell V. Charnley, a nationally renowned professor of journalism, died February 16, 1991, of heart failure. He was 92. He had officially retired in 1966, although he rejoined the faculty for another two years to fill the William J. Murphy Chair. He was the University's first professor to continue teaching full-time past the mandatory retirement age.

Professor Charnley joined the University of Minnesota journalism faculty in 1934 to teach reporting and magazine writing and editing. His textbook, *Reporting*, is in its fourth edition. He also wrote *News by Radio, Magazine Writing and Editing* (with Blair Converse), and numerous articles published in *Journalism Quarterly*, *Quill*, and *Columbia Journalism Review*. His students included Eric Sevareid, Harry Reasoner, Max Shulman, Charles

Roberts, Jay Richter, Vic Cohn, Geri Joseph, Tom Heggen, John Finnegan, Sr., Sig Mickelson, Graham Hovey, Pauline Gough, and many other well-known journalists.

A pioneer in broadcast journalism instruction, Professor Charnley earned the 1963 Distinguished Achievement Award of the Radio-TV News Directors Association. He also helped found WCCO Radio's first full-scale newsroom in 1943 and worked in the KSTP newsroom in 1952.

In 1952 he held a Fulbright lectureship in journalism at the University of Florence, Italy. In 1968 he was awarded Sigma Delta Chi's Distinguished Teaching in Journalism Award. He held various offices in Sigma Delta Chi from 1923 to 1937. In 1958-59 he served as president of the Association for Education in Journalism (AEJ). He was one of the founders of the AEJ Council on Radio-TV Journalism, serving as chair from 1947 to 49, and was one of the organizers of the Northwest Broadcast News Association.

Professor Charnley was at heart a teacher—outside and inside the classroom. Students and nonstudents found themselves drafted into his circle of continuing instruction. His letters of criticism and praise to working journalists, friends and colleagues often arrived unsolicited, but always welcomed. His wit, charm, selflessness and commitment to journalism education made him a truly remarkable person.

Born in Goshen, Indiana, Professor Charnley graduated from Williams College (1919) and went to the University of Washington where he received a master's degree (1921). He started his professional career as a waterfront reporter for the *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, and went later to the *Walla Walla Bulletin* and the rewrite desk of the *Detroit News*. He was editor of the *American Boy Magazine* and *Short Stories Magazine*, and a free-lance writer in Europe and Algeria. He taught at Iowa State College before joining the University of Minnesota. After his formal retirement, he served as interim director of University Relations for a year. He was an assistant dean in the College of Liberal Arts in the 1960s, and special assistant to the dean from 1972 to 1978.

Professor Charnley is survived by his wife Jean and three children: Donn of Seattle, Washington, Deborah Fort of Washington, D.C., and Blair, of Long Beach, California.

A memorial service on February 22 was attended by more than 400 faculty colleagues, former students, professional colleagues, and friends, attesting to the high esteem in which Professor Charnley was held as a teacher, scholar and friend.

JOHN WILLIAMS CLARK

1907-1991

John Williams Clark, professor emeritus of English at the University, died in Minneapolis on February 28 after a brief hospitalization. Failing health had confined him to his apartment ever since the death of his wife two years ago. His request was that no service be held.

An Excelsior native, Clark attended the University of Minnesota, where his literary precociousness and aptitude for languages was noticed by some illustrious teachers, including Frederick Klaeber, Douglas Bush, and Martin Ruud. Professor Ruud called him "a born scholar" and recommended he publish his sophomore essay on medieval monasticism. In an undergraduate class in Greek, Clark met Lucile Bayer of Minneapolis, who later became his wife. Receiving his B.A. in just three years, Clark earned an M.A. at Harvard and then taught for a year at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. In 1930 he returned to Minnesota, married, and began a 43-year career at the University, first as a doctoral student and eventually as professor. His career was interrupted only by army service, partly in Greenland, in 1944-45.

His articles on *Early English* (to use the title of one of his books) brought him academic recognition. The publishers of Webster's Dictionary offered him a lucrative position which he declined. Invited to work with the Shakespearean linguist, Eric Partridge, on *British and American English Since 1900*, Clark achieved something of an international coup when his work was called superior to that of his famous British collaborator. Meanwhile, he continued to teach lively classes in *Beowulf* and Chaucer that are still remembered by those who studied at Minnesota during the post-war years. At this time, Stoll, Klaeber, Moore, Ruud, and Beach were succeeded by the generation of scholars that included Robert Penn Warren,

Henry Nash Smith, Samuel Monk, Allen Tate, William O'Connor, and Leonard Unger. In 1958, Clark became chair of the Department, serving for eleven years with exemplary justice and integrity.

Clark had a rare gift for philology, the study of a culture's language and literature, and his career coincided with the heyday of his profession. English faculties originated a century ago for the purpose of studying Germanic philology. Courses in Old and Middle English—the languages of *Beowulf* and *The Canterbury Tales*—were the foundations on which departments of English built their literary curriculum. Works by Shakespeare and Milton, as well as modern authors like Keats or Dickens, were significant for their philological content. Nobody thought of literature as a "structure" that mirrors an author's or a society's ideological preconceptions.

