

Significant Events and Issues in Senate History<sup>1</sup>  
The Second 50 Years: 1962-62 to 2011-12  
(University and Faculty Senates)  
Gary Engstrand

November 1, 1962

In a report from the Administrative Committee about the budget and facilities needs, this comment was included: "In recapitulation of the requests for the 1963 legislature, it was noted that very large monetary sums are involved. The program is generally in conformity with the earlier requests, although it has been enlarged by inclusion of deferred items and by revising construction costs. One dean remarked that research activities are invading the instructional areas to such an extent that there is need to maintain a suitable balance between the allocations of building areas to research and to teaching."

The Administrative Committee also reported on the next steps to implement the reorganization recommended by the Senate at its June 4, 1962 meeting.

Also reported from the Administrative Committee: "7. *Orientation Program for New Faculty Members*. The President and the deans participated in a first orientation program for new staff members on the evening of September 25, 1962. An unexpectedly large group (approximately 325 persons) attended. A systematic evaluation is planned through an opinion survey by the School of Journalism. Informal comment was asked for to suggest further programming of this activity. The consensus seemed to be that the results had been good, that the program should be continued with appropriate improvements, and that efforts should be made to emphasize further the outstanding characteristics of this University. It was mentioned that faculty members from the outlying campuses might possibly be included."

The Administrative Committee also held a discussion about replacing the Greater University Fund with a University of Minnesota Foundation.

Also from the Administrative Committee: "9. *Role of the Graduate Research Center in Dealing with Research Support Proposals*. The committee several times discussed the Graduate Research Center as an agency for some co-ordination of research support proposals. . . . One of the questions raised in the committee's discussion was what constitutes research, and what requests for assistance with research would come to the attention of the Graduate Research Center if this co-ordination plan were adopted. Dean Crawford admitted that rigid definition is difficult. . . . The normal projects may be of interest only to single individuals, or may involve college co-operation or cross-college assistance. In both instances, the Graduate Research Center can often

---

<sup>1</sup> The primary criteria for including an item in this abstract from Senate minutes were (1) it was important historically, (2) it dealt with the process of governance and consultation, (3) it was just interesting, or (4) it is a subject that continues to be discussed. This abstract does not include routine constitution and bylaw amendments, committee memberships, memorials, most of the presidents' reports, FCC/SCC chair reports, faculty legislative liaison reports, routine policy amendments, and so on.

provide useful information about sources of funds, facilities, or related work at the University. . . . The Graduate School has long served as the source of assistance with the financing of incipient projects and enjoys a useful consultative relationship with the faculty on many new research projects which might be further developed through the Graduate Research Center. . . . Extreme concern was expressed in the committee that the faculty should be well informed of the discussion of this proposal and should understand its purposes and its usefulness. There is no intention to establish an administrative control point or to hamper the informal arrangements which, in the past, have been so useful in the initiation of research. . . . Although the graduate dean had already discussed the plan with the Faculty Consultative Committee, it was understood he would have further conference with that committee on the details and the expected operation of the proposal and would benefit from their advice on how to inform the faculty of the plan and its initiation.

The Senate had a lengthy discussion of a report about parking.

The Business and Rules Committee proposed amendments to the constitution as requested at the January 18, 1962 meeting, to reduce administrative representation, to clarify that the president is a voting member, to expand the electorate and eligible members to include assistant professors, to provide for 3-year terms, to allow all faculty members to speak and make motions at a meeting whether or not elected members of the Senate (but not vote if they are not members), and to establish a referendum mechanism. "Such referendum shall take place (a) if so directed by the Senate at the time of acting upon the matter, or (b) if requested by a petition signed by one hundred faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members, and delivered to the President within one week of the Senate meeting at which the action took place. In such referendum, each faculty member entitled to vote for Senate members shall have one vote." The Senate approved all the changes except the referendum proposal, which it deferred. The changes also removed FCC members as senators. In the abstract of the discussion: One faculty member "asked why the Faculty Consultative Committee was deleted from membership in the proposed changes. Mr. Hetland said the committee felt it was unfair to add these names to the 1 in 10 ratio [the ratio to determine the number of Senators from each college]. He pointed out that all FCC members were eligible for election from their own faculties. Mr. Wilson [that is, President Wilson] said that he was relieved to hear that the Consultative Committee's close association with the President had not sullied the members." There was also extended debate on the referendum proposal. The president "thought the referendum question arose from the vote on the Rose Bowl and that it reflected an urgency to restrain the President's influence. It was his opinion that the referendum procedure indicated a lack of confidence of the Senate in itself. As a sometime student of the referendum, he thinks of it as something for people who live in rural areas without radio and television, and with no ready line of communication. Mr. Nixon moved to re-submit Rule 8 to the committee and the motion passed. Vice chairman Smith then took the Chair and the President left. Mr. Gerald felt that the Senate should reassure the President that this was not a reflection on him, that the referendum question had been coming up for many years."

The Senate Library Committee reported on the need for a library on the West Bank and what had been done to obtain it.

### XIII. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

TASK FORCE "In October 1961, President Wilson appointed a Junior College Task Force, the purpose of which was to explore the implications for the University of the possible establishment of junior colleges in the Twin Cities area. . . The population in the 5-county area, for example, expanded between 1950 and 1960 by 28.8 per cent, whereas expansion for the rest of the state was 3.5 per cent. Because of the sharply increased birth rate following the war, the number of young people reaching college age will increase dramatically in 1964 and 1965, and will continue at a high level thereafter. . . . The University of Minnesota is the only publicly supported institution of higher education in the area, which also contains 10 private institutions. . . . All these institutions are planning for increased enrollments, although the private colleges do not plan increases proportionate to that projected by the University. Current estimates of future enrollments for the University are 38,000 by 1965; 48,000 by 1970; and 60,000 by 1975. . . . There will still be many thousands of young people living in the Twin Cities area who could not be accommodated in available facilities." The task force concluded, inter alia, that "1. There will be an increasing need for additional higher education facilities in the Twin Cities area, even if all institutions serving the area expand to the limit of their projected resources. 2. Any additional facilities will probably need to be publicly rather than privately supported. 3. Because of the increasing congestion, it is not desirable to expand facilities indefinitely at the Minneapolis and St. Paul Campuses of the University." The Senate accepted the report. In discussion, Dean Morse pointed out a question the University would have to deal with: "If junior colleges are established in the Twin Cities area, as proposed, what will be the admission policy of the University and its colleges? What shall be the internal composition of the student body, will it cover the entire range from freshman through post-doctoral, or will it concentrate at the top levels?"

#### December 6, 1962

The Administrative Committee reported: "*4. Policy on Office Space for Retired Faculty.* Vice President Willey reviewed University policy on the assignment of space on campus for retired members of the faculty at the October 1962 meeting. It was unanimously agreed that the University should continue the policy of resting these decisions with the respective deans and department heads. The increasingly great demands for staff might result in the need to continue faculty in an active role beyond the present age for retirement, it was noted."

The two-thirds requirement for a constitutional amendment was not present, so a vote on the referendum was not taken, but a straw poll suggested the majority were opposed to it.

#### February 7, 1963

The Administrative Committee reported discussion on the use of recording devices in the classroom. "The importance of supporting the instructor's authority to control the classroom situation and of protecting the rights of individuals participating in classroom discussion were emphasized. Although there was some sentiment for action on a policy statement, the committee agreed that since no problems were waiting to be dealt with, the several discussions of this matter had made attitudes clear; hence, no action was called for at this time."

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reported discussions about the faculty retirement plan and a report from an ad hoc administrative committee on which the chair of the Faculty Welfare committee served. "After reviewing the detailed 35-page report of the *ad hoc* committee, the Senate committee voted to endorse the basic principles and recommendations contained in that report and to urge an early consideration of the report by the administration. In brief that report called for a gradual transition to a plan under which . . . for long-term employees this pension plan, combined with OASDI old-age benefit for a single person, would generally provide an income equal to at least 50 per cent of the employee's average salary over the last 5 years of service."

The Senate passed a motion changing the name of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts to the College of Liberal Arts. The Institute of Technology retained its name.

March 14, 1963

The chair of the Committee on Committees reported on a survey of faculty interest in service on committees. "A 31 per cent return of the questionnaire was considered by Mr. Nixon to be not discouraging. . . . Of the 535 returned questionnaires, 404 were interested in committee assignments, 118 were not interested, the remaining were too vague to classify. . . . He suggested that some of the areas needing attention might be improvements in the structure or membership of committees, the need for continuing current committees, and the need for new committees. The work of some committees may be so heavy that they should be subdivided; others overlap in such a way that they may be consolidated."

May 2, 1963

The Committee on Education recommended, and the Senate approved, creation of the Council on Liberal Education to establish "floor" requirements for all bachelor's degrees, to be chaired by the Assistant Vice President for Academic Administration and composed of 12 members from the colleges that taught undergraduates. The faculty are to be chosen by the dean or associate dean; the Senate defeated a motion to have the faculty elect their representatives.

The University's lobbyist, Vice President Wenberg, reported to the Senate, apropos of the legislative situation, that "there are 56 new members in the House, each reflecting his electorate and his campaign platform. Most are committed by these to no new taxes; hence there will be no new money."

June 6, 1963

The Committee on Committees reported that of the faculty who had expressed an interest in service on a Senate committee, the numbers broke down this way: "Education, 166; Faculty Welfare, 125; Library, 118; Institutional Research, 110; Institutional Relationships, 106; Student Scholastic Standing, 93; Audio-Visual Aids, 91; University General Extension, 90; Intercollegiate Athletics, 89; Student Affairs, 80; University Printing and Publications, 73; University Functions, 65; Reserve Officers' Training Corps, 30; Judicial, 22; and Business and Rules, 20." The report also recommended to the president that he divide the 46 non-Senate

committees into two groups, All-University committees and those that are simply advisory committees to an office or agency. (The Tenure Advisory Committee fell in the latter category.) The Committee on Committees also recommended that the Council on Liberal Education, the Board of Admissions, and the Committee on Closed-Circuit Television be standing Senate committees. The Senate approved those and other changes, including a charge to FCC to consider including a representative from the Morris campus among its members (it already had a Duluth representative). The Committee also noted that it now, because of the change in the constitution, submitted a slate of candidates for committees to the president. (There was also debate about whether liberal-education requirements fell under the aegis of the Senate; it voted on 12/5/63 for a senate constitutional amendment indicating that they did.)

"The Faculty Consultative Committee has had five meetings with President Wilson during the year. At these meetings a variety of topics have been discussed which have been reported in the Faculty News Letters which provide avenues of communication between the Faculty Consultative Committee and the faculty. In addition to its consultative activities with the President, the Faculty Consultative Committee has also been represented at the meetings of the Minnesota Coordinating Council and the Legislative Steering Committee. Members of the Faculty Consultative Committee have attended legislative hearings. The committee has visited each of the campuses of the University during the year and has discussed the issues raised at these meetings with President Wilson."

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reported that a survey of faculty indicated the top two items of concern were a tuition waiver and the retirement plan.

The Committee on Education reported for action, and the Senate approved, a proposed "Policy on Accreditation of College-Level Courses Offered by Television." The report included a quote from President Wilson's inaugural address: "We must see the increased student population as an opportunity, not as a threat. If we are forced into self-examination, what begins as a burden may prove a blessing. Why should we cling to traditional educational techniques in a world which in every other respect has changed radically? We claim credit for much of the change about us and experiment with new techniques in every department but our own. Now we must change, or reject change only after giving novel methods a fair test. I do not ask for irresponsible experiments. But not to experiment now would be irresponsible" and went to comment that "when viewed in this framework, the University should undoubtedly take the position of positive encouragement for responsible new educational techniques." The recommendations included accepting television courses from accredited institutions already approved by the University, normal review of such courses, and University courses over television are to receive the same credit as the traditional offering of the course.

The policy on off-campus speakers came up again. "The policy states that a speaker may be denied approval "only if it can be clearly judged his presentation would serve no educational purpose or if the presentation would violate the law of the state of Minnesota or of the United States." The Committee on Student Affairs, in concert with the Minnesota Student Association, recommended adding a sentence to one of the procedures: "Decisions modifying the program should not substantially affect the opportunity of the speaker to present his remarks on the requested subject." The Senate approved the change.

Under new business, the Senate adopted this statement: "We, the Faculty Senate of the University of Minnesota, desire to express to our faculty colleagues at the University of Alabama our strong support and encouragement for their continuing efforts to insure the protection of the civil rights of all citizens with respect to education and to insure the legal conduct of academic matters by the University without political interference.

We share with you the belief that academic criteria form the only just basis for admission to a public university. Appreciative of the external pressures being exerted upon the faculty and administration of the University of Alabama, we warmly commend the Board of Trustees for its announced intention to admit two qualified Negro students in compliance with a recent U. S. District Court order."

October 31, 1963

The Administrative Committee reported on deliberations about tuition rates. Increases were proposed, more for non-residents than residents. "In extensive discussion, it was emphasized that University tuitions should not become too high, especially at the graduate level. The University of Minnesota is truly a national university and should avoid becoming provincial. Even now, the nonresident tuition rate is rather unfavorable and inconsistent with the composition of the student body and the complex nature of the institution."

It also discussed the faculty retirement plan and the extent to which salary funds should be set aside to for the retirement plan. "It was finally moved, seconded, and voted as the consensus of the committee that the wisest use of faculty salary improvement money available during the next biennium would involve the allocation of about one-fifth of the funds to improvement of the retirement program."

President Wilson explained that Academic Administration Vice President Willey had resigned to spend the last 3 years of his career at the University of Calcutta. "Mr. Wilson then went on to describe the way in which Mr. Willey's successor was chosen. The President thought this choice had to be a personal one. He consulted the budgetary officers of the University, the deans, and the Faculty Consultative Committee. There were two heartening results: One was that most of those consulted thought the person should come from within the University; the other was that many of the faculty were thought well enough of by their colleagues to be suggested for the position. The final selection was made by the President and concurred in by the Faculty Consultative Committee, although the committee did not concur unanimously since the person chosen was chairman of the committee. William G. Shepherd was then introduced as the new vice president for academic administration."

(There was no further information in the minutes on this.) " The President summarized events relating to the State American Legion Resolution calling for investigation of certain University groups and explained the University's position." (See 12/5/63 minutes, next.)

December 5, 1963

The Administrative Committee reported: " 1. *The University student Body, 1963-64.* . . . The President commented on the high ability and academic competence, as well as the magnitude, of the fall 1963 student body. . . . Dean Summers was asked to discuss attendance increases and the supposed reasons for them. The dean replied that although freshman attendance was very close to the expected total, an unusually high return of former students (both those attending the University last year and those coming back after a period of nonattendance) seemed to account for the major changes. Among the reasons offered for the low student attrition were the University's increasing selectivity and the possible influence of the national effort to keep students from dropping out of high school."

The Administrative Committee report included this item: "3. *The American Legion Resolution on Investigation of Certain University Units.* At its October meeting, the President discussed with the committee, in order to develop an awareness of the matter, the resolution passed at the July State Legion Convention calling for an investigation of the World Affairs Center and the Student Peace Union at the University. The history of this action was described, as were related newspaper reactions. The President said that there had as yet been no official University response."

Reorganization of colleges and departments had left unresolved the status of the two mathematics departments, one in CLA and one in IT. After eight meetings about mathematics, the Committee on Educational Policy (recently renamed) recommended consolidating the two departments in IT. The Senate voted to recommend the change to the president by an 84-18 vote. "The Dean's Advisory Committee of the College of Liberal Arts, as the elected representative body of that faculty, feels it must speak for its colleagues on the proposed abolition of the Arts College Department of Mathematics and the absorption of its members into the Mathematics Department of the Institute of Technology. The event is a severe blow to the Arts College. . . ." (The report was lengthy and discussed the role of the CLA as well as how departments are budgeted. The Senate debate was long and contentious. After the vote, President Wilson spoke at length on the issues. "Mr. Wilson recognized the concern expressed by the College of Liberal Arts Advisory Committee; he acknowledged it as a legitimate concern which neither the faculty nor the administration should overlook. A University is an organic thing and must carry out its total mission as well as its separate or specialized obligations. If one segment of the University is starved, the health of the entire University is threatened. If any unit as central to the University mission as the College of Liberal Arts is not properly nourished, there is certain to be serious difficulty in achieving the total mission of the institution. The University administration itself must be concerned with the distribution of budget resources for, under present national patterns, money is grudgingly given to the arts and generously to the sciences.")

February 6, 1964

Reported for information:

"The Board of Regents at its meeting on November 22, 1963, took the following action: The President presented a proposed addition to section 6 of the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* under the heading, "Tenure of Instructors" which was recommended by the

Administrative Committee and the Senate Judicial Committee and adopted by the Senate at its meeting on October 31, 1963.

"Voted, on the recommendation of the President, to approve the following addition to section 6 of the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure*: Also, and under the same conditions, the Director of the University Libraries, with the consent of the President, may continue in the future to permit instructors on the staff of the University Libraries to acquire indefinite tenure."

The Administrative Committee reported: "*3. Recurring Professional Services by Faculty Members Outside the University.* A Regents policy and University regulations require University faculty members who are reimbursed for services performed outside the University to seek prior approval. Because the procedures and requirements themselves have not always been clear, there has been need to develop better understanding of them; records of important faculty service are therefore incomplete, and the purposes and intent of the Regents may not always be observed." A committee was appointed to study a draft memo.

It also reported: "*7. Student Identification System.* Vice President Wenberg and Dean Summers described the student identification system, which became effective winter quarter 1964. An advisory committee composed of staff and students had recommended its adoption after making, during the winter and spring of 1963, a thorough investigation of the needs and uses for such a system. . . . Students are issued permanent individual University service cards that have the student's name and file number embossed on them for printing purposes (similar to a credit card)."

Under new business: "*2. Academic Freedom.* Vice President Shepherd reviewed the various proposals for investigation of the University that have been made in the last few months and called attention to statements by the Board of Regents, particularly" a letter from the chair of the board, Dr. Charles W. Mayo:

"In September 1963 the Board of Regents of the University began consideration of a draft of a statement on academic freedom. In December this statement was issued. It included the following paragraph:

""We, as the Board of Regents, are responsible to the public for the health and vitality of the University. It is our responsibility to inquire continuously into the conduct of the University to make sure this health and vitality are preserved.""

"Members of the Minnesota State Senate Education Committee voted to establish a subcommittee which, according to reports, will seek 'to determine whether or not there are standards for the employment of staff and recruiting procedures, rules and regulations about how people make application for employment and how somebody makes application to terminate employment.'

"U Employment policies and procedures are a matter of public record, and such policies are not unique to Minnesota. All of the most distinguished and honored universities of our nation have them. The lives of thousands of Minnesota men and women who have studied here bear eloquent testimony to the wisdom of these policies.

"If the subcommittee of the Minnesota State Senate Education Committee has questions about these and related policies, the Regents welcome an opportunity to cooperate with the legislature to clarify any such questions and concerns. This is in keeping with a long-standing tradition of the Regents.



"A period of public controversy such as we have just been experiencing makes it difficult for our citizens to get an accurate picture of the University.

"Ours is a great University.

"Our teachers do stand for open, responsible communication with their students and fellow staff members. They affirm constantly in their classroom practices, and in their opinions, their responsibility to students and the public. Our teachers are not advocates of the distasteful notions which have been discussed so much in recent weeks.

"Our students also have our confidence, and this confidence has been sustained tens of thousands of times over as we see their contributions as citizens. We believe that the moral standards of our students are high. This is a good place for our Minnesota young people to get their higher education. Our University is one of the most productive and respected in the world-its integrity must be preserved."

Some Senate members were concerned about the last sentence of the penultimate paragraph, but their concerns were allayed, and several Senate members thanked the Board for the re-affirmation of academic freedom. Vice President Shepherd reiterated that the tenure rights of the faculty had never been questioned.

The memorials in the Senate minutes record the death of Guy Stanton Ford, University president 1938-41 (when he reached mandatory retirement age). "Guy Stanton Ford came to the Minnesota campus in 1913 as professor of history and dean of the Graduate School. Under his guidance, graduate education at Minnesota was transformed from a scattered program involving fewer than 160 students, into a major academic enterprise that enrolled 2,000 students when in 1938 he left the deanship to assume the presidency. The development of the Graduate School was his major contribution but there are few significant developments at the University during the years of his residence with which his name is not associated."

#### March 12, 1964

The Administrative Committee report recorded that it had been informed about plans for a pedestrian deck and enclosed, heated walkway on the new bridge being built over the river.

The Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics reported that the Western Collegiate Hockey playoffs were scheduled during finals week so the team would not be permitted to participate if it were eligible. A member of the Senate "took the opportunity when the Senate considered the report of its Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics to congratulate the committee for standing up against public opinion in refusing to allow the hockey team to play in a conference play-off during examination week."

The abstract reports that the Senate vice chair, "Mr. Hoebel thanked the Senate for making his task as chairman simple and short and, after the Senate by a rising vote paid homage to departed colleagues, the meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m., making this the shortest Senate meeting in the memory of many veterans of Senate battles."

#### April 30, 1964

The Committee on Educational Policy provided a report by a special committee on the biological sciences appointed at the request of the Senate and said it would be making a recommendation later. The very long report proposed the creation of a College of Biological Science.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reported that it had urged the University to negotiate for a liberalization in the travel accident insurance policy to cover faculty members traveling to professional meetings. The University did so.

#### May 14, 1964 Special meeting

The minutes are only a note the meeting was called, the number present, and the abstract of the discussion. President Wilson defended his decision to postpone a debate between a faculty member and a leader of the John Birch Society scheduled the day before the beginning of State Senate hearings on the University. He provided a formal statement to the Senate and noted that the decision was made in accord with the speaker's policy (that the Senate had discussed many times before). Senators discussed issues of academic freedom. (In its annual report, the Senate Committee on Student Affairs reported that "the committee did not concur with Dean Williamson's disapproval of a debate between Mr. Peter W. Reiss and Prof. Mulford Sibley on the day before the Minnesota Senate subcommittee's initial meeting to inquire into the University's faculty hiring and firing practices.")

#### June 4, 1964

The Administrative Committee reported recommendations from the All-University Schedule Committee that it adopted: "To provide a more even distribution of classes by hours and days, the Schedule Committee report recommended the following class scheduling policy for the Minneapolis and St. Paul Campuses, effective fall 1964: (a) one-half of the sections in a multi-sectioned course meeting on Monday-Wednesday-Friday shall be scheduled after 12:30 p.m.; (b) one-half of the sections in a multi-sectioned course meeting Tuesday-Thursday shall be scheduled after 12:30 p.m.; (c) single section courses meeting 3 days a week shall be scheduled so that not more than two-fifths of them are on Monday-Wednesday-Friday mornings; The other three-fifths shall be offered either on Monday-Wednesday-Friday afternoons or on Tuesday/Thursday; (d) single section courses meeting 4 or 5 days a week shall be scheduled so that half (in any given department or college) are in the morning and half are in the afternoon."

The Council on Liberal Education provided a report for information, to stimulate discussion. The report had four sections:

I. A statement of the general goals of a program in liberal education.

II. A set of four specific positions about undergraduate liberal education at the University of Minnesota.

III. A. A tentative categorization at the curriculum in terms at subject matter divisions. B. A tentative categorization at the curriculum in terms of three ways of knowing or examining the content of experience.

IV. A statement of six lines at action which the council proposes to follow in the further development of its work."

The Committee on Educational Policy recommended that Social Work, Journalism, and the Library School remain within the College of Liberal Arts. (Social Work was strenuously opposed. The other two were not.) It also recommended creation of a College of Biological Sciences and submitted a long report on the subject. The Senate approved the recommendation. One member of the Senate, however, "convinced that the arguments for a College of Biological Sciences are largely applicable in other areas as well, the Senate hereby instructs its Committee on Educational Policy to report, not later than the winter quarter 1965, on the method and feasibility of extending the principle elsewhere. Specifically, it directs the Committee on Educational Policy to explore the possibility of establishing a College of Historical Sciences, a College of Philosophical Sciences, a College of Linguistic, Literary, and Philological Sciences, a College of Social Sciences, a College of Library Sciences, a College of the Science of Social Work, and a College of Journalistic Sciences, each to be organized along lines of the College of Biological Sciences." The Senate defeated the motion.

FCC, in its report to the Senate, "wishes to record commendation and appreciation to the Board of Regents and the President for the forthright and constructive statement of December 14, 1963, entitled *Freedom and the University*, reaffirming the University's dedication to the principles of academic freedom. The statement, prepared and released at a very difficult time, has been of inestimable value in clarifying the University's position."

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reported for information that it had "investigated a number of avenues whereby children of members of the faculty might receive special attention in the matter of tuition waiver at the University of Minnesota or other institutions, possibly other universities in the Big Ten. In the 1963 survey conducted by the Faculty Welfare Committee, this item was listed more frequently than any other as the most important item for the committee to study. The committee is continuing its investigation but it has determined that benefits of this sort are associated for the most part with private colleges and that many private colleges have questioned the desirability of continuing their plans. Some faculty members have also questioned whether a plan which favors some faculty members more than others is the most appropriate use of the University's limited financial resources."

Faculty Welfare also recommended to the Senate a change in insurance: "Under the proposed change, the University would continue to permit a faculty member to choose and pay for basic medical expense insurance under the Blue Cross, MII, or Group Health plans. The new feature would be major medical expense insurance for faculty members paid for by the University and providing protection against most expenses up to \$20,000 or \$25,000 in excess of the basic plan benefits selected. . . ." The Senate voted in favor, recognizing that implementation awaited funding.

The report of the Committee on Institutional Research included this:

"The committee also stressed two areas of needed research generated by immediate problems but with long-term implications: the impact of enrollment increases on the quality of the University's educational effort, and the impact of fees and tuition costs on the decisions of prospective students to enter the University or of enrolled students to continue their educational efforts.

"The major expansions in total enrollment anticipated in 1964, and in subsequent years, pose serious problems in terms of the optimum use of space, time, and faculty. Committee discussion has reflected a concern that although space problems are most visible, better use of total available instructional time may make the greatest contribution to the accommodation of enrollment increases. This concern is reflected especially in an interest in the continued study of problems of faculty recruitment and retention. . . ."

The Committee on Student Affairs recommended adoption of Policy on Human Relations: "The University of Minnesota believes that an educated person recognizes the existence of and understands diversity in attitudes, beliefs, and practices with respect to racial, religious, cultural, and socio-economic groups. The goal of this policy is to overcome prejudice and discrimination. The University atmosphere should be one in which participation in extracurricular activities will lead to a commitment to values based upon knowledge, familiarity, understanding, association, and respect for individuals from divergent backgrounds.

Implicit in the framework of the University's educational goals is the development of students:

1. Who are respectful of members of other races and religions
2. Who understand the interests, needs, and desires of people from other socioeconomic groups
3. Who have worked with people from different cultural, racial, and religious backgrounds on projects and programs of common interest.

Advisers and student officers are responsible for implementing this policy in their work with student organizations.

The Senate approved the policy.

November 5, 1964

The Senate tabled a motion that "central authority for future closed-circuit television installations at the University should rest with the Department of Radio and Television, with the understanding that this policy is not to affect existing installations unless mutually agreed to by the parties concerned."

The president was asked about building plans along Washington Avenue on the Minneapolis Campus. "He briefly summarized the history of the building program along Washington Avenue. At first it looked as though the University would need to close off all of its buildings and air condition them. Not particularly liking this choice, the administration took another look, going back to the original Cass Gilbert plans for the layout of the University. To the surprise of most people, the plans provided for a tunnel under Washington Avenue which would bypass the University. It was to be six lanes wide, providing for "internal combustion engines" and other kinds of traffic. . . . President Wilson decided to re-open the question with city planners and did so, discussing the idea widely with persons who might be involved in it. He found a surprisingly positive response from these people. On the other hand, he told the Senate "if I have given the idea there would be grass growing from Northrop to Coffman next spring," that is slightly misleading.

In discussion of one docket item, the abstract reports that "Mr. Schultze questioned the term 'faculty Senate.' Mr. Emery explained this term was used to differentiate it from the student Senate."

The speakers policy came back to the Senate; an amendment was proposed "simply set down and clarified action taken by the Senate at the May 14, 1964, meeting. Specifically, it makes clear that the channel of appeal from a ruling of the Dean of Students is through the Senate. The policy further states that it might take up to 8 days to process such an appeal. . . . This is, in effect, a warning to a group which might want to bring controversial speaker to the campus, that it should ask for approval in plenty of time to get an appeal through." The Senate approved.

December 10, 1964

The Administrative Committee reported: "*2. Policy Statement on the Selection and Designation of Professors to Named Chairs or for Professorial Awards.* The committee discussed professorial awards and named special professorships." A report "offered suggestions about the name of 'Regents' Professor' as against 'Professor of the University.' 'Regents' Professor' was favored since it was noted that the designation does not necessarily involve a dutiful change." The committee recommended a proposed policy governing the appointment of Regents' Professors and other named chairs. The Senate approved it.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare recommended a tuition proposal, "which may be viewed as a reciprocal tuition reduction plan, participating institutions, all of which would be public universities, would agree that children of faculty members at those institutions would always be treated as residents for the purpose of determining tuition and fees even if they chose to attend a public institution outside their home state." The Senate voted to recommend it to the president.

Faculty Welfare also reported on the importance of faculty travel to conferences. "In view of the place of conferences in the realities of modern scholarship, [which it outlined in its report] the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare urges the Senate to express formally its opinion that support for faculty attendance at such conferences is important to the educational purposes of this University, and to suggest that the University's administration explore means by which the costs of faculty travel to professional conferences might be funded." The Senate also voted to make the recommendation to the president.

February 4, 1965

March 4, 1965

April 29, 1965

The national AAUP and the American Council on Education had issued a joint statement on conflicts of interest in government-sponsored research. The Administrative Committee considered it. "It was remarked that there is, whenever government-sponsored research is undertaken, an inherent danger of conflict of interest in distribution of time of the faculty member who does the research. . . . It was suggested that Assistant Vice President of Business Administration Clinton T. Johnson might draw on a form used in the College of Medical Sciences in drafting a proposed statement from the principal investigator and department that

would be applicable in any school or to any type of project. Procedures to be followed will go before the Faculty Consultative Committee for consideration as they are developed."

There was a lengthy report on the academic progress of student-athletes from the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. "In sum, the grading of athletes at the University seemed to pose no special question of grade distribution." The Senate deferred discussion to a later meeting.

June 3, 1965

The Administrative Committee reported on: *8. Study of Students and Grading Practices at Minnesota Colleges*. The study author, a faculty member, "reported that studies of student personality characteristics, social skills, and home backgrounds had not yielded especially meaningful predictors of college success. It was noted that ability levels of students differ considerably among Minnesota colleges, including colleges of the University, and also that the mean grade point averages assigned vary with the colleges. However, little relationship seems to exist between the mean ability level of students in a given college and the distribution of the grades they receive. Some highly selective colleges are designating approximately one-half of their freshmen for below "C" averages. . . . It was asked if studies of this kind could reveal wherein the University might do its work more effectively and which characteristics of the University may prevent a student from doing as well as he should."

The Council on Liberal Education presented a report on liberal education and policy recommendations for action. "1. All colleges should include as part of their published formulation of purposes for programs leading to the Bachelor's degree a statement concerning the purposes of liberal education and the importance of such purposes to the program of the college. . . . 2. All Bachelor's degree programs should require students to present evidence of study and/or competence in each of the four interacting divisions of knowledge represented in the curriculum." The four areas were "(1) Communication, Language, Symbolic Systems, (2) The Physical and Biological Sciences, (3) Man and Society, and (4) Artistic Expression" with subcategories of requirements and a process for identifying courses to meet the requirements. The Senate approved.

FCC reported that "the single item which appeared to concern the faculty most during the past few years was the need for establishment of a central planning office concerned with all phases of the University's development. The committee has discussed this problem with the President and is gratified to learn that a central planning office . . . has been established as part of the President's office. . . .

"The committee recognizes that improving communication in an institution as large as ours remains a serious problem and proposes in the future to have meetings with representatives of appropriate Senate and other University committees."

The Senate again deferred action on a policy on centralizing radio and TV: "In order to ensure the most effective development of closed-circuit television at the University of Minnesota and to avoid costly duplication of installation, major responsibility for the establishment, scheduling, operation, and maintenance of such installations should rest with the Department of Radio and

Television. It is understood that this policy will not pertain to those installations presently operated by departments other than the Department of Radio and Television. However, in considering future closed-circuit television installations or additions to existing installations, departments should consult with the Department of Radio and Television to explore the need for compatability [sic] of equipment and to ensure such compatability where desirable." (But the Senate finally approved the policy at its next meeting.)

November 4, 1965

The Administrative Committee noted that "Regents' regulations state that members of the University faculty who wish to engage in any recurring professional service outside of the University must seek prior approval from the Regents. To keep the records complete and current, an annual inventory of these recurring commitments-consultantships and other outside work-is requested of all faculty members, deans, directors, and department heads."

Under new business, one Senator "rose to ask whether or not checks could be handled differently at the University. He suggested that a minimum change would be to put checks into envelopes so that privacy could be maintained. President Wilson asked John Williams, chairman of the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare, to take up the matter and to make a recommendation."

December 6, 1965

The Senate debated a recommendation from the Administrative Committee to adopt a 15-minute passing time between classes on the Minneapolis Campus, to accommodate the growth of the West Bank. "Representatives of the Institute of Technology indicated opposition of their faculty to such a change, and some other units were also reported as not favoring it. On the other hand, net gains appeared to be possible, both immediately and somewhat longer range, in proceeding with the recommended hour schedule. . . . Endorsement for Senate approval carried with a substantial majority, but with less than unanimous support."

Because of events at the Big Ten and the need to schedule games more than a decade in advance, the Senate voted to approve home football games before classes started.

February 3, 1966

The Administrative Committee reported that "the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the regional accrediting association applicable to the University, has set the dates of June 27-30, 1966, for an evaluation visit. The association is said to be resuming its practice of visiting complex universities and this would be the first such visit to the University of Minnesota in many years." The committee "voted that North Central Association's proposed visitation be accepted by the University of Minnesota. There was the apparent understanding that the University is to be examined as a single institution, not with respect to its separate campuses."

The registrar reported to the Administrative Committee that "that late reporting of grades to the Recorder's Office, sometimes unavoidable for good reasons, continued to be a source of concern

and discontent to hundreds of students whose initial grade reports were consequently incomplete when classes resumed."

March 17, 1966

April 28, 1966

The Senate voted to endorse a principle that the Dean of Students should not release the names of members of student organizations, expressing disagreement with the policy announced by the Dean. There was lengthy debate.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare "reported to the Senate that it had urged the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Universities, and the American Association of University Professors to prepare statements of policy on reimbursement of faculty travel expense to professional meetings." The associations had declined to do so. "Nevertheless, this item remains one of major faculty concern. The committee believes that the best approach at the present time is for the University to increase its "supplies, expense, and equipment" request to include some allowance for faculty travel." The Senate endorsed the suggestion.

June 2, 1966

The Administrative Committee reported: " *4. Policy on Scheduled Examinations.* Questions had been asked concerning (a) violation of the final examination schedule in holding examinations at other than the scheduled time or location, and (b) the existence of any policy on the necessity for final examinations during the period of scheduled examinations." No policy was thought necessary.

The Committee on Committees reported considering the establishment of several new committees, including one on long-range planning. "The many problems associated with University long range planning were elaborated and it was the subsequent consensus that a Senate committee could well be established." A draft bylaw, for discussion, suggested this charge: "The committee shall consider circumstances and developments which relate to the future of the University, in terms of its basic purposes, educational program, geographical and social context, organizational patterns and relationships, financial resources, physical facilities, personnel policies, state-wide patterns of higher education development, and all other matters which may affect the University's long-term development and make appropriate recommendations to this end."

The FCC chair "noted that there had not been much communication from the faculty during the year and that the committee interpreted this as either a lack of interest or a general feeling that things were going well. He pointed out that an open luncheon meeting sponsored by AAUP had been poorly attended."

The Council on Liberal Education reported that it had "received in 1965 a \$3,000 grant from the Standard Oil Foundation to fund three \$1,000 awards for faculty members judged to have made



an outstanding contribution to undergraduate education. . . . The council has been granted \$6,000 by the Standard Oil Foundation to fund six awards in the 1966-67 academic year."

"Salaries are clearly an item of concern for the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare. . . . The 1965-66 AAUP Committee on Economic Status Report was released at the annual chapter meeting on May 23. The findings are much more disturbing than was expected. The University has lost ground relative to competing institutions with respect to salaries and will slip even further behind unless some substantial salary increases are obtained in the next biennium. The AAUP report summarizes the situation as follows: 'First we begin with 1965-66 average total compensation at Minnesota, and 1965-66 median average total compensation in the 11 Institutions Group (Big Ten, Northwestern, California) and in the 31 Institutions Group (high quality universities). At the present moment the salaries at these two groups of competing institutions are 8.3 and 11.2 per cent higher respectively. . . . "Minnesota salaries will need to be increased by 19 per cent between 1966-67 and 1967-68 if the average Minnesota compensation is to be brought in line with the median compensation in the 11 Institution Group and by 23 per cent with respect to the 31 Institution Group. Between 1967-68 and 1968-69, another increase of 10 per cent is required to maintain balance with the projected growth of salaries for the other institutions. . . . 'It should be noted that our calculations of salary gaps are based only on achieving a median position for Minnesota salaries, with respect to competing groups. It might well be argued that Minnesota should be above the median. In the short-run, however, the Committee believes that achieving salary levels at Minnesota equivalent to the median salaries at competing institutions is the most realistic goal.'" The Senate agreed to endorse the goal.