The world of philological studies lasted right up the 1960s, and it was Clark's element. In letters from Harvard written to his former teachers he quotes Kittredge's etymological lectures on *Beowulf*. His Ph.D. dissertation on the language of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*—a poem even Chaucerians find difficult—was judged by its readers the most brilliant thesis the Department had ever seen. Clark used to exchange birthday epistles in Latin with his colleague, the late Huntington Brown, and wrote in Anglo-Saxon to thank the Department for a gift. One of his particularly clever coinages in that language was a word meaning "encyclopedia." Having mastered the language from medieval English to modern American, Clark rounded out his career with a study of *The Language and Style of Anthony Trollope* (1975).

The unrest that swept colleges campuses in the late 1960s affected Clark's last years as chair, and he retired in 1973, deploring what he accurately foresaw would be a momentous shift in English studies. His profession of philology had indeed begun to give way to sociology. As he watched the traditional study of *litterae humaniores* receding before the onslaught of the social sciences and what Marxists call "critical theory" (the analysis of ideology), Clark liked to repeat a quip made by the legendary classicist, E. K. Rand, to a student who wanted to know when the Dark Ages ended. "I have no idea," said Rand, "but they began in 1789."

Clark's determination that philology should flourish on our midwestern prairie was matched by his passion for European history and culture, particularly the culture of England. His wife, known to friends as Bobbie, was an accomplished linguist in her own right. After Clark retired, they travelled to Europe several times, visiting friends in England with whom they had long corresponded. Bobbie was thrilled by the Mediterranean and especially Greece, regions that stirred the youthful classics major in her. By 1982, however, an old spinal injury, incurred by strenuous work during the war, came back to afflict her, and she spent her remaining years as an invalid in her husband's care. In former days, in their house near Loring Park, it had been otherwise, with Bobbie looking after John. She used to tell how once, during a violent tornado, she rushed into his study to find him marvelling at a highway sign that had crashed through the wall, and exulting, "What a wonderful storm!"

JOHN N. CLAUSEN

1922-1991

John Norman Clausen was born on February 25, 1922, and died of a heart attack on February 21, 1991. John grew up in Minneapolis and graduated from the University of Minnesota, receiving the bachelor of science in industrial education in 1943 and the Ph.D. in curriculum and instruction in 1955. After service as an engineering officer in the navy in World War II, he joined the faculty as an instructor in engineering graphics in 1946. He was promoted to assistant professor in 1955 and to associate professor in 1970 in the Department of Mechanical Engineering. His promotion to professor had been recommended to the provost at the time of his death.

For twenty years, John Clausen ran the advising and tutorial services in the Institute of Technology, most recently as assistant dean. He was responsible for a wide array of programs, all directly concerned with improving the experience of students at the University: the Advising Program for Unclassified Students; the Tutorial Program, which John built from one table in a cramped office to the wonderful facilities in the Taylor Academic Center; in-

dustrial tours to help students learn what an engineering career is really like; and a one-to-one mentoring program with engineers in several local companies. He paid meticulous attention to detail, training the people who worked with him carefully. He helped the Athletic Department recruit student athletes to the Institute of Technology.

John cared passionately for students, and he helped thousands of them. With many he developed a deep friendship, which they maintained years later.

In addition to serving as a co-advisor of Tau Beta Pi, the engineering honorary society, John served as faculty adviser to the Board of Publications, the *IT Connection*, *Technolog*, and the presidential scholars in IT.

John was very active in two national organizations. He served for several years as vice-chair and chair of the Engineering College Magazine Association. He served on the Board of the American Society of Engineering Education.

Few people at the University of Minnesota have devoted their lives to undergraduate students with such singleness of purpose and such beneficial effect as did John Clausen.

John is survived by his wife Helen, a son Donald of Orono, two daughters, Anne Hendrickson of Kent, Washington, and Amy Bonbe of Edina, a sister Norma Newquist of Minneapolis, and five grandchildren.

ROBERT F. GRABB

1918-1991

Bob Grabb had already completed one career before he came to the University of Minnesota Law School in 1965—a very successful military career in the United States Army. After graduation from Brown University in 1941, Bob was drafted into the Army as a private. After Pearl Harbor, he went through officers candidate school and became a lieutenant in the Intelligence Division. Bob was fond of saying that he spent the war defending such places as Santa Monica, Miami Beach, Macon, Augusta, and Battle Creek. Following the war, Bob Grabb entered Harvard Law School, graduated, and was two years into a corporate practice when Uncle Sam remembered what Bob had forgotten—that he was a reserve officer. He was called back for the Korean conflict and was promptly dispatched to Italy for the duration. From 1950 to 1953, he served with the allied military government in Trieste, while Italy and Yugoslavia made that city the subject of international controversy.