#### September 22, 1966 Special meeting

"The Chairman stated that the meeting had been called to act on the request of the Board of Regents that the Faculty Consultative Committee be designated by the Senate as the faculty committee to consult with the Regents' committee on the selection of a new president." "In response to an inquiry concerning the meaning of 'to consult,' Francis Boddy, professor and associate dean of the Graduate School, spoke briefly on the procedure used in the last selection of a president, when the Faculty Consultative Committee was designated for the same purpose. At that time the committee conducted widespread investigation, worked closely with the Regents' committee, meeting frequently both jointly with that committee and separately, and at length a panel of names was submitted to the Regents' committee." The Senate so voted.

#### November 3, 1966

In the report of the Administrative Committee: "7. *Other Business*. Reference was made to the problems occasioned by the increasing use of Washington Avenue by trucks. . . . The University is still hopeful that a tunnel through the campus will be provided under Washington Avenue."

The Administrative Committee also reported that "reference by the North Central Association visitation team to the small percentage of nonresidents in the student body was brought to attention. The meaning and the effect of student migration were discussed, but no practical and effective method of improving the mix of undergraduate students was proposed. Means of

interesting the ablest and most desirable nonresident applicants in coming to Minnesota seems yet to be discovered."

"The Committee on Business and Rules submits the following resolution for consideration. Be it resolved that members of the press be permitted to attend meetings of the University Senate on the condition that no member of the Senate will be quoted or identified without that member's specific permission." The Senate did not approve.

The Senate did not approve a recommendation from the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics that the University support (in the Big Ten) freshmen competition. It did approve a vote against restrictions on televising home football games if they were sold out.

The Committee on Educational Policy provided a report on continuing education and "recommends to the Senate that: 1. There be in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Administration a single administrator responsible for all the University's continuing education activities. . . . 2. The present General Extension Division and the present Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service be placed at once under the direction of this single administration," and establishment of faculty advisory committee. The Senate approved after long debate.

Under new business: "President Wilson reported on an inquiry from a member of the faculty concerning classified research at the University. The President pointed out that in a total of some \$24 million in contracts and grants we have only one classified contract, which amounts to approximately \$47,000. University policy is that the investigator is a free agent."

#### December 8, 1966

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reported that the administration "was about to enter into serious negotiations with some banks for the deposit of salary checks for those faculty members who wanted this service. These negotiations indicated that the proposal was feasible but the University administration decided to check on faculty interest in this service before investing more time and effort in the necessary changes in payroll procedures. Consequently, a questionnaire was mailed early in the spring to all full-time faculty members. Because only 14% of the faculty indicated any interest in the proposal, the University administration has decided not to implement such a procedure at this time."

#### February 2, 1967

The Administrative Committee reported: *4. Use of Human Subjects in Research.* President Wilson explained that the University was obligated by the ground rules of the U. S. Public Health Service to submit by November 21 a statement of assurance of an established policy and plan for surveillance to insure the protection of the welfare and rights of human subjects in research investigations. The statement was prepared by an ad hoc committee chaired by Dr. Ivan Frantz and was approved by the Regents November 18. . . . The committee would concern itself with all projects including those not under the National Institutes of Health"

March 9, 1967

The Senate approved a motion from the Committee on Committees: "There shall be a standing Committee on University Planning composed of at least nine members. The co-ordinator of University Planning shall be a member ex officio. The committee shall consider circumstances and developments which relate to the future of the University, in terms of its basic purposes, educational program, geographical and social context, organizational patterns and relationships, financial resources, physical facilities, personnel policies, state-wide patterns of higher educational development, and all other matters which may affect the University's long-term development and make appropriate recommendations to this end."

On recommendation of the Committee on Educational Policy, the Senate approved a policy on ownership of University-sponsored educational materials. The major ownership clauses were these (the policy was lengthy): "A. Educational materials are University sponsored:

1. If the author or producer has employed in his developmental work, and without personal charge to him, the equipment, materials, or staff services of the Radio and Television Department, Audio-Visual Education Service, Center for Programmed Learning, Bureau of Institutional Research, Center for Curriculum Studies, or any other new agency, or combinations of old agencies, established or supported by the University to assist in developing and producing educational materials; *or*
2. If the author or producer has been commissioned in writing by the University, or one of its colleges, schools, departments, or agencies to develop the materials and, in their production, has used some part of the time for which he received compensation from University support budgets, grant and contract budgets administered by the University, or budgets based on special legislative appropriations. . . ."

Ownership of University-sponsored educational materials shall be vested in the University, subject to the conditions set forth in this statement of policy. The University shall copyright all materials subject to copyright, but this shall not affect a staff member's right to make uses of the contents of the materials in forms other than the University-sponsored form, so long as the University's copyright is protected in the subsequent use."

Taking note of proposals in CLA and at Morris, "Over the last 3 years, the council [on Liberal Education] has given extensive attention to actions which might encourage students to seek greater breadth of education, and help students experience more of the pleasure of learning for its own sake. The council believes that judicious use of 'pass-no credit' grading might contribute to such purposes, and that the University should therefore encourage experimentation with such a system of grading." A lengthy commentary followed. The Council proposed amending the grading policy to permit P (pass) and N (no credit); the Senate approved.

April 27, 1967

The chair of FCC reported (with no detail) on the committee's work with the Regents on the selection of the president.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reported that "at present faculty members and members of the administration have no way in which they can give official evidence of their affiliation with

the University. Several faculty members have requested a faculty identification card. . . . The committee recommends that the Senate endorse in principle the issuance of faculty identification cards on an optional basis." The Senate did so.

#### June 1, 1967

The Committee on Student Affairs recommended a revised policy on the release of names of members of student organizations; it proposed maintaining only the names of officers of political organizations and various other requirements but not keeping lists of students in those organizations. The Senate deferred action pending Board of Regents' decision on policy.

The Student Scholastic Standing Committee reported technical details on how information would be provided to draft-eligible students on their college academic performance.

The Senate unanimously approved the following resolution: "While O. Meredith Wilson has presided over this body we have been frequently brightened by his graciousness and wit, sometimes touched by his humanity, always strengthened by his commitment to orderly democratic process and the lasting good of the University we represent. At this final session of his Presidency, to express our appreciation and the collegial sentiments we shall continue to feel for him, we hereby declare O. Meredith Wilson, *honoris causa*, a member-at-large of the Academic Senate of the University of Minnesota. We wish for him and for his family a full measure of happiness and we bid him Godspeed in his new undertaking." In the abstract: "The motion was seconded and approved amid standing applause. President Wilson said there would be no honor he would cherish as much as that just accorded him."

#### November 2, 1967

In the president's remarks at the end of the meeting, the Abstract reports the President Moos "spoke briefly, indicating that he was looking forward to working with the faculty. He mentioned, also, that a meeting had taken place earlier in the day involving faculty, administration, and students, concerning recruiting and demonstrations."

#### December 7, 1967

Under new business: "The All-College Council of the College of Liberal Arts, the policy-making and legislative body of the college, at its meeting, Tuesday, December 5, 1967, decided unanimously to ask the Senate to censure severely Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey for attempting to use the selective service system to punish draft-eligible dissenters. Professor Harold W. Chase of the Political Science Department was designated to present this request to the Senate at the meeting on December 7, 1967. The Senate heard the request and, after debate, decided to request a special meeting in order to afford Senate members more time to study a proposed resolution, General Hershey's letter, and comment of *New York Times*." A proposed resolution was provided. One member of the Senate "questioned whether this type of activity ought to be a function of the Senate, and the ensuing discussion indicated that some members agreed it was not, while others noted that much of the activity alleged to be illegal has occurred on the

campus." There was long discussion, and a request for a special Senate meeting, which required 10 members of the Senate, was circulated and signed at the meeting.

#### December 14, 1967 Special meeting

After lengthy debate and review of materials, the Senate voted: "*Resolved*, That we, the Faculty Senate of the University of Minnesota, communicate to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Minnesota Congressional delegation, and General Hershey Our strong conviction that under no circumstance should the selective service system be permitted to use reclassification of draft status as punishment for alleged violations of law."

#### February 1, 1968

As it often did, the Senate discussed various elements of the proposed academic calendar for 1968-69.

The Committee on Committees reported seeking arrangements for telephone connections for committee members on the Duluth and Morris campuses and also "3. That the President, in consultation with the Committee on Senate Committees, be asked to appoint a task force on student representation. The task force will be asked to study the question of student representation in the Senate and on Senate Committees. . . ." The chair of the committee, "reporting on the progress of the committee in its study of the structure and functions of Senate committees, cited some of the conclusions of the committee: that some committees were too large, that there were too many committees, that there was need to orient to the facts of the multiple campus situation, and that it was desirable to define the commitment a faculty member makes in becoming a member of a committee."

#### March 7, 1968

In a "JOINT REPORT-SENATE COMMITTEES ON ADMISSIONS POLICY, ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY, ON PLANNING, AND ON INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS," for information, the Introduction posed a question: "In planning staff and facilities for the University of Minnesota for the decade ahead, this significant question must be answered: *If the University must at some time limit undergraduate enrollments on the Twin Cities Campus to levels below the number of qualified applicants seeking admission, by what criteria should such limitation be made?*" The report contained several assumptions: "1. The full range of undergraduate education now provided at the Twin Cities Campus should neither be phased out nor sharply curtailed. The University should maintain on this campus a full program of undergraduate studies, both Lower and Upper Division. . . . 2. The University does not support an undergraduate admissions policy which would limit undergraduate educational opportunity at the University only to those with the highest intellectual qualifications [with qualifications]. . . ." and two others. The long report also included assumptions and comments.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare began a report this way: "A recent survey by the Committee on Economic Status of the Twin Cities Campus Chapter of the American Association of University Professors indicated that only one of four faculty members eligible for a sabbatical

has taken one or more sabbaticals and that the sabbaticals taken have only been one out of six that could have been taken. Because it has become almost impossible for faculty members to perform their regular assignments and at the same time to keep up with the rapid changes occurring in their areas of professional interest, this Senate committee has been concerned for some time about the adequacy of the University's sabbatical policy. . . . The principal reason for this unsatisfactory situation is that under present policy the faculty member on sabbatical leave receives only half-pay. In some departments staff shortages also make it difficult to release a faculty member for a sabbatical. When asked to select among several alternative sabbatical arrangements, respondents expressed a strong preference for permitting a faculty member with a 9-month appointment on sabbatical to receive either full pay for a 2-quarter sabbatical or three-fourths pay for a complete academic year." The Senate endorsed a recommendation that the administration study the entire sabbatical policy.

The Committee on Committees provided a report calling for campus assemblies to deal with matters particular to one campus, including a Twin Cities Faculty Assembly.

April 25, 1968

The Senate adopted a resolution on "Free Tuition for Poor People": " The people of Minnesota founded the University of Minnesota with the intention of providing free higher education to all qualified students in the state. Economic necessity has forced the University to charge tuition. The amount is smaller than that charged by private institutions and for the student of ordinary financial resources it does not represent a serious burden, but for economically deprived potential students it is prohibitive.

Now, in the aftermath of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, the University community and the people of Minnesota generally, like the rest of the nation, are reviewing their responsibilities in the area of Dr. King's concern. We are searching for new ways to assist our oppressed and deprived fellow citizens and to eradicate the sources of injustice in ourselves and our society. . . . The Senate of the University of Minnesota respectfully requests the Administration and the Board of Regents to adopt a policy of free tuition and financial assistance for poor people. We request the administration to appoint an ad hoc committee to explore and recommend practical procedures to implement this policy. We further petition the legislature to make it possible for the University to carry out that policy without damage to the quality of University programs generally."

May 23, 1968

The Senate Committee on Student Affairs reported it had approved a policy change: "After consultation by the Dean of Students Office, with the Board of Residence Halls and other interested organizations, the committee adopted the following policy on women's hours: 'Women who have attained sophomore standing in the college in which they are registered or who have reached the age of nineteen shall have no hours. All other women may be absent from their residence until 12 midnight Sunday through Thursday inclusive and until 2 a.m. Friday and Saturday and on nights before University holidays."

The Senate adopted a statement on student demonstrations.

The constitutions for the University Senate and the Twin Cities Campus Assembly were adopted, it was reported. The consultative committee would now serve as an executive body.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare reported that "although [it] has not studied in depth the salary levels at the University relative to those at other institutions, it is of the opinion that, despite the generous action of the 1967 state legislature, the University's competitive position will suffer drastically unless substantial salary increase money is again obtained for the next biennium. Otherwise the University's position in the Big Ten will decline." It also commented on the inadequacy of nine-month salaries and recommended the University increase summer support.

A task force on classified research, appointed by the Committee on Educational Policy at the request of President Moos, issued a progress report and said a policy recommendation would be forthcoming.

October 31, 1968

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics that the University vote against an expansion of the (men's) basketball schedule from 24 to 26 games.

Under new business: "Leonid Hurwicz, professor of economics, inquired whether there had been any action on the proposal to expand the Senate to include students. David Berninghausen, professor and director of the Library School, and chairman of the task force to study student representation, replied that the subject had first come under review in 1914 and that in recent years students had been named to an increasing number of committees so that at present they are represented on almost all committees. He said it seemed probable that the task force would recommend a change which would have a great deal of impact and that it would recommend that the Senate be enlarged to include students, and in some cases, an increase in the number of students on committees."

December 5, 1968

The Administrative Committee reported on "the work of the subcommittee chaired by Mr. Kellogg in developing a new course numbering system to meet a variety of needs associated with planned University information systems. . . . Mr. Summers stressed the importance of planning ahead in so far as possible to provide for the most orderly and useful number structure and an exact indication of the "level of learning" (teaching level) of every course. He noted that care should be taken in naming courses to minimize confusion in their identification."

The Senate approved new bylaws for the University Senate and the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. One Senator opposed a "provision that the Consultative Committee initiate and further communications between the faculty and the Board of Regents (Section 4f). Mr. Gerald said there were dangers inherent in a policy which permits a faculty to go directly to its governing board. . . ." The Senate agreed and removed the provision, after debate.

### January 15, 1969 Special meetings (2 in the same day)

11:00 a.m. "The President explained that the meeting had been called as a result of the occupation of the first floor of Morrill Hall by 60 to 80 Black students when the University was unable to meet to their satisfaction the demands presented to the Administration on Wednesday, January 15, 1969. There was no formal agenda for the meeting and roll was not taken." The Senate deliberated about, and agreed to permit representatives of the press to attend, with the understanding that the meeting was off the record. Students were also permitted to attend. The president reported on events and negotiations that were taking place.

3:00 p.m. The president reported on the agreement that had been reached with the students, including establishment of a program leading to a B.A. in Afro-American Studies. There was considerable discussion.

### February 6, 1969

The first item on the docket was labeled "Special Business": "The following motion was made at the beginning of the meeting. I move that the University Senate henceforth permit the attendance at its general meetings of authorized representatives of Minnesota news media, on an off-the-record basis, unless they are in specific instances excluded by majority vote. After debate, a motion was made to commit the motion to the Committee on Business and Rules for recommendation. The motion was amended to permit the press to attend this particular meeting on an off-the-record basis and to refer the original motion, without prejudice, to the Committee on Business and Rules for study and recommendation."

The report of a task force on student representation laid out membership number for students in the Senate and Assembly and on the various Senate and Assembly committees and the recommendations were referred to the Committee on Business and Rules for preparation as bylaw amendments. There was lengthy debate.

### March 6, 1969

The Senate amended its agenda to adopt a statement concerning the leaders of the occupation of Morrill Hall and action by the Hennepin County grand jury; part of the language read as follows: "*Resolved*, That the Senate of the University of Minnesota expresses its continued confidence in the University's orderly procedures, functioning under authority granted by the Board of Regents, to deal justly and effectively with its problems and so deplors the Grand Jury's use of its acknowledged powers in such a way as to interfere with the University's procedures, and supports uninterrupted progress toward implementation of the Memorandum of Agreement of January 15."

FCC offered this report of the topics it had been dealing with: "the University's 1969-71 legislative request; the role of the committee under the new Senate Constitution, effective for the year 1969-70; the problem of student representation in general and specifically on the Consultative Committee; plans for implementation of the report of the Committee on Campus Demonstrations . . . ; the planned review of the University's student personnel program under the



new vice presidency for student affairs; possible review of the University's business administration and plant services operations; the issues faced by the University in carrying forward long range planning activities; desirable centralization and extension of the University's educational technology and support facilities.

"As appropriate, members of the University's central administration, faculty members of other Senate committees, and other staff have participated in the meetings of the Consultative Committee concerned with the topics listed above. Each of the topics is complex and intricate; none can result in rapid or final solutions; all represent continuing issues for wide consideration by all segments of the University, before a resolution can emerge."

The Committee on Faculty Welfare endorsed, with minor additions, recommendations from an ad hoc committee on sabbaticals : " (1) a faculty member on sabbatical leave receive 75 percent of his base pay instead of 50 percent, and (2) the rules on outside income be liberalized." The lengthy report discussed at length the source of the additional funds that would be required; the docket also included the report of the ad hoc committee, which included considerable data and cost estimates. The Senate approved the recommendations.

The Senate took up proposed (lengthy) constitutional and bylaw amendments adding students to the body and to committees. After considerable debate, they were laid over to the next meeting. One objection was that there was no faculty senate separate from the University Senate. One provision allowed the faculty members, and student members, of the Consultative Committee to meet separately with the president or others.

The Board in Control of Student Publications urged the Senate to abandon the restriction on reporters attending Senate meetings.

#### April 10, 1969 Special meeting

The Senate considered and approved amendments to the proposed constitution and bylaws establishing the Faculty, Student, and University Senates, including establishment of the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Student Consultative Committee and granting ex officio Senate voting membership to those committee members. In this and previous meetings, the Senate voted to admit members of the press on an off-the-record basis only.

#### April 24, 1969

Again, the Senate voted to admit the press on an off-the-record basis.

The Administrative Committee reported: "*3. Equal Employment Opportunity Task Force*" The equal employment opportunity officer for the University "distributed a memorandum which would be sent to deans, directors, and department heads the next week. . . . Its aims, he said, were twofold: (1) to pull into one set of papers the relevant equal employment opportunity policy statements, and (2) to call attention to those aspects of the policy that rely upon the climate of the departments' response to the University commitment. He stated that special attention was being given to recruitment, employment, training, and maintaining a supportive environment, and he

indicated that starting spring quarter reports would be filed by each department on minority group staffing in academic and civil service positions."

The Administrative Committee also reported: "*4. Task Force on Special Programs and the Disadvantaged* - Mr. Smith recalled that last week the President had appointed a new administrative task force which paralleled the EEO task force - a task force to coordinate special programs for academically and economically disadvantaged students."

The events surrounding the occupation of Morrill Hall and indictment of three students were taken up by the Administrative Committee. A "Liberation Coalition and a program of activity for 'Liberation Week'" included a request to faculty to dismiss classes to permit students to participate. "[Academic Administration Vice President] Shepherd called attention to the troublesome nature of unilateral decisions by faculty members to dismiss classes in support of events unrelated to classroom objectives. He observed that the issue rose during the Viet Nam rally last spring when some faculty members urged dismissal of classes through an advertisement in the *Daily*. He indicated that dismissals undertaken by the individual faculty member appeared to violate the basis on which the faculty as a whole determines the calendar and class schedule, and could impinge on an obligation to students who wish the class to be held. There was general agreement that students at the University were free to miss classes if they assumed the responsibility for making up the work, but that dismissal or diversion of the announced purposes of a class should ordinarily involve judgment by the faculty of a department as a whole."

May 22, 1969

The Senate Committee on Student Affairs brought a motion that the "SDS should be permitted to hold its convention on the University of Minnesota campus with the understanding that SDS is committed to the same responsibilities for payment of costs and protection of property to which all other student organizations are held." Following long debate about freedom of expression, which included admitting a student member of SDS to make the case for its constitutional right to hold the convention at the University, the Senate approved this motion: "The University Senate supports the decision of President Moos rejecting the request of the SDS to convene its national convention at the University of Minnesota."

It was reported to the Administrative Committee that "experience this year in developing data for the legislative session showed that other additional types of information would be needed in 1971. He indicated that these data would include development of differential costs of instruction for lower and upper divisions, graduate and professional, as well as data on faculty effort and output, and teaching loads (with an indication of the relationship of research and graduate instruction)."

The Senate approved, after being provided a long report by the Committee on Educational Policy, allowing University College to grant up to 15 credits for work outside the University.

The Senate also approved a recommendation to create a School of Statistics, recommended by the Committee on Educational Policy.

The Committee on Educational Policy recommended the Senate adopt and forward to the president and Board of Regents a policy on classified research, with providing that the University "shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or a grant which would restrain the University from disclosing (1) the existence of the contract or grant; (2) the identity of the sponsor or the grantor and, if a subcontract is involved, the identity of the prime contractor if the results of the research must be reported to the sponsor, grantor, or prime contractor; and (3) the purpose and the scope of the proposed research in sufficient detail . . ." and "shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or a grant, even though it meets the requirements of Article 1, if the contract or grant limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results or specifically permits retroactive classification, except for reasons found compelling by the University community through the review process outlined in Article 4. . . ." Exceptions were to be permitted on recommendation of the Senate Research Committee to the University Senate, and to the president. The Senate approved the policy. (A minority report was not approved at the May 22 meeting.)

The classified research policy was actually not approved until May 29 because a quorum call on May 22 led to adjournment prior to completion of the business of the meeting.

May 29, 1969

The Senate reconvened and approved the constitution and bylaws of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

The Senate received for information the lengthy "PROPOSAL FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON CAMPUS DEMONSTRATIONS" that included sections on "Standards for demonstration – disruption," "Proceedings to assess a violation of the standard and fix individual or group responsibility," and "Sanctions."

October 13, 1969 Twin Cities Campus Assembly

December 4, 1969 University Senate

The U Senate voted, with some debate, that meetings would be open to news media representatives accredited by the chair of the Senate (the president). The Senate could vote at any time to go into executive session. Barring executive session, speakers could be identified in news reports.

The Senate received a report (which may be the longest in Senate minutes) on accreditation of private high schools. "Since 1912, the University Senate has assumed responsibility for the accreditation of private secondary schools in Minnesota. From 1952 until 1969 the accreditation function was delegated to the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships." Now it would be assigned another Senate committee; the report outlined the criteria used in deciding on accreditation.

March 12, 1970

The Senate received a report prepared by a joint subcommittee of the Committees on Educational Policy and on Planning and Resources that had been charged to respond to two questions: "For the University as a whole, is the movement from a predominance of 3 credit courses to 4 and 5 credit courses a desirable goal? 2. If so, how should colleges proceed to accomplish the change and retain the compatibility of current programs and the planning process?" The report recommended reaffirming the 1922 standard of academic work (three hours of work per week per credit) and adopting as policy that 4- and 5-credit courses will be the norm and courses with a different number of credits would be exceptions. The Senate approved.

The Committee on Business and Rules: "The report of this committee on press coverage of Senate meetings approved by the Senate on December 4, 1969, included the following sentence 'Accreditation may be revoked for cause by the Senate upon recommendation of the Committee on Business and Rules.' Upon reconsideration, the Committee believes the sentence to be unduly provocative. The Committee has had difficulty, moreover, determining on what grounds revocation might be considered." The Senate agreed to delete it.

May 28, 1970 (recessed to June 4 and June 5) [This meeting had by far the longest list of major reports and policy matters on any docket up to this time. It is clear why the meeting took two days.] From the abstract of the discussion: "Carl Auerbach, professor of law, noted that a number of faculty Senators had not been able to find seats, and he proposed to delay discussion of the report until they could be present. (At this point the meeting was moved from Murphy Hall auditorium to the Museum of Natural History auditorium. Shortly after assembling in the Museum auditorium the meeting was recessed until June 4 as a result of a disturbance by students protesting the presence of the University police.)]

At the June 4 meeting, the chair of the Consultative Committee "reported that the committee recommended that flags be furled at the meeting and that it intended to work out rules governing such displays at Senate meetings in the near future. It was moved that it be the sense of the Senate that the request of the Consultative Committee be acceded to. . . ." Two senators "supported the motion, asserting that the Senate had the right to control the conditions under which it met and could exercise discretion in maintaining an atmosphere of debate and in which actions by non-members present could reasonably be regulated." Three senators opposed the motions. "The motion was then approved. Several flags continued to be held, unfurled, by non-members."

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Administrative Committee to make attendance at commencement optional (it had been mandatory since 1916).

From the University Committee on the use of Human Subjects in Investigation, through the Research Committee: The Surgeon General had in 1966 "promulgated a Public Health Service grant policy that no research or research training or demonstration grants in support of clinical research and investigation involving human beings would be awarded unless the grantee institution (to which the grants were made) gave assurances that it would provide . . . 'prior review of the judgment of the principal investigator or program director by a committee of his

institutional associates." The Senate was presented a very long report, including definitions, review committees, and procedures, and laid the matter over to the fall.

The Senate approved lengthy changes to the tenure regulations, including lengthening the probationary period and new language on removal for cause, among other things.

The Committee on Academic Standing and Relations recommended allowing an I (incomplete) to remain permanently on a student's transcript and allowing an I for a student who cancels after the sixth week of class (rather than have it convert to an "administrative F." The Senate [Twin Cities Campus Assembly] approved.

The Senate approved a recommendation to take the University out of the accreditation business for other Minnesota colleges and universities for purposes of recognizing transfer credit (because accrediting agencies had taken on that responsibility).

In a long report with rationale and principles, the Council on Liberal Education proposed "an ongoing All-University Educational Development Program in support of faculty and faculty-student efforts to improve undergraduate and graduate education. The Educational Development Program would provide flexible support for the systematic renewal of existing programs and for development of new programs. . . . It is proposed that the Program be financed with a specific and regularly budgeted fraction of the total costs for instruction of the University. By the end of a five-year period, scheduled to insure harmony with present budgeting procedures and existing resource requirements, this proposal provides that 3% of University instructional resources be allocated to the Educational Development Program." The Senate approved, and also established a University Committee on Educational Development, to report through the Committee on Educational Policy.

The Senate also approved a second long report from the Council on Liberal Education dealing with experimental education through University College. It also approved creation of a University College Governing Council, reporting through the Committee on Educational Policy.

The Senate accepted a long report from the Committee on Educational Policy on reorganization of responsibilities in graduate education, including degree requirements and other things; "the most important aspect of these recommendations is that the Group Committees become involved in periodic intensive reviews of all graduate degree programs, covering all aspects of their operation. The Group Committee of which the field is a part will be expected to review the curriculum, to assess the faculty and students and the facilities available. It will also be expected to look at among other things the relationship between the resources of the field and the size of its graduate program."

The Senate approved a lengthy report and recommendations from an "All-University Special Committee on University-ROTC Relationships." The Committee on Educational Policy recommended establishment of a University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships," which the Senate approved. During debate, one student member "moved to amend by substitution, introducing a set of alternate proposals calling for removal of all military training

programs from the campus, for funds for support of all such programs to be turned over to the development of the Afro-American Studies Department. . . ." The motion was defeated.

The Senate approved a lengthy report proposing changes in General College, endorsed by the Committee on Educational Policy, including "that the Regents of the University authorize the Faculty of the General College to develop experimental programs leading to appropriate bachelor's degrees or certificates. . . ."

"The Senate Committee on Educational Policy joins with the All-University Council on Liberal Education in endorsing 'The All-University Policy on Liberal Education' and in recommending that the Senate approve this statement of policy." The abstract noted that "the policy would require colleges to provide a statement concerning the objectives of liberal education and its importance in the program of that college, and students in bachelor degree programs would present evidence of study leading to those objectives. Colleges would be asked to furnish the Council with their own ways of fulfilling the objectives, and proposals would be drawn up in such a way as to demonstrate clearly the procedures by which candidates for bachelor's degrees would satisfy the requirements for a liberal education." The Senate approved.

"The Regents of the University of Minnesota are persuaded that the present trend to a multi-professional or health team approach to the delivery of health care will be extended. . . . For some time informal coordination of these efforts particularly in the planning for the expansion of the Health Sciences Center has been facilitated by the Council of Health Science Deans and Directors. It appears desirable and necessary to formalize this arrangement and accordingly it is now proposed that a Health Sciences Center be established which will serve as an over-arching organizational unit for the several health sciences." The Regents proposed the unit be headed by a vice president. Provided with a long report, the Senate approved the recommendation.

The Senate declined to approve a motion from the University Schedule Committee that noted an increased awareness of students in the political process and the fact of congressional elections in November, so "the University Senate instructs the Administrative Committee to amend the University Calendar for the Academic Year 1970-71 to advance the first day of Fall Quarter classes to September 21 and to designate the week October 26 through October 30 as Action Week. During this week there would be no regularly scheduled classes and students would be encouraged to spend their time engaging in off-campus political and social action in connection with the 1970 election campaigns." The chair of the Schedule Committee reported it took no position on the motion and instead endorsed a recommendation from the Committee on Educational Policy, which began by noting that "the United States is in the midst of a crisis of major proportions. This crisis is not exclusively a foreign policy one, but is exacerbated by the continuing and expanding war in Southeast Asia" and that recommended several activities to colleges and departments related to the political situation. The Senate approved the latter motion.

The Senate Consultative Committee report indicated it had met 12 times and the faculty and student committees had not met separately.

The Committee on Business and Rules proposed and the Senate approved a number of changes to procedures governing the conduct of committee and Senate business, including a clarification that "each Senate committee, standing or special may determine for itself who may be present at its meetings other than duly appointed or elected members of the committee and may make its own rules of procedure." This included authority to close meetings.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported recommendations it had made to change the single-quarter leave system, including extending eligibility to assistant professors, and they will continue to be awarded on merit. In its long annual report, it also noted many other recommendations it had made, including: "Committee consensus is that neither formal reports to the University Senate nor news or other reports in the Minnesota Daily are sufficient to inform the faculty of SCF A deliberations and actions. Hence, it was decided to issue a periodic newsletter to the faculty. Vice President Smith's office agreed to provide the funds."

The Committee on Educational Policy noted its work and reported it had held 34 meetings during the 1969-70 academic year. Much of its work had resulted in recommendations to the Senate.

#### December 3, 1970

The Senate Consultative Committee submitted a report (for action at a special meeting a week later) on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The chair of the Consultative Committee dissented from presenting it to the University Senate rather than the Faculty Senate. The genesis of the report: "At a meeting on June 2, 1970, the Consultative Committee approved a resolution proposing 'the appointment, in cooperation with the Office of the President of the University, of a special committee on the University in Crisis.' The sponsor of the resolution explained that he hoped the special committee would: study the events of the past year and of continuing trends and issues associated with the corporate politicalization of the University, the student-faculty strike, the contractual responsibilities of faculty members to meet classes. . . . Soon after it began its work, the special committee saw as its first objective the formulation of a statement which would deal with the question of academic responsibility. To highlight this objective, it changed its name to the University Committee on Academic Responsibility." The Consultative Committee chair maintained that violation of the recommendations could lead to termination of a faculty member, so belonged to the Faculty Senate. The statement defined academic responsibility and recommended grievance procedures.

The Committee on Educational Policy recommended establishment of the Institute of Agriculture, composed of a College of Agriculture, a College of Forestry, and a College of Home Economics. The Senate approved.

Under new business, one Senator "introduced a proposal to establish a joint Senate-administration-Regents task force committee to investigate reports in a recent NBC program of military surveillance of students and faculty. He said that if the activities occurred and if the information remained available to military and police agencies, academic freedom was threatened." The Senate held over a vote until the following special meeting.

### December 10 and 17, 1970 Special meeting

On December 10 the Senate began debating a statement on academic freedom and responsibility. It recessed until December 17 and then approved the statement. The debate at both meetings was lengthy. (The Regents approved the statement in January, 1971.)

The Senate also approved a recommendation to the Board of Regents to establish a joint Senate-Administration task force to "examine the nature of the activities reported and the extent of surveillance of all kinds on the campuses of the University of Minnesota in the recent past. . . ." The two Senators sponsoring the recommendation note that "recent reports of surveillance by U.S. military intelligence personnel of student and faculty members of the University of Minnesota seriously concern the University Senate."

### March 11, 1971

Pursuant to adoption of the statement on academic freedom and responsibility, the Committee on Committees recommended creation of the University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The Senate approved.

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly also approved establishment of a University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships.

The Senate Library Committee recommended "adoption of the following resolution:

The University Senate, University of Minnesota, regrets the action of the Board of Regents in refusing to appoint James Michael McConnell as an instructor in the University Library. This action, contrary to the expressed policy of the University of Minnesota in the past, violates the principle that academic staff should be hired, retained, and promoted on the strength of academic and professional criteria and not on the basis of personal characteristics irrelevant to the fundamental mission of the University. As elected representatives of the faculty and student body, we ask assurance from the Regents that this principle will be honored in the future.

In light of the Regents' violation of the principle stated above, we urge that the Regents withdraw their appeal and employ Mr. McConnell as ordered by the court."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Wikipedia: "Early in 1970, the University of Minnesota Librarian offered McConnell the position of Head of the Cataloging Division at the library on the St. Paul campus. On May 18, 1970 – while the offer awaited final action by the Board of Regents – [Jack] Baker and McConnell applied for a marriage license<sup>[9]</sup> in [Hennepin County, Minnesota](#). This is apparently the first attempted same-sex marriage in the United States. Hundreds of letters arrived after news reports circulated around the globe. . . . Just two weeks prior, four students were shot and killed by National Guardsmen on the campus of [Kent State University](#). Perhaps widespread panic explains why the Board of Regents voted to withdraw the offer. 'His personal conduct, as represented in the public and university news media,' they said, 'is not consistent with the best interests of the university.' Meanwhile, the Clerk of Court denied them a license. They sued and lost in District Court, appealed and lost in the Minnesota Supreme Court. An appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court was dismissed for 'want of a substantial federal question.' The case opinion, [Baker v. Nelson](#), has been frequently cited as precedent in various same-sex marriage cases since then. Concurrently, McConnell sued to gain the job that was offered. He prevailed in federal District Court. The University appealed to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals,<sup>[13]</sup> which concluded that the University



The Senate approved.

"The Senate Committee on Educational Policy supports the resolution of the All-University Committee on Extension and Community Programs requesting that the President appoint an Administrative Coordinating Council for Continuing Education and Community Programs." A long report identified the problems and reason for much greater activity in continuing education.

The Committee on Educational Policy forwarded for information "procedural recommendations . . . to the Senate Consultative Committee for their opinion as to whether action by the Senate is required." They reviewed the language of the Senate constitution for its legislative authority and noted three areas: procedures regarding collegiate reorganization and program change (to be reported to the Committee on Educational Policy and then to the Senate); procedures regarding major organizational changes of the University (creation of new colleges or addition of a major new mission to existing campuses, to be reported to the University Senate through the Committee on Educational Policy); and procedures regarding addition of a new campus to the University system (to be handled by the Senate Consultative Committee).

Under new business, several motions were referred to the Committee on Business and Rules: establishing a Senate Grievance Committee, abolition of the Minnesota Student Association, a request that the Regents delegate to the Senate authority to select delegates to corporate shareholders' meetings and direct the University's vote, and a resolution expressing Senate support for students serving on the Board of Regents.

May 27, 1971

President Moos made a statement to the Senate. "On the Governor's desk awaiting signature is a legislative appropriation bill of approximately \$162 million for maintenance and operations expenses of the University for the coming biennium.

"This bill requires that we cut our academic staff by 75 full-time equivalent faculty positions in the first year and by 25 positions in the second. The bill also cuts 85 Civil Service positions from our staff over the two years, but does grant additional positions for new buildings. . . . The final bill will not require the immediate release of any tenured faculty from the staff of the University. . . .

"Nonetheless, the cut of 100 faculty positions is a substantial one and will require that the University prepare itself for a biennium of austerity. Necessary decisions will be made with the fullest consultation with the goal of protecting the heart of the University's instructional, research and service missions. . . .

"I have requested that budgets be prepared by all instructional units with a 5% reduction from current levels. My office and the Vice Presidents' offices will budget for this next year at 10% below current operating levels. All other administrative offices will prepare budgets with a 6% reduction. . . .

---

did not restrict free speech. Instead, the court ruled, it was McConnell who wanted 'to pursue an activist role in implementing his controversial ideas concerning the social status to be accorded homosexuals and thereby to foist tacit approval of the socially repugnant concept upon his employer.'"<sup>[14]</sup>

"It is clear that we have faced a very severe test during recent months--a test not unlike that faced by many of our sister institutions across the nation. . . .

"In my judgment there is nothing in the Legislature's action that consciously intends to see the quality of the University diminished. . . .

"It is also my impression that with open communications between sessions, we can go into the 1973 session with a much higher level of understanding by the Legislature and its staff on the way we arrive at our requests and the justification for them.

"In the riptide of the intensive debate over higher learning, I want to take this opportunity to offer a challenge for all of us in the University. The fiscal crisis that we must cope with for this biennium is more than a transient phenomenon associated with national trends. Even if the money crunch eases, we must assume the burden for putting our own house in order. . . . The Legislature was, I am sure, expressing in its actions, uncertainties and questions about the role of the University in the State. It is becoming increasingly clear that this University, in fact no university, can maintain first rank programs in every area. We have to build more selectively in deciding where we are going to place our resources."

The finance vice president provided an overview of the budget and state appropriation. The Senate responded: "It is the sense of the University Senate that the Academic Community of the University must participate in a significant and meaningful way in the retrenchment of the University. This participation must extend to consideration of the budgets of all parts of the University, including not only academic units but administrative and supporting units as well.

"The University Senate charges the Consultative Committee to implement this resolution."

The Senate approved continuation of the P-N grading system.

"The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has carefully considered and adopted as its own the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities for Faculty and Student Women." The recommendations covered hiring, promotion and tenure, grievance procedures, women in administrative positions, salaries, nepotism, and sanctions.