In 1953, Bob returned to Washington and served in the Pentagon until retiring from the military in 1965. While rising to the rank of colonel, he held three major positions in the judge advocate general's staff. He was chief of the International Law Branch; chief of the Procurement Law Division, responsible for approval of government contracts; and chief of the Career Management Division, responsible for placement of all Army lawyers.

The Law School had the good fortune of attracting Bob Grabb as assistant dean upon his retirement from the Army in 1965. Bob served as the Law School assistant dean and later as associate dean for 19 years until his retirement from the Law School in 1984. During that period he served as the principal right-hand assistant for three deans: William B. Lockhart (1965-1972), Carl A. Auerbach (1972-1979), and Robert A. Stein (1979-1984).

Bob was involved in almost every aspect of the Law School. He supervised the administrative operations of the school. When the day-to-day pressures inherent in the administration of any law school arose, the University was blessed in having in its midst a wise and witty friend to remind faculty and students alike of the importance of mutual caring and respect. He counseled more than half of the living graduates of the school in his capacity as dean of students. He had an unusual talent for working with people. Even when unable to respond affirmatively to a student concern, he invariably earned the student's respect and affection. He knew which complaints to take seriously and which he could best respond to by being a sympathetic listener.

As director of the Law School Alumni Program, Bob was in charge of development, and under his leadership the annual fund of the Law School, the "Partners in Excellence Campaign," became, and continues to be, one of the most successful development programs among the nation's law schools. In addition to all of his other Law School duties, he taught the government contracts course, an arbitration seminar, and supervised the legal writing program. He was a very well-respected and much loved teacher.

But even more than his extraordinary administrative and teaching abilities, Bob will be remembered mostly by the Law School as a friend. He was a friend to the faculty; he was a friend to the staff; and he was a friend to the students. His door was always open. Many in the Law School community included a visit with Bob Grabb as part of their daily routine. Many students viewed him as their best friend in the Law School, and even after retirement he was a confidante of many still on the faculty.

Bob retired in 1984 after discovering he had a serious illness. He wanted some years to "smell the roses." He died on January 10, 1990. He is survived by his wife Jean, and children Nan, Lynn, Bob, Jr., and Steve.

KEVIN S. GUISE

1950-1991

Dr. Kevin S. Guise, associate professor in the Department of Animal Science, died February 12, 1991, following an extended illness. A native of Kettering, Ohio, Dr. Guise received his B.S. degree, summa cum laude, in botany from the University of Rhode Island in 1972. He completed his M. Phil. (1978) and Ph.D. (1981), both in biology/somatic cell genetics, at Yale University. Dr. Guise was a postdoctoral research fellow from 1981 to 1984 in the Genetics Department, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada. He joined the faculty at the University of Minnesota in 1984. Despite his tragically short career, Kevin Guise established an internationally recognized research program in molecular genetics. His many friends, colleagues and students will miss his leadership, dedication, cooperative spirit, friendship and loyalty.

Dr. Guise chose to investigate the basic molecular genetics of growth promoting genes as well as the development of methods to transfer isolated genes into poultry and fish. He also used molecular techniques to identify and characterize separate populations or stocks of fish and birds for use in wildlife management and in commercial stock identification. Much of his research involved interaction and coordination of several research groups. As group leader for the transgenic fish project, he led a team of investigators from Human Genetics, Genetics and Cell Biology, and Fisheries and Wildlife, each working in their area of expertise, to cover all aspects of piscine genetic engineering—from gene isolation to gene transfer to growth analysis. His firm belief in collaborative efforts was also demonstrated by ongoing collaborations in poultry and fish systems with groups in Ohio, Arkansas and Canada.

Dr. Guise was involved in the cloning of growth hormone genes for several fish species to use in species specific gene transfer. In collaboration with Drs. A. Faras and J. Schneider of the Institute of Human Genetics, northern pike growth hormone was isolated and sequenced. Its sequence showed similarity to other piscine and mammalian growth hormones. Dr. Guise was also investigating other potential growth promoting genes such as chicken insulin-like growth factor (IGF-1). He investigated the function of several oncogenes in poultry, looking at methylation as a monitor of gene expression. He was studying the effects of IGF-1 and growth hormone releasing factor on fish, in addition to his growth hormone work. In collaboration with Dr. M. E. Halawani of Animal Science he studied the induction of prolactin by demethylation of DNA using 5-azacytidine in turkeys, and ultimately planned to explore the effects of prolactin in transgenic fish. In collaboration with Dr. P. Hackett of Genetics and Cell Biology, two carp beta-actins were isolated, sequenced, and their promotor/enhancer regions dissected. He was using *in situ* hybridization techniques to map cloned genes in the chicken. To date he had mapped beta-actin (chromosome 2) and growth hormone (chromosome 1) and planned to continue mapping avian peptide hormones.

The second part of his research program was the development and utilization of gene transfer systems for poultry and fish. To date, only retroviral transfer has been effective in poultry. Because of problems of public acceptance of a virally modified food animal, and problems of viral recombination producing fully infective viral units out of the defective transfer virus, Dr. Guise was searching for a non-retroviral mode of gene transfer in poultry.