The Senate Committee on Research recommended language governing secrecy in research and restrictions on publication of research results. The language included a proviso that "the Senate Research Committee shall recommend to the Senate acceptance or rejection of every proposed contract or grant which limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results. . . ."

The Consultative Committee reported that it had written to President Moos apropos of the motion that the Senate support appointment of a student to the Board of Regents. "Because the functions and composition of the Board of Regents are In question and the issues can be resolved only by the State Legislature and, in view of certain proposals that have been made, possibly only by amendment of the Minnesota Constitution, the Consultative Committee thinks that the Board of Regents itself is the best body to undertake the inquiry and recommends that it do so."

Apropos of the resolution calling for the Regents to delegate to the Senate the selection of University representatives to shareholders' meetings and the direction of the University's vote, the Business and Rules Committee referred it to the Consultative Committee for determination

whether it was germane to the business of the Senate. The Consultative Committee reported that it had concluded the resolution was not.

A report from an ad hoc COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED INTERFERENCE WITH THE ORDERLY PROCEDURES OF THE SENATE, which investigated concern that an Air Force ROTC faculty member intimidated a graduate student (and officer in the Air Force Reserves) because of statements the student had made to the Committee on Educational Policy critical of the Air Force ROTC program. The report concluded the comments may have been appropriate within a military context but not for someone with a professorial appointment. And more. But the events did not interfere with the processes of the Senate. The Senate agreed with the recommendation to refer to the ROTC committee "the problem of determining the relationship to the University and to the Senate of military officers who are assigned as the ROTC instructors."

Reported in the minutes was a response from the Board of Regents concerning Mr. McConnell. "The Regents acted in the McConnell case in the light of their best judgment concerning their responsibilities. The Regents are confident they were acting fully within established principles and rules of the University and will continue to do so. They recognized that their action might be challenged in court, as it was, and that court action would clarify at least some of the issues they faced. They do not believe that the appeal was unwarranted, and indeed believe that using the appeal process will strengthen and clarify understanding of the relationship to law of their decision in the McConnell case. Further comment during the pendency of the appeal does not appear appropriate."

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy reported: "Excellence in teaching at the University of Minnesota has long been encouraged and rewarded. In an attempt to continue and advance that tradition, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy placed on its agenda the question of the use of various evaluative techniques. . . . Because SCEP believes that regular evaluation of teaching can contribute to the improvement of instruction at the University of Minnesota, we took up this question, make the above report to the Senate, and have initiated procedures with the deans, directors, and division heads for conducting a year's study of the question of teaching evaluation."

The Senate Consultative Committee reported, inter alia:

"3. The Consultative Committee met with the President and Vice Presidents early in the year to discuss the principles that should guide the University's request for legislative appropriations and the problems of tuition increases associated therewith.

4. The Consultative Committee directed its Chairman and Professor Reynolds to discuss with Central Administration the possibility of using funds from the Educational Development Fund to institute periodic qualitative reviews of all major educational and research programs of the University. . . .

6. A resolution introduced at the Senate meeting on March 11, 1971, called for Senate support of the principle that students should serve as members of the Board of Regents. . . . The Consultative Committee has written to President Moos recommending that the Board of Regents undertake to study anew (1) what should be the duties of the Board of Regents; (2) what should be the appropriate relations between the Board of Regents and other sectors of the University

community; (3) whether it is necessary, in order to bring about these relations, that the Board membership include representatives of these various sectors - students, faculty, civil service personnel and administrative personnel; and (4) how the members of the Board of Regents should be chosen.

9. The Consultative Committee has been constantly concerned with the problem of communication within the University and between the University and the state as a whole. It welcomed the institution of BRIEF as an improvement in communication within the University. It remains concerned about the inadequacy of communication between the Senate and the Regents and between the University as a whole and the state at large. It is alarmed by the erosion of popular support for the University and will give this matter close attention during the coming academic year."

The Senate Judicial Committee reported on several cases in progress. "The members of the Judicial Committee feel some concern that the substantial increase in requests for hearings, which contrasts sharply with an absence of any hearings during the preceding decade or more, may create a situation in which the painstaking and time-consuming procedures followed by the Committee cannot be continued. In cases in which one or both parties are usually represented by attorneys, a circumspect and carefully documented procedure is a price which must be paid to avoid lawsuits, but it will be difficult for the Committee as presently constituted to maintain such standards if its business increases sharply. . . . The Judicial Committee has submitted to the Tenure Committee a detailed statement of its views on the reorganization of reviewing procedures in general and those of the Judicial Committee in particular.

"Finally, attention is invited to the requirement in Section 9 (revised numbering) of the Regulations concerning Faculty Tenure that the department chairman or other appropriate administrative officer 'discuss from time to time with each probationary faculty member in his department the progress and growth the faculty member is making.' In several cases probationary members of the faculty have presented considerable evidence that this requirement has not been fully met."

The Committee on Printing and Publications reported that it had, among other things, "developed a plan for a comprehensive study of present University publications which, it is hoped, can lead to the development of guidelines which, in turn, can lead to economies and greater effectiveness in the broad variety of publications now being produced at the University."

The Senate Committee on Resource and Planning reported that a task force it appointed prepared a report, "Toward 1985 and Beyond," "a first effort in the development of a comprehensive long-range plan for the University. . . . The report falls into two major parts; Part One (Chapters I, II, and III) presents background materials, while Part Two (Chapters IV and V) contains the main discussion of the University, its mission, and the planning principles developed."

The same committee also reported on parking, and "the committee applied three planning principles which resulted from earlier deliberations: 1) the support of policies to reduce vehicular traffic within the campus and to separate, insofar as possible, vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, 2) the present Minneapolis Campus boundaries should remain fixed (with two possible exceptions), 3) the University should actively encourage and support the development of an effective metropolitan public transportation system." It also called for establishment of an

advisory committee parking, which was created. (It also commented that "a substantial increase in the revenues generated by parking is required, both to sustain present operations, and to provide resources for the required construction and maintenance of new facilities.")

The annual report of the Committee on Educational Policy, which met 31 times during the academic year, concluded in this fashion: "Professor R. Stuart Hoyt began his third year as chairman of the SCEP in the Fall of 1970. He actively guided the work of the Committee until the day before he died of a lingering painful illness on February 24, 1971. His physical presence gave the year's work its initial momentum and the memory of his courage, dignity, and dedication was a continuing vital force throughout the year. The present chairman, stumbling into the breach, is deeply grateful to the faculty and student members of the Committee for their support and encouragement. Their persistent, imaginative, and vigorous application to the Committee's tasks deserves greater recognition than the decent obscurity of the Minutes of the Senate."

#### December 2, 1971

The Senate Committee on Resources and Planning presented a long report and a recommended mission statement for Senate action: "The University of Minnesota, a public land-grant institution, is dedicated to the survival of present and future generations with an improvement in the quality of life. To this end the University will conduct programs of disciplined inquiry to discover, test, disseminate, and preserve knowledge and values, and will conduct programs of teaching which are indigenous to and nurtured by programs of inquiry in order to develop the competence, with commitment, of individuals and groups. To achieve its program objectives, the University will organize a community of learning (faculty, students, and staff) in an environment that will provide the academic freedom essential for the exercise of its responsibility to society." The committee also recommended 17 planning principles for Senate endorsement. A student Senator "introduced a substitute motion calling for defeat of the . . . motion and for a reconstituted SCRAP task force to include representatives from civil service, teaching assistants, untenured and tenured faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, coordinate campuses, and the community at large." After prolonged debate, the Senate deferred action to its next meeting.

The Senate Library Committee presented a motion: "Despite the action of the Court of Appeals, the Senate reconfirms the principle of its resolution of March 11, 1971, namely that it regrets the action of the Board of Regents in refusing to appoint James Michael McConnell as an Instructor in the University Library. This action, contrary to the expressed policy of the University of Minnesota in the past, violates the principle that academic staff should be hired, retained, and promoted on the strength of academic and professional criteria and not on the basis on personal characteristics irrelevant to the fundamental mission of the University. As elected representatives of the faculty and student body, we ask assurance from the Regents that this principle will be honored in the future. In the light of the Regents' violation of the principle stated above, we urge that the Regents employ Mr. McConnell." The Senate approved the motion.

The Senate adjourned without taking up a number of additional items on its docket.

#### January 12, 1972 Special meeting

The December 2, 1971 docket included numerous items related to the budget planning process and the involvement of various Senate committees, for information. President Moos wrote to several people to ask them "to join the Consultative Committee . . . to serve as the all-University committee with which I will consult in the preparation of the 1972-73 program budget. My central offices and I worked with an augmented Consultative Committee in the development of the 1971-72 budget, and felt it was a most useful instrument for this important work. In addition to the Expanded Consultative Committee we will be sharing budget documents and planning alternatives with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning. Their input will be most useful as we work to prepare the new budget."

A long joint report from Educational Policy and Resources and Planning, "Accountability and Educational Criteria: University Planning for Selective Growth," had been presented to the president the preceding summer. It was endorsed by the expanded Consultative Committee and used in budget planning. The report suggests "criteria which the colleges should find useful in evaluating the contributions of their programs to the University's mission. . . . The continuing exercise of this capacity should generate criteria for ordering programs which reflect long-range goals rather than the present desperation. Funds generated by a reallocation scheme, explained in the document, will be allocated on the basis of priorities established through program planning. The scheme is designed to recover fifteen percent of the instructional budget . . . over the three-year period 1972-75. Included is a rationale for reallocating these resources so as to enhance the vitality of the University. . . ." The chair of the Committee on Educational Policy explained that the report "was presented as a means of avoiding the indiscriminate across-the-board reductions which had been necessary for 1971-72."

The Committee on Educational Policy made two recommendations about the St. Paul Campus because "it has been recognized for some time that it would be desirable to broaden the range of programs available on the St. Paul campus, so as to better serve the educational needs of students enrolled in St. Paul and to employ the facilities available there in a way that would be of service to the whole University community [and because] both the east and west banks of the Minneapolis campus have become seriously overcrowded. . . . Recommendation I: The University Senate endorses the proposed School of Cross-Disciplinary Studies within CLA which, at an appropriate time, could be the vehicle for expansion of liberal arts in St. Paul. . . . Recommendation II: The University Senate recommends the establishment of a set of Graduate Centers for Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies."

The meeting was recessed before docket items could be completed.

#### February 8, 1972 Special meeting

The Twin Cities Assembly met in special session to take up a proposal that freshmen in football and basketball be permitted to participate in varsity competition. The Assembly voted that the University should oppose a rule change.

The Senate convened. The Committee on Business and Rules laid out the rules for debate and reported that it would in the future set times for each item on the docket. The debate was lengthy.

President Moos wrote to the Senate: "With this memorandum I am reporting to the Senate my recommendations for the budget for 1972-73. These recommendations are the result of an unprecedented process of internal consultation and deliberation. Faculty, students and administrators have been involved together in literally thousands of hours of review and discussion.

"The recommendations that I originally submitted to the Expanded Consultative Committee and SCEP /SCRAP for their review have been altered as a result of their response."

The expanded Consultative Committee provided a lengthy commentary and set of budget recommendations in response to the president's proposals. "These recommendations reflect our long discussions with the vice presidents' group, the views expressed at the public hearing by students, faculty members, and deans and our best judgment concerning the welfare of the University as a whole. . . . Throughout the long weeks that we have listened to the description of the plans and programs of the heads of the collegiate units of the University, faculty, and students, we have become impressed with the great variety of urgent tasks the University is expected to undertake and the inadequacy of the resources at its disposal to accomplish them. We feel obligated to stress this fact, though we appreciate the support the legislature has given the University and are mindful of the ever-mounting fiscal demands being made upon the people of Minnesota."

SCEP and SCRAP also reported. "The Senate Committees on Educational Policy and Resources and Planning have reviewed Central Administration's proposed reallocations to fund programs at the all-University level. Our primary purpose was to determine if the recommended programs were consistent with the guidelines described in the document, 'Accountability and Educational Criteria.'" In general they were, but the committees had reservations about some of the priorities, and they offered recommendations of their own (for information).

March 9, 1972

### **Web entry incomplete**

SCEP and SCRAP reported criteria they would recommend to the administration in ranking program requests and emphasized that "faculty-student participation in University governance can significantly determine educational policy only insofar as these groups take an active role in the budget and planning process. The University is competing with many other bodies for state funds. . . . In developing the University's legislative request, some criteria must be used to determine and rank priorities. The process of priority-ranking and justification in developing a budget is inescapable. The issue before the Senate is the degree of faculty-student participation in this process. The University Senate can help maximize this participation by, first, recommending to central administration suitable criteria for ranking program requests and,

second, assuring that the final rankings are reasonable and consistent with these criteria by authorizing a continuing consultation process by appropriate bodies which are accountable to the Senate." After long debate, the Senate approved the criteria proposed.

The Senate approved the delegation of authority over grading systems to the campus assemblies of each campus.

The Faculty Senate approved a revision of the transfer recognition policy.

The Board of Regents responded to the further statement of the Senate concerning Mr. McConnell. "The Regents of the University understand your request; however, as the litigation in the matter is still pending, the Regents will have no statements or additional actions until the matter is ultimately concluded."

May 25, 1972

President Moos opened the meeting with comments. Before getting to budget matters, "I cannot allow this occasion to pass without some word about the events we have experienced during the past two weeks. As I told the House Committee on Foreign Affairs two days ago, we have experienced violence on this campus for the first time in our history. The events and circumstances surrounding that violence will be thoroughly investigated, and I do not propose to assign blame or responsibility here. I simply ask you all to join with me in sober reflection on the implications of such violence for this institution.

"I cannot fully describe the feeling I had when I saw the National Guard come on our campus with all that their presence symbolized and represented. That our traditions of civility and rational discourse had broken down to such an extent that external police and military force were deemed necessary to keep the University open and functioning is commentary enough. However, there are still those in our community who continue to believe that the proper institutional response to our nation's continued tragic involvement in Southeast Asia is to close the University. It is an unreasoning and illogical demand. When we are in national crisis and tension, is precisely the time when the open and protected environment of a university is most desperately needed. When the institutions of government are pursuing policies that divide rather than unite a nation, that is the time when debate and the free exchange of ideas are most essential. To close the University under such circumstances is unthinkable and subverts the true meaning of our lives as students, teachers and scholars. I want to use this forum to re-state that proposition as an article of personal faith, and to thank the overwhelming majority of students and staff (regardless of their views on the war) who have indicated that they share this view of the University's role."

The president then spoke at length about the retrenchment and reallocation process.

The Senate Research Committee recommended very long "proposed standards and procedures" concerning the use of human subjects in research, medical and social," including establishment of a "University-Wide Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research." Following discussion of a large number of amendments to the policy, one non-Senate member "commenced another discussion on protocol at Senate meetings, and Mr. Howell adjourned the meeting when the motion to permit her to speak again was defeated and order could not be restored."



November 3, 1972

On presentation of the slate of committees for the year, never contested, "the following motion was presented: To request President Moos to resubmit for approval a Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs more representative of the faculty and chaired by a member who is not a dean." The motion carried.

The Consultative Committee recommended and the Senate approved adding two Senate meetings.

The recommended policy on the use of human subjects in research was brought back for action and approved. By amendment at the meeting, students were added to the review committee.

January 18, 1973

The meeting opened with a long set of remarks from President Moos, "'Whither the House of Intellect: The Coming Era.' Included were comments on the future of higher education in Minnesota, on University governance, on budget procedures and information needs, and on Legislative request prospects."

The Senate referred to the Faculty Senate a proposal to create student advisory boards on tenure in academic departments and approved putting four students on the Tenure Committee. The Senate defeated amendments to the bylaws to add students to the Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Judicial Committee.

March 8, 1973

### **These minutes are messed up**

The Administrative Committee report: "Constitution guidelines. Mr. Shepherd reported that the Regents had requested that collegiate constitutions should provide for a review of each department by the dean of the college and an overall review of the college every five to seven years."

The Senate approved an amendment to section 18 of the tenure regulations: "The effective administration of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure is the responsibility of the president. He shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Faculty Tenure, representative of the various faculty ranks of the University, and which includes student members.

"The preceding statement was modified to provide for two students, one graduate and one undergraduate with the committee to total not less than nine members. The amendment was then approved."

"The chairman of the Consultative Committee began a preliminary discussion of University government and how the Senate might become a more effective legislative body. He requested the views of various members of the faculty and the student body. In the course of the

discussion, the following motion was made: The Senate instructs the Consultative Committee to meet with the President and discuss the apparent leadership crisis in the University and the future of the Arts and Sciences and report back to the Senate at the next meeting. The motion was seconded and *carried*." There was long discussion about governance.

#### April 19, 1973

Senate and University Committees, 1972-73: Reported for Action: University Committee on Tenure: Fred Morrison replaces Carl Auerbach as chairman. Students: Gary Engstrand, Janet Salomonson.

The chair of the Consultative Committee reported he "had met with the president as a result of a charge to the Consultative Committee from the Senate to inquire as to a 'crisis in leadership,' an 'epidemic of resignations,' and the future of the liberal arts, as well as the health sciences, at the University." A statement from the president and two lengthy letters he had written to the chair of the Consultative Committee were included in the docket materials. They responded to questions about University leadership and recent resignations by the Vice President for Academic Administration and his two associate vice presidents.

The Consultative Committee also presented a program on expanding education in the health sciences.

A student Senator proposed that "the University Senate create a task force that would draw up a policy enumerating the qualifications of a professor entitled to receive tenure at the University of Minnesota." It was withdrawn and instead the Senate adopted this resolution: "The University Senate hereby creates a task force to define and encourage excellence in teaching." The resolution also provided that "approval by the University Senate shall constitute a recommendation to the Faculty Senate that such statements shall be appended to the Tenure Code for guidance as to the definition of merit in teaching and utilized together with other criteria by units in hiring, salary, tenure and promotion consideration." Part of the debate was about the authority of the Faculty Senate, especially over the tenure regulations, independent of the University Senate.

#### May 24, 1973

From the Senate Committee on Educational Policy: "DIRECTED STUDY is a relatively new approach to individualized learning in this university, and one that is being increasingly utilized by students as an alternative or supplement to regular courses. Therefore, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy believes it would be helpful to both faculty and students for the University Senate to adopt a limited set of policy guidelines and principles to govern the use of directed study projects." The Committee proposed a set of standards the Senate approved.

The Committee on Educational Policy also submitted a long report and recommendations concerning liberal education requirements that the Senate approved.

The Committee on Educational Policy also submitted a set of recommendations concerning "Recapture by Sponsoring Units of Expenditures to Produce Educational Materials." The Senate approved.

The Senate approved revisions to the Senate handbook, one of which was that "The Consultative Committee may by majority vote require any Senate or University Committee to report on any matter within that committee's jurisdiction to any subsequent meeting of the University Senate which shall occur at least thirty (30) days after notice is given to the subject matter committee."