Dr. Guise's work in fish gene transfer was well advanced. He and co-workers presently have approximately 2,500 potentially transgenic or proven transgenic fish. They had successfully microinjected and produced transgenic northern pike, walleye, rainbow trout, ze-

brafish and goldfish and were working on Chinook salmon. Since his goal was an all fish vector system, he was isolating piscine growth promoting genes and control elements from northern pike and carp. The gene transfer effort was highly successful, with a high rate of transfer effected, and the genes expressed. The transferred DNA and high levels of bovine growth hormone in the serum of some transgenics were detected and a significant growth enhancement in the transgenic population was obtained.

Dr. Guise found his research to be very rewarding and highly exciting. He was highly successful in generating outside grant support and his work in both poultry and fish received national and international recognition. This was evidenced by the number of foreign sabbatical scientists who work in his lab, repeated invitations to present research at international conferences and workshops, including the F.A.O., and collaborations with groups in the U.S. and Canada. The team of Drs. Faras (Human Genetics), Hackett (Genetics) and Kapuscinski (Fisheries) and Guise was one of the most comprehensive fish gene transfer groups in the world. He expected his research to continue at its rapid pace in both poultry and fish, and to have a major impact on the protein supply, especially in the developing world.

Dr. Guise is survived by his wife, Alberta; a daughter, Amanda; a son, Nicholas; his parents Carolyn Jean and R. Kenneth Guise of Centerville, Ohio; a sister, Pamela Merl of Spring Valley, Ohio; a brother, Peter, of Centerville, Ohio; and a grandmother, Edna Guise, of Cincinnati.

Memorial services were held at St. Lawrence Catholic Church on February 14, 1991. Memorials in remembrance of Dr. Guise are being received by the Department of Animal Science for the establishment of a Kevin S. Guise Memorial Lecture.

STEVEN OREY

1928-1991

Steven Orey was born on July 17, 1928, in Berlin, Germany. In 1936, he had to leave Germany with his mother and sister to escape Nazi persecution and spent the next four years in Portugal as a refugee. He attended an English school in Portugal and immigrated to the United States in 1941. He graduated from Scarsdale High School in Westchester, New York, in 1945. The years 1945-1949 were spent at Cornell University for undergraduate education, except for a short period spent with the U.S. Army. Steven started his graduate work at Cornell and met his future wife, Dolores, in a philosophy course in 1949. They were married in 1950.

Steven Orey received his Ph.D. in mathematical logic from Cornell University in 1953, spent a year at Cornell as an instructor, and joined the School of Mathematics at the University of Minnesota in 1954. He and Dolores had a son, Michael, in 1958 and a daughter, Vivian, in 1960. He was promoted to full professor in 1962. His scientific interest in the meantime had shifted from logic to the theory of probability. During the period 1957-1961 he made two major contributions to probability in the areas of renewal theory and the ergodic theory of Markov chains. His contributions to the subject continued in several other areas such as random walks, Lévy processes and diffusion theory. Lately, he had been working on problems in the theory of large deviations. In addition to his research contributions, Steven served on editorial boards of prestigious mathematics journals and also produced fifteen Ph.D. students.

Steven was always a source of inspiration to his colleagues and students. His wit and humor were exceptional and he often turned awkward moments into light ones. He was an extremely conscientious teacher and his students had very deep admiration for him. He suffered from cancer for the last two years of his life and died on February 15, 1991. The void he has left will be felt for a long time by his friends, colleagues, and students.

Steven is survived by his wife Dolores, son Michael, daughter Vivian, granddaughter Rachel, sister Irene Harrison, and brother Robert Liebenthal.

BERTRAM WOOLFREY

1928-1991

Bertram F. Woolfrey, M.D., Ph.D., died in St. Paul, Minnesota, on January 27, 1991, at the age of 62 years. With him American Pathology has lost a dedicated teacher and investigator in clinical microbiology who combined in a harmonious fashion laboratory investigation and clinical medicine.

Bert Woolfrey was born in Crosby, North Dakota, on October 10, 1928. After graduation from the University of Minnesota in 1950 with a B.A. in physics, he followed graduate studies in the Department of Physics, obtained a B.S. degree in physics and then entered Medical School, receiving the doctor of medicine degree in 1955. After an internship and a radiology residency at Santa Clara County Hospital, San Jose, California, he served as medical officer in the United States Army in Okinawa, Ryukus Islands, Japan, from 1957 to 1959.

In 1959 Bert Woolfrey returned to the University of Minnesota where he took a pathology residency, which he completed in 1963. He entered the graduate program in pathology and was engaged in research in radio-histochemistry, studying ribonuclease and ribonucleo~~o~~polymerase activities. In 1966 he moved to St. Paul-Ramsey Medical Center, a major teaching affiliate of the University of Minnesota, as director of the clinical microbiology section and director of the medical technology training program. He obtained his degree of doctor of philosophy from the University of Minnesota in 1970 with a major in pathology, a minor in hematology, and with radiation biology as collateral field.