The Committee on Academic Standing and Relations recommended a change to degree requirements that the Senate approved: "Present residence credit requirements were drafted in the 1920's. Considering the changes in educational technology, the current diversity of instructional modes, all the increasing emphasis which continuing education will receive in the future bringing a student to campus to be in residence for instruction has lost importance and requiring it may inhibit the development of new methods of making University instruction available to new audiences. . . . To be eligible for a University degree, a student must present 45 University of Minnesota credits. Of the last 45 credits earned prior to the award of the degree, 30 must be University of Minnesota credits. All credit awarded by the University, regardless of the type of instruction, and regardless of the University unit through which the credit is offered, shall count toward the credit requirement for the degree."

The Senate Committee on Resources and Planning reported major criticisms of "Toward 1985 and Beyond" in lengthy commentary and sought to develop an institutional long-term planning process.

The ROTC Committee provided a lengthy report on ROTC.

With the lowering of the drinking age, the Senate considered (but did not adopt for lack of a quorum) a statement on alcohol consumption, including repeal of restrictions in the student unions and residence halls and asked that the Regents do the same. An amendment calling for a bar and grill in the basement of Morrill Hall and other locations on the Twin Cities and coordinate campuses, in order to raise additional revenue, was ruled out of order.

#### October 4, 1973 Special meeting

"The Regents invite the cooperation of a Faculty-student advisory committee on the selection of the President. The functions of the committee are as follows:

1. To make nominations for Regent consideration, which nominations might either be their own, or be made on behalf of the entire University community;
2. To cooperate with the Regents' committee, upon Regents' request, in seeking outside appraisal of candidates suggested;
3. To comment and appraise particular candidates upon request of the Regents;
4. To meet with the Regents' committee as requested by either committee.

Accordingly we request that the University Senate at a special session designate the All-University Consultative Committee as the committee to act as advisor to the Regents."

The Senate approved.

"The Consultative Committee was instructed last spring to prepare for the Senate a statement of the issues before governance structures so that senators would be better able to handle the major issues which can be foreseen. . . . Various issues were listed: the structure of the Senate; the virtually unworkable amendment clause; compulsory evaluation of courses; accountability and consultant policy; how to overcome the inertia of the transition period; governance and collective bargaining; budget evaluation; and others." The issues would be brought back later; there was amplification of the content in the discussion.

The Business and Rules Committee reported it would be bringing an amendment to the language on amending the Senate constitution because there were almost never enough Senate members present to reach the threshold required to approve constitutional amendments. Rather than two-thirds of all members, the required vote would be a majority. [At a much later date, the Senate approved a process for electronic voting after the meeting if there were not enough people physically present at the meeting when the vote took place.]

November 7, 1973 Special meeting (University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly)

The Senate approved an amendment to the constitution requiring either a two-thirds vote at one meeting or a majority at two successive meetings to amend the constitution. Because of a lack of a quorum thereafter, parallel amendments to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly were not adopted.

November 29, 1973

The Consultative Committee decided that for 1973-74 there would be a question time at each Senate meeting, at which time administrators would receive questions submitted to (and decided by) the Consultative Committee.

The Senate Committee on Research presented a (long) policy and procedures for animal care and usage at the University. (A statement had been accepted by the Regents earlier in the year.) An equally long set of amendments was proposed. The issue was put off for a meeting.

The Senate approved a requirement that any degree from the University carry at least 45 (quarter) credits and that of the last 45 credits, 30 had to be awarded by the University.

The Senate approved a recommendation to the Regents that alcohol be permitted in residence halls within the constraints of University rules.

January 17, 1974 Special meeting

The Senate did not approve a motion to direct the Business and Rules Committee to develop a plan to reduce the size of the Senate by 50%. Business and Rules proposed that any coordinate campus that wished to be linked to Senate meetings by telephone could be.

The University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility concluded that "an examination of the labyrinth of grievance appeals mechanisms reveals that present procedures are unreasonably vague and confusing to persons who desire to file grievances." So it sought "1) to define academic freedom and responsibility in a way that will delimit the kinds of grievance falling under this rubric, 2) to clarify the routing of grievances and appeals concerning academic freedom and responsibility," and to address other issues. "It is generally accepted that academic freedom includes the freedom to research, teach, publish, and learn without inhibition by external influence, within or without the institution. As such, it forms an extension of the minimum protection guaranteed in the Bill of Rights and is considered the basis for the system of academic tenure. The University Senate of the University of Minnesota in 1970 adopted a statement on academic freedom and responsibility which gave new breadth to the concept by removing from its definition the emphasis on the protection of the rights of academic faculty and extending this concept to include the entire academic community: 'Academic freedom consists in the unfettered exercise of scholarship. The faculty and students are obligated to help protect academic freedom and to help provide the conditions in which academic responsibility can prevail.'"

The chair of the Consultative Committee reported on its work with the Board of Regents in the selection of a new president.

February 28, 1974

The Senate approved a policy allowing non-regular faculty to be Principal Investigators on grants.

The policy on animal care and use was approved.

The Senate "(1) hereby designates Thursdays from 3:15-6:00 p.m. as its principal meeting time. (2) recommends that its committees do likewise. (3) requests that the office of Vice President for Academic Administration instruct all units scheduling classes not to assign faculty members of the Senate to classes during that period of time unless the senators specifically agree to such assignment in writing." And more. The statement was approved.

The chair of the Consultative Committee proposed:

"A. There shall be established a task force on academic salaries responsible to the Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the University Senate.

B. Charge To Task Force: to develop general principles and guidelines appropriate to establish and maintain an equitable system of academic salaries within a university.

...

D. Task Force Procedures: (1) to solicit from faculty, students, alumni, emeriti, department heads, deans, and others throughout the University who desire to write to, or converse with, or testify before the task force---statements, opinions, recommendations, or narratives which would in any way assist the task force in fulfilling its charge. (2) to ascertain the general principles and guidelines employed by comparable institutions in establishing academic salaries."

And to report by September 1974, such report to guide the Consultative Committee in advising the administration on the 1975-77 budget.

Under Questions to administrators, one senate asked about "the new program to head toward academic excellence in special areas." The acting vice president for academic administration "said there were two points to consider: the procedure for defining "excellence" and the procedure for arriving at those decisions upon which the presentation to the legislature would be based." He had appointed a small planning group with staff support; "the group has been asked to develop and implement a plan by which the 'margin of excellence' decision packages would be reviewed for the 1975-77 legislative request. It would also assist units in developing statements of mission and short-term planning goals, and it would prepare a long-range plan for academic planning, including procedures and organizational requirements. . . . Recommendations on decision packages would be made to the Council of Academic Officers, the Consultative Committee, and other related bodies of the University Senate. He said that as yet no substantive decisions had been made in the drive for excellence and that there would be ample opportunity for debate. He reassured those who might consider such a drive an 'elitist' concept, indicating that the University's mission, as a land-grant institution, is different from that of the private institutions in the East."

April 18, 1974

An ad hoc committee on faculty accountability appointed by the previous vice president for academic administration submitted for discussion a complete overhaul of the Board of Regents 1914 (plus accretions since) policy on outside consulting. The Senate agreed to a special meeting on May 9 to discuss the report. One Senator "urged that the committee include a statement of how many hours of faculty members' time are "purchased" by the University. He also asked for a definition of a workweek."

The Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations recommended that the University no longer serve as an accrediting agency for private secondary schools. The Senate approved.

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs reported that in order to carry out its charge, "we created five subcommittees to study the following specific problems: (1) early retirement, (2) health insurance, (3) sabbatical leave, (4) performance of faculty retirement funds, and (5) fringe benefits for part-time faculty." The chair provided a set of progress report on the issues from the subcommittees.

The Senate approved the lengthy recommendations of the University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility "to clarify the routing of grievances and appeals concerning academic freedom and responsibility, 3) to propose general guidelines for the structure and implementation of grievance procedures, 4) to propose general principles for the resolution of grievances, and 5) to make specific recommendations for implementation."

The Senate approved "International Education: A Statement of Purpose: A Rationale for International Education in the University" that began: "The University of Minnesota recognizes that a great university ideally builds and extends its service, its potential for research, its scholarly standing, and enhances its contribution to the education of students and citizens of the state by providing an international dimension in its educational programs. This is true in all fields

of study: in the professions, the sciences, the arts, the humanities, and in all periods of history in which the university serves." It also approved a University Council on International Education.

The Advisory Subcommittee for the Presidential Search reported that "We are delighted with the choice of Dr. C. Peter Magrath as President of the University of Minnesota. We also take satisfaction in the process by which he was finally selected. . . . We are impressed and pleased with the participation accorded our subcommittee at every appropriate stage. The relationships between our committee and the Regents' committee were most favorable and beneficial; the communication was thorough and effective."

May 9, 1974

The Committee on Educational Policy introduced for discussion a policy on the evaluation of teaching that had a number of specific recommendations: All faculty should evaluate at least one of their courses annually. . . . Evaluation of teaching should include some form of student opinion of the teaching effectiveness of the instructor. Other sources might include teaching colleagues, professional peers, and the instructor himself. . . . Since evaluation should be in terms of recognized goals, academic units should implement . . . faculty performance agreements . . . that clearly state the criteria upon which faculty will be judged at the end of the stated term of the agreement. . . . The faculty reward system at all levels in the University should be so designed to insure that excellence in teaching contributes significantly to decision concerning promotion and to salary increases. . . . Primary responsibility for improvement of teaching should be with the individual faculty member and with the basic academic units. The University, however, should act to increase its resources and expertise for helping both the individual faculty member and the academic units to strengthen weaknesses identified by evaluation of teaching or to improve instructional practices in general." The policy was approved later in May.

### **LENGTHY DEBATE MIGHT CITE**

A lengthy revision to the proposed outside consulting policy was introduced; a vote was postponed to later in May and following lengthy debate, the meeting was recessed for a week.

May 23 & 30, 1974 (one set of minutes)<sup>3</sup>

The *Proposed Policy on Professional Consulting, Service Activities, and Other Outside Work*, nearly ten pages of the Senate minutes and required lengthy debate over the two meetings.

The Committee on Committees reported on a review of Senate committee; "the review certainly revealed that a large number of people have worked diligently at the task of making the Senate committee structure work, and their efforts have resulted in substantive accomplishments. In addition, the fact that we can recommend (as we do below) the abolishment of two committees is evidence that the committee structure can be kept flexible in the face of changing needs.

"One important conclusion which has been reached because of information and opinions gathered from this review concerns three committees—the Senate Consultative Committee, the

---

<sup>3</sup> Senate Committees: "University Committee on Tenure: Students: Add Patricia Strike and Gary Engstrand."

Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning—whose duties and responsibilities are at the very heart of the ability of the Senate to govern. The findings of the review support the belief that there is some uncertainty of initiative, no little overlap of scope and function, and a resulting confusion about how to achieve a coordinated effort." So it appointed a task force.

"A disturbingly small fraction of the faculty volunteer for service on Senate committees . . . ; and those who volunteer generally are interested primarily in those committees which are perceived to be central to the power structure of the Senate and the administration of the University. Given the limitations on the size of these committees and the 3-year terms of service, the opportunities for appointment in any given year are limited. This has given rise to charges that faculty participation in University governance is deliberately limited by an 'in group.'" The Committee on Committees explained it tries for broad representation.

The review also suggested "the need for improved communication with respect to policy proposals between the Senate and the administrative officers who carry the responsibility for the implementation of these proposals and for their funding."

The review also recommended dissolving two Senate committees, which was approved.

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs offered a large number of recommendations, including among others that "Social Security coverage be extended to all *nonstudent* academic appointments," "Health insurance be extended to all *nonstudent* academic employees," complex retirement income calculations, "partial early retirement to enable a person to retire gradually rather than abruptly," the performance of faculty retirement funds, health insurance, and sabbaticals.

The Consultative Committee reported on a proposal from a special committee to include Civil Service employees in the Senate [at that time there was no P&A class]. It was concerned about possible conflicts with bargaining units and with an upcoming faculty vote on collective bargaining and concluded that it could not advance a proposal to the Senate. It suggested that the proponents secure agreement from bargaining units that representation in the Senate would not be regarded as an unfair labor practice.

November 21, December 5, 1974 and January 9 and 23, 1975 (the latter three were special meetings)

The meetings were devoted to debate of the proposed policy on outside consulting. There were over 120 proposed amendments to the draft, each of which was debated and voted on. The Faculty Senate approved the policy.

Other business was also taken up: The Senate proposed to disband the Administrative Committee.

The Senate Library Committee introduced a resolution that the Senate approved: "That the President reconsider the 45% reduction made in the proposed book fund request that had been accepted for legislative asking by various groups reviewing the University budget request, and that every effort be made to restore the purchasing power of the book budget to its 1969-70 level when it appeared to meet the major needs of the faculty and students for library resources."



March 6, 1975

The Senate voted to establish a rule on forfeiting Senate membership when a senator misses meetings, does not find an alternate, and does not notify the Clerk of the Senate of the absence.

The Committee on Educational Policy moved this resolution (quoted in part), which was adopted: "In 1974, Congress has authorized the appropriation of ten million dollars per year for three years to further metric education in the United States, in recognition of the inevitability of increasing use of the modern metric system. It is likely that in 1975 Congress will pass legislation for an orderly completion of the process of metric conversion begun by industry. . . . Many primary and secondary schools have begun the essential process of acquainting students with measurements in SI terms. It is the obligation of a community of scholars to do their part in assuring that University students become knowledgeable about this aspect of the culture of the world and of ours. Therefore, the Senate of the University of Minnesota resolves that the International System of Units should be used as extensively as is practical in the University's educational and scholarly activities."

The Senate approved a patent policy that read at the beginning in part: "Patents when viewed in relation to the basic purposes of the University, are an ancillary objective, valuable and important as they contribute to the basic purposes something to be striven for, but not at the expense of the primary objectives. . . . The interests of the University of Minnesota in seeking patent protection are to provide a vehicle for bringing the University discoveries into public use, to develop royalty income, and to provide recognition to the inventor and to the University. The intent of this policy is to permit staff members maximum freedom to publish or dispose of their findings consistent with their obligations to the University. Any staff member who, as a result of his University researches, makes a discovery, retains the ultimate right to decide how it shall be made public, i.e., by publication, by patenting, or by both."

May 22, 1975

The Senate Research Committee proposed, and the Senate approved, recommendations on improving the distribution of indirect-cost funds within the University. "The committee proposed that such revenue should be redistributed in the ratio of 2:1:1 to departments, colleges, and the Graduate School research fund, thus reflecting the proportion of such funds generated."

The Consultative Committee reported on a dialogue with the president about the University's mission statement.

The Consultative Committee also reported on efforts to facilitate the conduct of Senate business, including sending copies of all committee minutes to the Consultative Committee chair.

The Senate Consultative Committee also report: "For a somewhat protracted period this year, there was some uncertainty about which Regents would be leaving the Board, and, indeed, who the new Regents would be. During this period and the following weeks of orientation for incoming Regents, after they were selected, the President and the SCC agreed to defer to a more

auspicious time a meeting of the Committee and the Board. Such a meeting is now being arranged: a two-hour luncheon on June 12, 1975. We hope that this will inaugurate a trend toward closer relations between the Regents and the SCC, as the consulting arm of the Senate."

The Committee on Committees reported on extensive efforts to recruit students for committees; it also reported that "for the past three years, [it] has been studying both the committee structure of the Senate and the operation of the committees. As a part of that effort we appointed in June 1974 a Task Force [which] recommended to the Consultative Committee the establishment of a steering subcommittee to coordinate Senate business. In Winter Quarter the Consultative Committee established the recommended subcommittee (Subcommittee to Facilitate the Coordination of Senate business), and the group has met several times in the interim. Early indications suggest that the subcommittee is serving well the purpose for which it was designed." Next it was going to look at the charge to the finance committee and "the question of Senate input into legislative requests and budget review."

The Task Force on Academic Salaries reported, in a lengthy document. "In recent years faculty morale has been adversely affected by so-called merit increases which have been far below increases in the cost of living. Recent decisions concerning equalization requests submitted by various groups have been questioned by some members of the faculty. Other faculty members asserted that legislative intent was being subverted by the Regents in distributing merit salary money which the faculty thought had been appropriated for across-the-board increases. As an outgrowth of these concerns, the Consultative Committee recommended formation of a Task Force on Academic Salaries [on February 28, 1974]." The recommendations included these: "1. The head of each University department, in consultation with the department faculty, shall prepare an efficient" planning budget based on marketplace principles. . . . 2. The department head, the dean of the college, and the appropriate vice president shall examine the efficient budget to determine whether the proposed department budget based on the peer group reward system is appropriate for the department. . . . 5. Decisions concerning salary increases for individual faculty members should continue to be made primarily at the departmental level. Department heads and department faculty should consult to determine expectations of performance and rewards for performance. . . ."

June 5, 1975<sup>4</sup>

The Committee on Educational Policy introduced a resolution that was approved: "BE IT RESOLVED . . . that the University, through established and appropriate channels, support experimentation and development activities with a view toward adding cable television capabilities to the educational delivery systems of all University campuses; and furthermore, that these activities be considered initial steps in the possible development of a statewide educational network in which the University would participate with other educational institutions."

The Consultative Committee and President Magrath invited "all interested persons in the University community to a LEGISLATIVE POST MORTEM . . . to review the University experience in presenting and defending the proposed 1975-77 University budget before the state

---

<sup>4</sup> Elected student members of the Senate for 1975-76 included Gary Engstrand.

legislature and to discuss and begin to plan strategy-techniques of presentation, deployment of resources, etc. for presenting a 1977-79 University budget before the legislature."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs made a number of recommendations, in a very lengthy report, regarding Social Security coverage, retirement benefits, and health insurance that were approved.

November 20, 1975

A subcommittee of the Committee on Educational Policy "submits the following recommendations on the question of the proposed merger of University and MPR radio services, and on one related topic, the internal coordination of academic and broadcasting activities in radio: *1. That the University not enter into any merger arrangements that necessitate the surrender of its radio licenses or its freedom to seek such licenses or other governmental permits and supports in the future.*" And more. The Senate approved. The Committee also forwarded a proposed plan for joint MPR/University activities in educational broadcasting.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs also reported on discussions with the president and administration on the myriad recommendations it had made earlier in the year.

The Senate Research Committee reported that "unfortunately, the University budget for 1975-76 does not include the redistribution ICR funds recommended by the Senate. In fact, the current budget is a giant step backwards. Previous budgets allocated 60 per cent of ICR to the general University budget and 40 per cent, largely, to research related activities, such as plant services, libraries, computing facilities, collegiate research funds, and the like. The current budget allocates 76 per cent of the ICR to the general University budget, leaving only 24 per cent for activities more directly tied to the sponsored research that generated the ICR."

March 4, 1976

The Committee on Committees recommended (at the suggestion of former Vice President for Academic Administration William Shepherd) establishment of "a University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review which would report to the Senate through the Consultative Committee. This committee would be composed of nine members, seven of whom would be designated by the committee which they represent. . . . The University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review will provide a channel by which Faculty/Student ideas and concerns about programs, facilities, services, governance, faculty status, student affairs, and other matters may be voiced before biennial requests are formulated. The committee will participate in and share responsibility for developing criteria according to which budgeting requests are examined and ranked, and in developing the rationale for supporting those elements of biennial requests which are of concern to faculty and students." (The committee became known by its acronym, UCBRBR, or uck ber ber.) "The President said, in response to the former objection, that it would be a "significant" committee which would present judgments and recommendations to administration in advance of the actual decision-making," although the administration would retain final authority. The Senate approved.