At St. Paul-Ramsey Medical Center, Bert Woolfrey developed a research program in microbiology, focusing on microbial sensitivities and resistance with a steady stream of publications in peer reviewed journals. In the course of his teaching activities in medical technology, he had adjunct faculty appointments at the University of North Dakota, North Dakota State University, the University of South Dakota, Hamline University, and St. Cloud and Mankato State Universities in Minnesota. In recognition of his accomplishments in research and teaching, Dr. Woolfrey was promoted to assistant professor in the Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology in 1971 and to associate professor at the University of Minnesota in 1985. Since 1987, he was a member of the editorial board of the American Journal of Clinical Pathology.

In addition to his outstanding ability as a teacher, author, and practicing pathologist, Bert Woolfrey was a warm and considerate man who loved to play the banjo and the tuba, and actively participated and performed with local groups. He will be sorely missed by the many students, physicians, and scientists who were fortunate enough to have known him. He achieved all of this against overwhelming odds of a progressing diabetic retinopathy which left him during the last ten years of his life virtually blind. This did not prevent him from continued excellence in practice, research and teaching.

Dr. Woolfrey is survived by his wife Dona, six children, six grandchildren and a brother.

STUDENTS

UDAY AYYALA, Graduate School

MARY JANE KEYS, CLA

FOUAD NAKLI, Graduate School

XI. 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 132 voting members of the faculty/academic professional staff. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 14

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

COMMITTEES OF FACULTY SENATE, 1990-91

Action (2 minutes)

JUDICIAL—Faculty: Hyman Berman, David Born, Jonathan Chaplin, James Holte, Tarald Kvalseth, Marilyn Sime. These are additions to the 1990-91 membership list.

MARIO BOGNANNO
Chair

Approved

III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

PROBATIONARY PERIOD CHANGE

Information (10 minutes)

In response to a request from the Medical School for an extension of the probationary period from the present six years to nine years for their tenure-track faculty, the Faculty Consultative Committee established an all-University Task Force on Extending the Probationary Period. The task force was charged with examining whether the probationary period should be extended University-wide and, if not, whether unit-by-unit variation should be permitted.

To answer the question of the impact of policy change on recruitment, the task force surveyed 2000 doctoral students and over 1000 new faculty in their first eight years of employment at the University of Minnesota. (Of these, 418 and 630 responded, respectively.) It also gathered information from various sectors of the University administrative and policy-shaping community, and contacted 21 major public and private universities to compare policies for tenure-track faculty for the universities as a whole and for their medical schools.

The 11-member task force concluded by 7 yes votes to 1 no with 3 abstentions that it would not be in the best interests of the University of Minnesota to change the overall probationary policy from the present six years with one terminating year for unsuccessful candidates.

A majority (6 members) concluded that it was not in the best interests of the University to permit college-by-college variation in the probationary policy, and rejected the Medical School's motion for extension of probation from six years to nine years at the Medical School. A minority (3 members) supported the Medical School request for extension. There were 2 abstentions.

While concluding that there should be no policy change at this time, the task force was in agreement that the problems faced by the Medical School are real and serious. However, the majority did not consider that lengthening the probationary period was the appropriate solution and encouraged the exploration of alternative changes in Medical School policies or practices.

The information-gathering processes also identified serious problems with the probationary process itself that were not related to the length of the probationary period. In particular, it was recognized that problems were experienced by individuals with clinical service or extension service responsibilities and by women, minorities, and other under-represented groups. It was strongly recommended that these issues be addressed by the appropriate office or committee.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

See Abstract

IV. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

TENURE CODE REVISION

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the tenure code be amended as follows (deletions are indicated; additions are underlined):

14.4 Action by the President. The President must give the faculty member and the administrator the opportunity to submit written comments on the report and to make oral presentations. ~~The President may not discuss the case with the Vice President or with any other academic officer, except in the presence of the faculty member or the faculty member's representative, but the President may discuss the case with the University's General Council, unless the General Council has personally participated in the prior proceedings or the preparation for them. In determining what action to take, the President may consult privately with any administrators, including attorneys, who have had no previous responsibility for the decision at issue in the case and have not participated in the presentation of the matter to the Judicial Committee. The President may not discuss the case with any administrator who was responsible for the decision at issue in the case or who participated in the presentation of the matter to the Senate Judicial Committee. The Vice President and other academic officers~~ Such administrators may communicate with the President ~~about the case~~ in writing, but only if the full text of the communication is given to the faculty member and the faculty member is given a reasonable opportunity to respond to it.

The President shall not take action materially different from that recommended by the Panel unless, prior to the action, the President has consulted with the Committee. The parties and their representatives shall not be present at any meeting between the President and the Committee nor shall their consent be required for such meeting.

In addition, the President may request the Judicial Committee to make further findings of fact, to clarify its recommendation or to reconsider its interpretation recommendation. The reconsideration will be made by those who have heard all of the evidence in the case, but the full Judicial Committee may consult with them on questions of general policy.