The Committee on Educational Policy proposed a guide for negotiations with Minnesota Public Radio: "The subcommittee on radio of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy has reviewed the Report of the Governor's Task Force on Public/Educational Radio in terms of the principles and procedures incorporated in the policy adopted by the Senate on November 20, 1975. It was found that the Governor's Task Force Report is not incompatible with the University Senate Policy and the radio broadcasting interests of the University. Indeed, the Report is additional evidence of a general public interest in the development of public radio in Minnesota and recognition of the University's potential important contributions to this medium." The document enunciated three principles. The Senate approved.

The Senate Consultative Committee proposed, and the Senate approved, guidelines for the "establishment and functioning of search committees for filling major administrative positions"; they included this language: "Members of search committees and their chairpersons shall be chosen by the President (or his agent) after consultation with and assent of appropriate Senate, University, or collegial bodies representative of the constituencies clearly affected by the appointment. In the case of the central administrative officials, the appropriate body shall be the Senate Consultative Committee." The list of positions covered included all vice presidents and deans.

The Senate Research Committee reported for information: "In recent months the Office of Research Administration has announced new guidelines for the collection of indirect costs on NSF grants, for cost transfers, and for faculty effort certification. These changes in policy . . . have been reviewed and approved by the Senate Committee on Research. In all cases, the policy changes were required by the federal government to meet their existing regulations. While often onerous and seemingly pointless, the increases in paperwork and clerical time are necessary in view of the increasing accountability of University procedures to federal regulations."

A senator asked the Vice President for Academic Administration, apropos of the May 1975 report: "How realistic do you feel the recommendations of the Equity Task Force on Faculty Salaries are? Is central administration prepared to implement all or some of these?" Vice President Henry Koffler responded (in part): "Regardless of whether one accepts the appropriateness of market place principles in the academic world, in my opinion past practices in major American universities especially during the 1950's and 1960's have followed them. Talent is scarce and talent in some areas is more scarce than in others. An institution that is serious about maintaining and building strength must provide more attractive terms of employment than those offered by competing institutions." He was not certain the administration would implement all the recommendations.

April 15, 1976

The Senate approved establishment of a Committee on Social Concerns, which is to "make recommendations for the University's response to social problems."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs recommended, and the Senate approved, that the University extend Social Security coverage to all non-student employees and that the University seek legislative funding to cover the additional cost.

A senator "submitted a question involving the level of legal costs in the past decade, noting that laws against discrimination had seemed to have benefited only the apparatus of litigation. The President reported that indeed such costs had increased greatly, from \$28,000 in 1971 to \$172,000 in the last academic year. . . . The staff itself had expanded from one . . . to four during the years since 1971."

May 20, 1976

The annual report of the Senate Judicial Committee reported issues it had been dealing with; the chair included this comment: "My personal impression is that the greatest problem facing the Judicial Committee of the Senate is the increasing tendency to litigate all disputes, and the tendency to challenge any unfavorable decision. Hearing a single case, and writing findings may take from 50-100 hours or more. It is becoming almost impossible for faculty to assume this responsibility while discharging their primary teaching and scholarship duties."

The report of the Senate Consultative Committee included these items: "The Consultative Committee enjoyed open and frank discussion with the President in a series of regularly scheduled meetings throughout the year. . . . The chairman of SCC served during the year as chairman of the Steering Committee of ten faculty and student leaders developing an extensive Self Evaluation Report for the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus for the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools 1976 Accreditation Review of the University."

Also from the Senate Consultative Committee: "Faculty relationship with the Regents, which has been largely peripheral and informal, developed in constructive ways during the twelve-month period. On June 12, 1975, the Regents hosted a luncheon for faculty members of SCC, during which a variety of faculty concerns were probed and discussed. SCC responded with a Farewell Party for retiring regents in the Campus Club to which provosts, deans, directors, and department heads were invited. In the fall of 1975, the Regents reconstituted their committee system, creating a new Committee on Faculty concerns. Faculty representation on that committee was welcome, and during the academic year, various members of the Consultative Committee attended Regents meetings, injecting faculty viewpoints into the discussion of a variety of issues concerning faculty needs."

November 18, 1976

The Committee on Faculty Affairs introduced for information a statement on "philosophy for faculty compensation." It began with an introduction, including that "the primary objective of an Overall Compensation Plan is to aid in the attraction and retention of highly qualified faculty in an atmosphere conducive to both productivity and creativity" and then outlined principles: "*#1 Highest priority shall be for competitive salaries which will attract and retain highly qualified faculty . . . #2 The second highest priority should be given to financial insulation against unanticipated, unexpected, uncontrollable events which impair the faculty members employability or threaten the well being of his/her dependents. . . . #3 Retirement, while anticipated and expected, has an economic impact that is so great that a retirement benefit*

*requires a similar high priority, if retired persons are to have a measure of economic security. . . . #4 Of lesser priority are benefits that may ease extraordinary burdens at particular times, such as housing for new faculty, family educational privileges, and low interest personal loans." The Senate approved the statement at its next meeting for forwarding to the president.*

"The Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations had agreed to look into grading practices. The President said that the recent annual meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges the subject had been a topic of discussion, with almost all institutions indicating great concern about allegations of deteriorating standards and procedures, and that there were a number of studies under way across the country."

March 3, 1977

The Council in International Education proposed a set of procedures to govern international exchange agreements. The Senate approved.

One senator "asked whether rumors that there were five WATS lines at the University were true and, if so, whether telephone costs as reported were accurate. The president said there would be a response at the next meeting."

May 26, 1977

The Senate Consultative Committee announced the appointment of a task force on overload teaching.

The Senate Research Committee recommended that "the Senate endorse the" *Procedures Manual for Control of Potentially Hazardous Biological Research* "as presently developed by the University Biohazards Committee in conjunction with the Department of Environmental Health and Safety" and that "if research involving recombinant DNA is conducted at the University of Minnesota or by its faculty, *all* such research shall conform to at least the standards for physical and biological containment specified by the National Institutes of Health." The Senate approved.

The Senate Committee on Resources and Planning offered two resolutions: "1. That the University Senate requests the President to submit by the first Senate meeting of each academic year a report giving a policy agenda for the University. This message should be brief and should include: a) Major trends or changes as anticipated or projected at that time, for example, those which affect enrollment, faculty, programs, and physical planning. b) A list of reviews to be undertaken during the coming academic year. This is to include program reviews as well as evaluations of such items as student services, parking, affirmative action compliance, and any anticipated special task forces. 2. That the Senate set aside specific meetings or portions of meetings for discussion of issues arising from the President's report." The committee indicated that it "has often felt frustrated in trying to extract long-range planning policies from decisions made under day-to-day pressures. Concurrently, other Senate bodies have expressed an interest in a more structured way of learning about issues confronting the University."

The Committee on Educational Policy brought forward a long report on University College and experimental education, in response to an earlier recommendation that University College be eliminated.

Apropos of faculty retirement funds, in response to "faculty interest in new options in the faculty retirement system," the Committee on Faculty Affairs proposed to create a feasibility committee to "to initiate discussions with the MM-NWL to: 1) develop estimates of the magnitude and incidence of various costs associated with proposed new options, 2) resolve various legal questions surrounding proposed options, and 3) develop possible implementation procedures."

The Consultative Committee reported that "a number of persons representing units potentially affected by implementation of the proposed 'E' track met with the Committee to present and discuss their concerns." [The "E" track is what eventually evolved into the P&A appointment category.]

November 17, 1977

In response to the Senate request for a policy agenda, the Planning Council presented on behalf of the president a long list of "Major trends or changes, as anticipated or projected at that time; for example, those that affect enrollment, faculty, programs, and physical planning" and "A list of reviews to be undertaken during the coming academic year. This is to include program reviews as well as evaluations of such items as student services, parking, affirmative action compliance, and any anticipated special task forces."

A question from one senator, in response to NEA data on administrative costs, asked "why there has been an increase in the number of administrators in the face of budget cuts elsewhere. . . . The president said he welcomed the question and that it required a careful and structured answer, which he would provide at the next meeting of the Senate. He indicated the data were complicated and that the data base used by the National Education Association . . . was not comparable to that of the University. He said it was important to specify what an administrator was, and NEA used many classifications that were quite different from those at the University. There were some comparisons available on four Big Ten institutions, although he acknowledged that definitions were uncertain."

March 2, 1978

The University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review (UCBRBR) "has held several meetings since September, most of which have been devoted to clarification of its mission. . . . [UCBRBR] has been in existence for approximately two years, during which time it has accumulated some experience in trying to determine and define its responsibilities and activities. . . . The Committee was established by the Senate to provide a means whereby the faculty and students would have greater access to budgetary decisions and greater opportunity to implement those decisions and recommendations of various Senate committees which have budgetary implications. . . . It is believed that the long-run role of the Committee would be primarily to provide advice relating to the biennial request and to the budget in the light of its understanding of the University's goals and priorities."

Two student senators introduced proposals computing: "I. That the lab rooms be kept open the full time and that the computer is available for time sharing. The terminals shall also be kept open. . . . II. Because of problems incurred by students, we, the members of student government, recommend that: A users' committee be set up to determine policy and act as a liaison between Computer Services, users of the computer services, lab supervisors, and the University Committee on Computer Facilities. This committee should be composed of students and faculty members. . . . In an attempt to distribute more equally *student access* to computer terminals, student government proposes that: For easier access to computer terminals in Health Sciences Unit A, maps to the rooms should be readily available, and signs posted to direct students to the facilities."

Two student senators "called attention to the report going to the regents in March regarding University handling of its investments in South Africa and pointed out that the Subcommittee on Social Responsibility in Investments had not considered the alternative of divestiture when it passed its resolution urging a coalition of colleges and universities to present shareholder resolutions to companies doing business in South Africa to sign the Sullivan Principles in an effort to change the apartheid policies of the present government there." The president said the subcommittee had considered divestiture but voted against it, but would consider it again.

May 25, 1978

The Senate approved creation of the Committee on International Education.

The Senate Research Committee presented a resolution, after whereas clauses and with an explanation: "THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that to prevent further erosion of opportunities for Graduate Research, an increase in the Graduate School Research Fund budget be made, concomitant with a revised 1970 budget, in terms of 1978 economic conditions, so that the total level of support of the Legislative Special and the NIH Biomedical Sciences Support Grant and the O&M budget contribution be equivalent to that of 1970." "Since the 1969-70 academic year, the Graduate School's research funds (excluding health sciences) have fallen from \$899,000 to \$795,000; in real terms, after adjusting for inflation, this represents a fall of 46%. The reduction is due to our loss of fellowship funds." The Senate approved the resolution.

"Action by [10] individual senators.<sup>5</sup> In recent months, members of the faculty have grown increasingly uneasy. They are deeply and sincerely concerned about a number of issues: the impact of financial adversity upon educational policy and practice; a perceived lack of long-term planning; an evident need to clarify the missions of the various components of the University; and the breakdown at critical times of the consultative relationships between the administration and the appropriate bodies of the Senate. Problems of this sort can seriously impair the functioning of the University, and the faculty, the students, and the administration have an important stake in working together to resolve them. 1. . . . Problems that have been emerging during the last decade prompt us to suggest a review of the *structure* of central administration to seek modifications that will improve its ability to solve these problems, and a review of the *consultative institutions* of the Senate to determine how they can be made more effective.

---

<sup>5</sup> As of the date of this compilation, September, 2012, three of the ten are still on the faculty.



2. There is an impression that the decision-making process in the University is uncertainly defined, cumbersome, and slow, with the consequence that occasionally there has not been sufficient time for effective consultation. We believe that the consultative process needs to be more clearly defined, regularly implemented, and mutually responsive, with faculty, students, and administration working effectively *together* rather than independently or, as sometimes happens, against each other. . . . Therefore, we call upon the Senate to establish a select committee to work with the administration in studying the issues which have been raised and to report to the Senate before the end of the calendar year." The Senate approved. "President Magrath felt the proposal was a constructive one and he endorsed its intent, recognizing that communication was important to all segments of the University community."

The "Senate Task Force on Developing and Encouraging Excellence in Teaching," originally appointed in November, 1973, reported that "it seemed desirable to the Task Force, due to changes in administration and a time lapse between the original directive and the identification of persons to serve on the Task Force, to ascertain whether the original directives and guidelines were still valid." The Consultative Committee decided they were; the task force thus issued a report "Preamble and the Identification of the Good Teacher and Good Teaching." The report also addressed measuring teaching effectiveness, the relationship among teaching, research, and service, and included 15 recommendations (some of which had subparts).

In the Senate Consultative Committee annual report: "Faculty relationships with the Board of Regents continued to be strengthened and formalized through regular quarterly meetings of the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Regents."

UCBRBR reported that its "concerns regarding the biennial request were identified in a 28-page document- forwarded to the President through the Senate Consultative Committee" that identified 23 issues. The committee "met with President Magrath and his administrative colleagues . . . to discuss UCBRR's document. The President indicated his agreement with most of the comments and his appreciation of the Committee's work. The Committee believes that substantial progress has been made toward establishing a consultation process in terms of biennial request and budget review."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs submitted a very long annual report that included work on salaries, retirement benefits, and other topics.

November 30, 1978

The Senate approved a new constitution for University College.

Students in the Twin Cities Campus Assembly proposed adding ten students to the Senate: "ten students from the Twin Cities campus elected as representative of the following ethnic minorities (1) Black Americans, (2) American Indians, (3) Chicanos, (4) Asian-Americans and of international students."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs issued a set of recommendations because "recent amendments to federal and state statutes concerning age discrimination have raised the earliest permissible

mandatory retirement age to age 70 and have extended to age 70 prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of age." It also reported, as it had previously, on sex differentials in periodic retirement benefits.

The president presented his policy agenda for 1978-79, which included such items as Development and Implementation of a Reallocation System for the 1979-80 Budget, Development of a Continuing Reallocation System for Future Years, Development of a Long-Range Institutional Plan, Coordination of Academic and Facilities' Planning, Review of Teaching Evaluation Practices, and Review of Faculty Retirement Programs, among other things.

One student senator "wanted to know why faculty members of the Consultative Committee held meetings with the President and did not include student members, alleging that such tactics hampered the goal of the committee. The President said some of the meetings had been held at his request, some at the request of the Faculty Consultative Committee. At the same time, he pointed out, he was continuing to meet with the full committee on a regular basis, and with representatives of student organizations on all campuses in private sessions."

One senator, "in the period reserved for questions to the President, asked whether he was committed to the idea that the coming retrenchment should not serve to increase the ratio of administrators to faculty members. The President replied in the affirmative, while pointing out that it was not always obvious what an administrator was and that there were many different definitions used nationally and within the state."

One student senator asked the president "whether he or his administration had considered protection for the minority student departments and their faculties in any retrenchment moves. The President said that it had been considered by the University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review, which also took into account the University's affirmative action needs."

#### February 15, 1979

"The University Senate at its May 25, 1978 meeting approved a resolution to establish a Select Committee to study the structure of central administration and the consultative institutions of the Senate and to review the decision-making process at the University." The long report was submitted at this meeting, including lengthy appendices. The authors cautioned that "the accuracy and acumen of these perceptions [communicated to the Select Committee] vary widely and, though we do not wish to give currency to false ideas, it would have been impossible to trace each impression to its source or label each opinion with our evaluation. In any case erroneous perceptions are part of the problem." The report offered lengthy comments on planning ("planning is no panacea, but [the committee] strongly endorses the planning effort that has already begun in the Central Administration. . . . It wishes to stress the overriding importance of academic concerns in all aspects of planning. . . .), decision-making ("the committee sees a vital need for some reorganization which will make the primacy of Academic Affairs quite evident and in which the decision-making process is carefully defined and understandable to everyone [;] . . . we feel that careful consideration should be given to a scheme which puts the focus of academic decision-making at the high level we deem appropriate without impeding the

President's right to make ultimate decisions or restricting his freedom of consultation [;] the committee recommends that the administration further strengthen the communication of decisions, and of what has gone into them, to the University at large as well as to the specific collegiate constituencies most directly affected [;] we recommend adherence to college constitutions and democratic procedures and urge faculty to participate vigorously in department and college decision-making since this is where important decisions of the University should be made [;] we recommend that the Senate Consultative Committee exercise its role as a steering committee for the Senate, and identify, without ambiguity, the appropriate consulting mechanism at the various levels of decision-making"), and consultation ("the pattern of consultation involving faculty and Administration is not easy to describe, being a somewhat dappled thing and not always (pace Hopkins) evoking praise. The central officers are asked by many individuals and groups to consult with them on a wide range of matters. It is a time consuming activity, and they have been generous in making time for it. In its formal channels, such as with SCC, it has worked well on many issues, but on others has been precluded or rendered ineffective by pressures of time, serious inadequacies of data base, or the weakness of long-range planning. It has also been suggested that it has, on occasion, taken place after certain basic decisions, which may restrict later options, have already been made, though improvements in this respect have been remarked in the more recent period. Consulting can also become too dispersed, and there needs to be agreement about whom and on what matters Central Administration should consult. . . . The faculty are not always too well informed on the consultation that does take place, and in some cases, the process appears to work badly because committees do not adequately inform their colleagues of the recommendations they make. . . . The committee feels strongly that the system of consulting (both in the Administration and the Senate) should have its structure more clearly defined. In particular the legitimate expectations of the parties to consultation should be made explicit, the lines of responsibility for each category of issue should be clearly articulated, and the necessary limits of consultation spelled out. . . . While not recommending any specific restructuring of the Senate, it does endorse the idea that the Senate should be called upon to examine itself and make its structure and procedure more effective. In particular it should consider reducing the number of standing committees and using short term task forces for specific projects." The report concluded "it is, however, the considered view of the members of the Select Committee that a well functioning system of governance is vitally needed and that the existing system at the University of Minnesota will not remain functional without a strengthened commitment on the part of the administration, the faculty, and the students to make it work."

The Senate approved a substitute motion (in lieu of one proposed by the Senate Library Committee) providing that "the University Senate acknowledge the critical import of library acquisition funding and therefore recommends that the University Libraries' reallocation request to restore funding for the proposed retrenchment of acquisitions be given a high priority."

UCBRBR "consists of members delegated from the Senate Consultative Committee, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Senate Committee on Research, and two at-large members. The UCBRR examines legislative request and budget matters and coordinates the actions of its "parent" committees on these matters. . . . The UCBRR has dealt with four major issues during

the first half of the current academic year," among others *"Review of Interim Guidelines and Criteria for 1979-80 Retrenchment and Reallocation."*

March 29, 1979

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Committee on Educational Policy: "A new course-teacher evaluation document is authorized which will be available to students and faculty for guidance in course selection." "In the process of a major review of progress toward fulfilling the recommendations of the 1974 Senate Policy on the Evaluation of University Teaching, SCEP has become convinced that one aspect of the policy should receive additional support now. There has long been concern at the University of Minnesota for providing students better information that will enable them to make informed decisions about course selection."