The President may impose the action recommended by the Committee, or any ~~lesser measure which appears to be appropriate~~ action more favorable to the faculty member. The President may impose action less favorable to the faculty member only for compelling reasons, which must be stated in writing, with specific detailed reference to the report of the Judicial Committee, the evidence presented, and the policies involved. The President's written statement must be given to the ~~faculty member~~ parties and to the Judicial Committee. ~~Unless the faculty member requests confidentiality, its full text must be published in the next docket of the Faculty Senate; if the faculty member requests confidentiality, a summary of the relevant considerations must be so published without identification of the faculty member. If the Judicial Committee decides that the President has imposed an action that is less favorable to the faculty member than it had recommended, it shall inform the faculty by publication of the President's action in the docket of the Faculty Senate. If the faculty member waives rights to confidentiality, the full text of the statement will be published. Otherwise a summary of the statement will be published without identification of the faculty member or information that may indirectly identify the faculty member.~~

15.5 Action by the President. The President must give the faculty member and the administrator the opportunity to submit written comments on the report. ~~The President may not discuss the case with the Vice President or with any other academic officer, except in the presence of the faculty member or the faculty member's representative, but the President may discuss the case with the University's General Council, unless the General Council~~

has personally participated in the prior proceedings or the preparation for them. In determining what action to take, the President may consult privately with any administrators, including attorneys, who have had no previous responsibility for the decision at issue in the case and have not participated in the presentation of the matter to the Judicial Committee. The President may not discuss the case with any administrator who was responsible for the decision at issue in the case or who participated in the presentation of the matter to the Senate Judicial Committee. The Vice President and other academic officers. Such administrators may communicate with the President about the case in writing, but only if the full text of the communication is given to the faculty member and the faculty member is given a reasonable opportunity to respond to it.

The President shall not take action materially different from that recommended by the Panel unless, prior to the action, the President has consulted with the Committee. The parties and their representatives shall not be present at any meeting between the President and the Committee nor shall their consent be required for such meeting.

In addition, the President may request the Judicial Committee to make further findings of fact, to clarify its recommendation or to reconsider its interpretation recommendation. The reconsideration will be made by those who have heard all of the evidence in the case, but the full Judicial Committee may consult with them on questions of general policy.

The President may impose the action recommended by the Committee, or any action more favorable to the faculty member. The President may impose action less favorable to the faculty member only for important substantive reasons, which must be stated in writing, with specific detailed reference to the report of the Judicial Committee, the evidence presented, and the policies involved. The President's written statement must be given to the faculty member parties and to the Judicial Committee. Unless the faculty member requests confidentiality, its full text must be published in the next docket of the Faculty Senate; if the faculty member requests confidentiality, a summary of the relevant considerations must be so published without identification of the faculty member. If the Judicial Committee decides that the President has imposed an action that is less favorable to the faculty member than it had recommended, it shall inform the faculty by publication of the President's action in the docket of the Faculty Senate. If the faculty member waives rights to confidentiality, the full text of the statement will be published. Otherwise a summary of the statement will be published without identification of the faculty member or information that may indirectly identify the faculty member.

COMMENT:

The main purpose of these amendments is to provide that the President will consult with the Judicial Committee before taking action less favorable to the petitioning faculty member than the committee has recommended. President Keller, Interim President Sauer and President Hasselmo have each agreed to consult with the Judicial Committee in such circumstances, but there is some chance that such consultations are prohibited by the second sentence of Sections 14.4 and 15.5 as currently written. The proposed amendment replaces that language and, in a new paragraph, provides for such consultation.

Also, the last sentence of each section as currently written requires the publication of some presidential actions in the Senate docket but leaves it unclear who is responsible to see it is done. The amended language makes it clear that the Judicial Committee has that responsibility.

In addition, some stylistic changes are proposed in the last two paragraphs of each section.

WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Faculty Consultative Committee
AVNER BEN-NER, Chr.
Faculty Affairs Committee
C. ROBERT MORRIS, Chr.
Judicial Committee

Approved

V. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The University Senate was called to order by President Nils Hasselmo at 3:45 p.m. in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, with coordinate campuses, except UMD, linked by phone. The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Vice Chair election. Warren Ibele, professor of mechanical engineering and chair of the Consultative Committee, nominated for the office of vice chair for next year Karen Seashore Louis, associate professor of educational policy and administration. He cited her academic appointments and her activities related to the Senate. There were no further nominations; she was elected unanimously and rose to acknowledge the applause.

Handicapped people service, policy and procedures. Professor Ibele introduced the motion to make certain changes in the policy and procedures of services for the handicapped which had been proposed by the committee. Sue Kroeger, director of the office for students with disabilities, provided further background, involving appointment of the preliminary committee in 1974, formation of a compliance committee in 1977, and appointment of a University Committee on Services for the Handicapped in 1978. An operations committee was established in 1981 to review the work of the first committee and to develop the first statement of policies and procedures. The new amendments were made following a study to ensure that the policies were workable and compatible with other University policies, including application to faculty and staff with disabilities. The document had been considerably shortened, she pointed out, but nothing was lost of the essence of the original document.

Hans Weinberger, professor of mathematics, thought the policy mandated a commitment of a certain amount of faculty time and he wondered the extent of it. He also noted the absence of a definition of "handicapped," and he sought clarification of the terms "learning disability" and "psychological condition" described in the comments. Phillips Shively, professor of political science, said he was working with three students with clearly defined learning disabilities, one with dyslexia, and he assumed that service for such persons was what was intended rather than using generalized intelligence as a measure of learning disability. Ms. Kroeger added that the University was mandated by federal and state statutes to provide accommodations for students with diagnosed and documented disabilities, and those disabilities were defined in the statutes. The motion was then approved.

Consultative Committee report. Professor Ibele, chair, reported on four items: 1) The undergraduate liberal education discussion (see 4/18/91 Assembly abstract); 2) The budget principles for guiding development of the budget for the coming year, which he described as a difficult task, with some sobering implications. It had been hoped that the University's budget base could be protected and that funds would be provided for increases for University employees if such increases were provided for state employees. Under the current economic conditions, he explained, if the faculty and staff did not receive cost-of-living increases it would mean that in a very real sense they would be providing a subsidy for the ongoing programs of instruction and research and service. He pointed out that compulsory costs such as coal, water, and electricity and supplies, expense and equipment would be met, and he thought there should be some way to recognize the subsidy in the budget as a gift to the institution. He urged senators to contact their representatives about their concern—both for the short and long term. 3) The restructuring and reallocation changes that were in process resulting in concern that appropriate places would be found for faculty members in various programs to be dropped. A discussion of policy covering that situation was under way, he said. 4) The recent publication of the retention and graduation rates. Fewer items had been brought more frequently to his attention, he said, and he interpreted that interest as a sign that the faculty was concerned and willing to examine the causes for the low figures and to fashion some sorts of programs and remedies for improvement.

President's report. President Hasselmo announced the election of two new members to the Board of Regents—Ann Wynia and H. Bryan Neel—and the reelection of Regents Anderson and Sahlstrom. He reported that the Regents had approved the restructuring and reallocation plan and that implementation was under way. Open forums had been held to provide an opportunity for the University community to discuss the implications.

At the legislature, the Governor had introduced an austerity budget which included cuts for higher education, he said, resulting in a \$24 million reduction for the University in the first year of the biennium. A subsequent addition of \$5 million for each of the two years which would be assignable to specific types of research was subsequently proposed. The matter was still before the legislature, he reported, and the University was testifying, although it had been instructed not to ask for anything, so there was not the usual vehicle of a legislative request. However, the University was trying to place before the legislature some of the needs, with the urgent emphasis on salaries for faculty and staff. He noted that the legislature had been considering a number of merger proposals for the higher education system in the state, but there was little or no momentum for inclusion of the University. He reported that the Regents had been actively working with legislators on behalf of the University. A proposal to change dramatically the funding structure for instruction had been made—a proposal that would alter the current formula whereby the legislature provides one third of the cost of instruction and two thirds is expected to come from other sources, that is, tuition. Financial aid would be greatly enhanced. One of the repercussions of a tuition increase would be the effect on the University's relationship to other institutions, including implications for reciprocity, he explained. The University questioned the approach because it held out the threat of causing a lot of dislocation and would probably have some quite unforeseen and undesirable results. A number of analyses were being made in an effort to place all of the relevant issues before the legislature.

Finally, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act at the federal level had been in the news and the University had had an opportunity to meet with Senator Durenberger and representatives of the Department of Education to place before them its concerns, especially relating to the financial aid portion. Senator Wellstone had scheduled hearings in the Twin Cities, and the University would participate at that time. Some University students had gone to Washington to participate actively in a lobbying effort as well.

Tuition. Tim Huisken, student, had asked what was being done to address the issues related to the rapidly increasing Medical School tuition. The president responded that the increase was part of the overall tuition issue, and he shared the concerns, particularly with regard to the incentives for graduates to enter primary care specialties. It was recognized that the University Medical School tuition was among the highest when compared with other state-supported medical schools, and had increased rapidly in recent years due to the policy requiring students to pay one third of the cost of the instructional programs in which they were enrolled, which included the Medical School. Attempts had been made to get an offset in tuition from the state in the form of need-based, non-repayable aid, but the Higher Education Coordinating Board had not been successful so far, he said. Also, the University had adopted a policy of capping tuition for high cost programs at third place in their comparison group, but that third-place rule had not applied to medical students. Congressional delegates had been contacted regarding the deferment problem, which was one of the issues taken up in the reauthorization discussions. He urged medical students to get further information on the issue from the Medical School dean's office and the office of the vice president for health sciences.