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) reported on its response to the Select Committee report. "SCC wishes to congratulate the Senate Select Committee and its chairman, Professor Dennis W. Watson, for a task well done and to thank them for their conscientious efforts. . . . SCC has taken three actions to advance implementation of those recommendations. First, it has sent the Report to each Senate and University Committee with a request for the Committee's reaction to the Report and for specific suggestions for implementing those recommendations that pertain to the University Senate. . . . Secondly, SCC has appointed a Subcommittee to organize its own responses to the Select Committee's recommendations. In a preliminary report, that Subcommittee has identified three large areas of concern upon which it hopes to focus its attention: A. The Senate Committee system; B. the structure of the Senate itself; and C. the structure of the Central Administration. . . . The third action taken by SCC to advance implementation of the Select Committee Report was to arrange a joint meeting between SCC, the Select Committee, and the President to discuss the Report. That meeting took place on March 23, 1979." More would be forthcoming at a later Senate meeting.

From the discussion abstract: "The agenda contained a proposal to amend the constitution by adding ten students as representatives of five minority groups. However, Mr. Altholz [chair of Business and Rules] moved that the issue of minority representation and all such pending motions be recommitted to his committee, in consultation with the Social Concerns Committee, so that opinions of minority communities, coordinate campuses, and other affected and interested groups could be considered." The motion passed overwhelmingly.

One senator, speaking about the Select Committee report, "made a 'nonexhaustive' list of five factors that he called 'the situation.'" They were as follows: '1) Many universities, especially state-supported universities, as institutions are in trouble. Budget cuts are being recommended or imposed largely for political, not economic, reasons. 2) There is a deterioration of public confidence in universities as institutions. Grade inflation is rampant. The bachelor's degree . . . is becoming a vinyl sheepskin. 3) There is great pressure to quantify education, to deal in the debased coinage of student-credit hours, faculty productivity, etc. - the language of large corporations and big business. The pragmatic philosophy that 'dollars chase students' is widely accepted as a basis for budgetary decisions, presumably because students have a true and inherent intellectual homing instinct. 4) The quality of a university is a sensitive function of the quality of the top few percent of its faculty, precisely those faculty who almost always have

options at any stage of their careers. 5) Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois, three Midwestern universities, were the only state-supported universities that had been cited along with Harvard, Stanford, Berkeley, Yale, Chicago, MIT, and Columbia as the best universities in the country in a recent survey." The Senate applauded the comments.

May 17, 1979 (this appears to be the first meeting held in 25 Law, now 25 Mondale)

One faculty senator made a motion: "That the Senate ask the President to establish a committee to review existing college and department constitutions, to recommend optimum levels of faculty participation in governance, and to recommend procedures to guarantee all faculty certain minimum rights in participatory governance at the college and department level where those rights are not properly guaranteed by existing constitutions." The comment included this text: "Having gathered several constitutions from colleges and departments, I find a large variation in the governance procedures in different units of the University. . . . Surrounded by this confusing variety of constitutions, non-constitutions, and traditions, I wish to declare an 'environmental alert.' Many faculty members with long years of service have few opportunities for meaningful participation in governance at their college or department level, whereas others have enjoyed these privileges for at least fifteen years." The motion was tabled 64-53, with one senator "voicing concern that the Senate was setting itself up as a judge of individual faculties and colleges and urging that it not act in a hurry on a loosely worded motion." The Senate agreed 64 to 53 to table the motion.

The Committee on Educational Policy introduced the "Report of the Study Group on University Outreach that outlines the overview of the Study Group's recommendations on basic policy and issues. The Report [is] 121 pages in length. . . . The Study Group's basic policy concerning outreach is that outreach functions are an integral part of the faculty's professional responsibility in the University. This is to say that since the responsibility for all of the academic programs of the University - both instruction and research - is vested in the faculty, the faculty is, therefore, responsible for the academic aspects of the University's outreach activities. Or to put the matter another way, the Study Group rejects the idea that there is a part of the University's academic enterprise, namely outreach instruction and research, for which the faculty is not responsible. Consequently, over time, faculty activity and the faculty reward structure should be modified as necessary to reflect this responsibility. University organization should provide focus and leadership, and funding should support outreach."

The Senate approved a revised Patent Policy.

The Tenure Committee moved that "the Senate suggest to the Senate Judicial Committee that it amend its rules to allow a trial period of two years during which time hearings before panels of the Committee may be open to the public if both parties and the panel agree that they may be." The Senate approved.

"Because [the Senate Consultative] Committee is interested in continuing to develop its consultative relationship with the University community, three newsletters were issued (SCC Reports) which detailed SCC Committee work as well as that by other University and Senate Committees. These newsletters represented SCC's effort to assure improved communication

between Committees and the University community." SCC also reported that " The faculty and student members of the SCC were both invited by the Board of Regents to participate in the evaluation of the President, and each group met separately with the Board's consultant who conducted the review." And that the "Faculty Consultative Committee continued to have regular quarterly meetings with the Regents at which matters of general interest to the faculty were discussed."

The Judicial Committee annual report noted that "last year it was reported that appearances suggested the flood of litigation before the Judicial Committee was subsiding and that we might look forward to a less burdensome year in 1978-79. Unfortunately this not only proved incorrect but incorrect to such an extent that the entire judicial system has threatened to collapse."

May 31, 1979

The president provided a multi-page response to the Select Committee report. "Let me first address the question of the primacy of academic values at the University of Minnesota, since this issue clearly focuses upon my work as the chief executive officer of the University of Minnesota. I believe that the members of the Watson Committee and I, as well as the entire University community, agree on one fundamental point: Everything that we do, discuss, and, at times, argue about at this institution is motivated out of a genuine concern for academic values." The president addressed the usual organization of multi-campus systems and said that "I find it to be needlessly bureaucratic, having the disadvantage of pulling the ultimate chief executive away from direct involvement with campus and faculty issues and needs. . . . Every chief executive has his or her own style of doing things. Unquestionably and without apology, I have mine. It is not perfect and others might function somewhat differently. But I do my work in a way that, frankly, fits me as I try to serve, as best I can, the academic mission of this University. I prefer not to have an executive vice president, thereby isolating myself from direct campus issues and concerns. . . . Such preferences, however, should not be interpreted as a negative comment on academic matters. Quite the contrary . . . the vice president for academic affairs is to my thinking the vice president who assists me most directly in representing the fundamental educational concerns of the total University of Minnesota." The president also responded to each of the specific recommendations of the Select Committee.

SCC had received from its subcommittee studying the Select Committee report a set of complicated recommendations for changes to the Senate committee structure; among other things, the subcommittee had found that committees resisted being dissolved or merged.

One part of its report read as follows: "At least two well-informed respondents, including the Chairman of UCBRBR have recommended that UCBRBR be abolished as a separate committee and its functions taken over by a subcommittee of members of SCC. The subcommittee cannot square its perception of the situation with this expert advice; hence, we recommend that UCBRBR be continued as a separate entity of some kind. We bring the matter to SCC as an unresolved question, however, and earnestly seek a majority opinion. To our way of thinking UCBRBR has been a success in at least one important way - in the past two years it has managed for the first time in history not only to involve students and faculty in the biennial request and budget processes but to influence the President's final decisions on such matters."

With respect to communication, "the Senate could purchase for an entire academic year a one-half page advertisement in the same place in each Monday's *Daily*. Each Thursday all committees (including SCC) could send abbreviated notices of meetings, agenda, progress reports, and the like to the Clerk of the Senate for editing, preparation of copy, and delivery to the *Daily* for insertion in the one-half page advertisement."

While agreeing with the Select Committee emphasis on primacy of academic affairs, "we are concerned, however, that the [phrase] . . . has come to mean something more absolute than the Watson Report [Select Committee] intended or something more specific than what may be workable in a complex University. We do not believe that it ought to mean that all academic concerns must find their focus in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Were we to paraphrase, we would suggest that "primacy of academic affairs" stands for the principle, especially critical as the University moves from incremental budgeting to retrenchment and reallocation, that the academic mission of this University - at the Department, College, Campus, and All-University levels - must take precedence over all other concerns. And if the administrative structure does not, for good and valid reasons, reflect the preeminence of academic concerns, it should be made luminously clear in operation."

The president's response and the SCC report were the subject of lengthy discussion.

#### November 1, 1979 (Special meeting)

The Senate set aside two hours for a discussion of the report of the Study Group on Outreach. SCC proposed a multi-part motion that began with this: "(1) The Senate endorses the principle that outreach functions are an integral part of the University's responsibility, and the principle that the responsibility for them is, like responsibility for all of the instructional programs of the University, vested in the faculty. (2) The Senate endorses the principle that the faculty of the University should consider in all of the instruction the University offers, including outreach instruction, the needs of the students for whom the instruction is to be provided. Thus all of the University's instruction, both credit and non-credit and without respect to location, time of day, or year, will be organized and offered on the basis of a coordinated plan that has resulted from careful periodic discussion and review. (3) The Senate reemphasizes the freedom of the faculty to pursue their chosen research interests, including interactive community-oriented research." SCC did not endorse the operational recommendations of the Study Group, pending more information from the administration.

#### November 29, 1979 (Beginning with this meeting, all meetings of the Senate were now held in 25 Law)

The Committee on Business and Rules brought forward without recommendation a constitutional amendment: "(2) The representatives of minority and international student concerns shall be chosen in accordance with the following provisions. There shall be five (5) student members elected from the Twin Cities campus; one (1) student each shall be elected from the Duluth and Morris campuses; and (1) student shall be elected alternately from the Crookston and Waseca campuses. Student membership from the Twin Cities campus shall comprise one (1) representative of Native American students, one (1) representative of Chicano students, one (1) representative of Black students, one (1) representative of Asian-American students, and one (1)

representative of international students." The report detail arguments for and against the change; the Senate did not support the proposal.

UCBRBR reported that "Our general reaction to the reallocation process followed in 1978-79 must be described as 'mixed.' We recognize the need for reallocation. In our view, an ongoing process of internal reallocation of resources is essential to the academic health of the University. A means must be found to continue this function on a regular basis. The principal problems this year have been associated with timing of the decision-making (about which we warned in our initial review of the process), and a tendency of the system to require relatively trivial decisions to be made at the highest levels of consultation, while meaningful aspects of consultation are rendered more difficult by the inadequacy of the existing data base. This has led, to some extent, to inefficient decision-making."

The president presented his policy agenda for 1979-80.

SCC presented a motion calling for approval of "the principle of "E" (Academic Staff) appointments for appropriate groups. . . . The question of which categories of positions should be classified as "E" (Academic Staff) is one that shall require consultation and advice by the Faculty Senate in order to safeguard academic freedom. The Faculty Senate shall also be consulted as to the provision of academic freedom for individuals in professional positions on "E" track. The Senate designates the Tenure Committee as its representative for this consultation, and recommends that the Tenure Committee consult with affected groups." And more. SCC said that consideration of individuals with E appointments for Senate members would be taken up later. [It finally was, in 2004.] The motion was made because of the report of the "Task Group to Develop Personnel System Recommendations for Non-Faculty Administrative and Professional Appointments," which "contained statements of rationale for development of a third personnel system in the University" because "In most large and heterogeneous public and private universities there have emerged important and essential positions, mainly academic in nature, which do not fit under either the faculty or the civil service systems."

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs reported that "last spring a subcommittee of this committee issued an extensive report entitled "Sex Differentials in Periodic Retirement Benefits Under the Faculty Retirement Plan." The covering letter indicated the intent of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) to hold a hearing on this issue this fall. In the meantime a Task Force on the Faculty Retirement Plan has submitted a proposal to the SCFA that calls for a basic restructuring of the pension plan on which the Task Force and SCFA intend to seek faculty reaction." So SCFA would wait on addressing the specific question of the sex differential.

February 14, 1980

"Upon the recommendation of the University Committee on Biennial Request and Budget Review (UCBRBR), the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), and the President, the Senate should devote a maximum of one hour at the February 14 meeting to discussing the President's and the Budget Executive's recommendations on the 1980-81 Budget, the 1981-82 Reallocation, and the 1981-83 Biennial Request." "President Magrath opened the discussion with comments by way of explanation of a planning and budgeting process which was new to the University. For



the first time the University had been asked to develop a six-year capital request and was making preliminary judgments on a two-year budget cycle. . . . There had been an unprecedented number of meetings involving the budget executive (the vice presidents for academic affairs, finance, and health sciences), himself, and representatives from the colleges and campuses in formulating planning and budget decisions. Also new was the extent of involvement of Senate groups, he said. Finally, fiscal decisions were being made in the context of long-range planning. He explained that the process afforded deans and faculties flexibility in making budget decisions and that the University community, through Senate representatives, had more time and opportunity to review and comment." The chair of UCBBR "reported that the budget process had been one of the most open in his memory."

The Senate Committee on Social Concerns moved that "that the Senate requests the Board of Regents to direct the University Food Services to refrain from further purchases of Nestle products, and those of its subsidiaries, until Nestle stops all promotion of infant formula in less-developed countries." There were lengthy majority and minority statements. The Senate approved the resolution. The president later declined to support the resolution before the Board of Regents.

The University Committee on the Handicapped had been established in 1978 by the president and had made recommendations; the Committee on Educational Policy would take them up.

The Senate adopted a motion authorizing a new course-teacher evaluation document designed to provide information to assist students in course selection. The Student Course Information Project (SCIP) was initiated on a pilot basis during spring quarter, 1979. . . . An evaluation of the pilot project has been conducted by the Measurement Services Center in an effort to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the data collection instruments and reporting procedures. Results of this evaluation are generally quite positive." So it should be continued.

April 17, 1980

The Committee on Faculty Affairs proposed that "all contributions made to the faculty retirement plan after October 1, 1980, be used to purchase annuities at retirement priced on a unisex basis," explaining that "through this recommendation the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs is favoring a plan that provides equal monthly pensions for men and women with the same accumulated contributions at the same retirement age." The Faculty Senate approved.

SCC "has reexamined the guidelines for search committees for filling major administrative positions at the University . . . and recommends the changes contained in the above text. Those changes (1) emphasize the affirmative action aspect of a search and charge each search committee member with responsibility for seeing that affirmative action policies of the University are carried out; and (2) eliminate sexism in the guidelines' language."

One senator moved that "the Senate go on record as favoring a secret ballot referendum, to take place in each department (or comparable unit) of the University, to determine the faculty's preference as between the headship and chairmanship systems. . . . I have come to believe that the lack of systematized and meaningful participatory procedures for departmental decisions (in

particular, with respect to salaries, but also other matters) is a major cause of low faculty morale in a number of departments, and such procedures are more often encountered under the chairmanship system than under headship. Yet it is precisely in departments lacking such procedures that it may be difficult or impossible to initiate reform from within." It was referred to Business and Rules.

May 15, 1980

SCC brought recommendations for 26 changes to the Senate, recommended by the subcommittee that reviewed the report of the Select Committee. They dealt with election to the senate, committees, committee structure, a very complex set of recommendations that the Senate approved.

The Committee on Educational Policy recommended that "the Senate consider the recommendation from the Report of the Study Group on University Outreach that 'over time, the University should incorporate instruction now on overload, e.g., CEE credit instruction and Summer Session, into the regular workload of the faculty either by substituting any instruction now on overload for other current assignments or by employing additional faculty' at the earliest possible date during the 1980-81 academic year." The Senate approved.

The Senate approved a revised policy on principal investigator eligibility on sponsored projects.

The Committee on Business and Rules followed up the previous meeting with a resolution: "That the office of the vice president for academic affairs administer a confidential survey of the regular members of departmental faculties to ascertain their preferences with regard to the structure of department governance. The survey should include questions as to the desirability of changes in method of selection of department chief executive officer; method of allocating salaries, research funds, space, and teaching assignments; method of appointing new faculty and awarding promotion and tenure; and, in general, the relative roles of the chief executive officer and the faculty at large in determining policies." The proposal was defeated.

The SCC annual report included the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). "VI. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE. At times the FCC exercised the option of closed meetings with the president to discuss personnel items not covered by the open meeting policy. . . . The FCC feels that such closed meetings, in accordance with the law, remain beneficial as a limited channel of administration-faculty communication that should continue to be used on a judicious basis." It also reported that "the FCC and Regents continued meeting together quarterly. These meetings have been on the whole constructive in providing a forum for frank exchange and the building appreciation of mutual concerns."

December 4, 1980

The president provided a written statement of reasons and then turned the gavel over to the vice chair. "They had to do with his, the central administration's, and the regents' recent action following a vote in favor of entering into collective bargaining by the faculty of the Duluth campus. Last month the regents had suspended participation by that faculty in the University

Senate and its committees and had suspended the UMD Campus Assembly constitution and the constitutions of its various schools pending the outcome of negotiations for a contract between the agent selected by the UMD faculty (the University of Minnesota Duluth Education Association) and the regents. . . . He maintained that the Public Employee Labor Relations Act (PELRA) made the action not only appropriate but necessary. . . . His recommendation and the subsequent regents' action was in no way to be viewed as a punitive measure, he said, as had been alleged in some quarters."

The Committee on Business and Rules offered two resolutions on the same matter; following whereas clauses, resolved "that the All-University Senate invites and encourages its nonmedical faculty colleagues from the Duluth campus to participate in the deliberations of the Senate and its committees until a collective bargaining agreement has been reached by the University administration and the Duluth faculty" and "that the Senate requests the President to restore the Duluth faculty's voting power in the Senate and on all its committees by administrative order until the collective bargaining agreement has been reached." The first was approved, the second was defeated.

The Senate approved: "Pursuant to and for the duration of the court decree in the case of Rajender vs. University of Minnesota, there shall be established a University Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women."

The Senate approved "a policy that a member of the Twin Cities campus faculty not responding to a second recall notice will lose the privilege of recalling library materials held by other patrons until that faculty member returns the recalled material. Warning of potential loss of recall privileges would be contained in the second recall notice."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs moved " That the Senate endorse the concept of an employee assistance program for faculty members to be implemented as soon as possible following the report of a faculty advisory committee on how such a program should be implemented." The Senate defeated the motion 52-56.

The president presented his policy agenda for the year, including an institutional goals, objectives, and priorities statement, unit planning memoranda, policy studies agenda, outreach, establishment of an academic staff professional and administrative (pa) personnel category, space planning procedures, fiscal policies, and graduate school programs reviews to take place.

### February 19, 1981

The Judicial Committee and the Tenure Committee proposed a method for making its hearing and findings more public, one that required approval by the Faculty Senate. They "believed that the present interpretation that hearings should be closed and circulation of findings limited was no longer suitable, and under stimulation of the courts the committee had come to the conclusion that there should be an opportunity to experiment with open hearings and some disclosure of findings." The Faculty Senate approved.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs brought back the motion to approve an employee assistance program, in part because the proposal should have been voted on only by