Tenured faculty transfer. A series of questions had been submitted by School of Public Health Professors Le, Weckwerth, and Williams bearing on the procedure of transferring tenured faculty members. President Hasselmo explained that the tenure code was silent on transfers other than in the closing of a unit. In that case, the University had a responsibility to assign such faculty members to responsibilities as closely related to their original field of tenure as was practical, with no vote on the part of the receiving unit. Where a unit was not being closed, he said it would be a matter of negotiation. If it were programmatically desirable, for example, to merge a particular unit with another unit, that would normally be subject to negotiations. In the end, if deemed necessary, the administration would probably be in the position of making the final recommendation to the Board of Regents. He emphasized that everything possible would be done to negotiate such transfers. As for financing, he said that too would be negotiated, both for transfer because of closing and in other, more discretionary, transfers. The administration was wrestling with that situation currently, he noted, and would be judging on a case by case basis. A further consideration, he said, would be

that of support staff and support funding involved. Later, Professor Weckwerth followed up his question about a vote by a receiving unit. If there were not a closing, the President said he believed the matter would be discretionary and the best mode of proceeding would be through negotiation. He called it a judgment call because it was his belief that the rules were not specific, that a variety of approaches would be available, and possibly a vote could be taken. Asked who would be involved in negotiations, the president said the responsible administrators would identify the appropriate administrators in the units, and the faculty should have a clear role also. He said it would not be conceivable to force tenured faculty members on another unit except under extreme circumstances or to protect the rights of the faculty member.

Transportation policy. Woods Halley, professor of physics and astronomy, called attention to recent indications in the *Daily* and in the debate of the Finance and Planning Committee that there was some incoherence concerning the policy of encouragement in the use of mass transit and bicycles. For example, the transitway, which was planned for next year, would not include bicycle paths, although the reasons were unclear. Also, the Parking Services Office during the past year had spent \$2.5 million acquiring new land and it was planning over time to increase the facilities and keep the rates down, which was not in the interests, in his view, of encouraging mass transit and bicycle use for commuting to the University. The president, indicating his response would be brief and preliminary, said that in principle what the University was trying to provide was a balanced mode of transportation. That necessarily involved some upgrading of parking facilities. At the same time, encouragement of use of other modes of transportation was continuing, he said. As to the bike-ways, he requested that the clerk get a written response to Professor Halley.

Following a silent tribute to deceased faculty members and students, the meeting was adjourned.

The Faculty Senate was called to order by the president; minutes of the last meeting were approved, as were additions to the Judicial Committee membership.

Probationary period change. Professor Ibele reported that the Task Force on Extending the Probationary Period, chaired by Professor William Gerberich, had been appointed to respond to a request of the Medical School for a policy change. He said that the Faculty Consultative Committee had asked the task force whether the probationary period for all units of the faculty should be extended and, if not, whether the Medical School faculty should be given the freedom to extend on its own. The task force had answered "no" on both counts, although it recognized the particular problems confronting the clinical faculty of the Medical School and suggested that there were other ways that ought to be explored as a means of providing conditions for that faculty that would permit them to reach tenure. He further reported that a special committee had been appointed and it had made some recommendations which would establish a special clinical track with certain surrounding conditions. That proposal was presently before the Faculty Affairs Tenure Subcommittee, he noted. Its report would come before the faculty in due course.

Tenure code revision. The president called on the "ubiquitous" Professor Ibele to introduce proposed revisions of the tenure code. Professor Ibele explained that the changes dealt with the kind of "stately minuet" that ought to take place between the president and the Judicial Committee when certain recommendations were made. He said the procedure had actually been in practice during the terms of the last three presidents, but it appeared desirable to codify it in the tenure code. It involved those cases where the president would arrive at a decision less favorable to the petitioning faculty member than that which the committee had recommended, and it called for communication of the reasons for that decision to the committee for their discussion with him/her. He noted that the Faculty Affairs and Faculty Consultative Committees had approved the amendments.

Charlotte Striebel, associate professor of mathematics and University grievance officer, opposed the amendments on the grounds that they were premature; the grievance policy would be reviewed next year and that review should include the Judicial Committee procedures. She noted that there was already agreement from the president as to the procedure so there was no urgency about the matter. One problem, she said, was that the sys-

tem of the president's consultation with other members of the administration such as the University attorney needed to be clarified. A clear policy was needed to indicate when the president could consult with the University attorney in as much as that office acts as counsel for one of the parties. Another problem, she said, had to do with the section specifying that the parties and their representatives could not be present at any meeting between the president and the committee. She was concerned for the due process rights of the parties involved, and she maintained the appeal process would be eliminated.

Robert Morris, professor of law and chair of the Judicial Committee, held that one section of the existing procedure could be interpreted as prohibiting the informal agreement with the president now being used, and it was important to write the procedure into the code as soon as possible. Where the president's recommendation would be more favorable than that of the committee, the committee would also have an opportunity to review that recommendation, although he said in his experience since 1965 he had never seen that happen. He acknowledged that the president would make the ultimate decision, but the committee should have the opportunity for a discussion with him/her.

Professor Striebel said she understood that the legal impediment was that under the current language it might be interpreted that the parties would have to be present so, if the president and the Judicial Committee were willing to have the parties represented at the meeting, there would be no legal impediment. Professor Morris said that was not correct; it was a right that appeared to be given up but in fact it was a right that had never been exercised. The amendment gave the president the right to consult with other administrators without the parties being present. The motion was then approved, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor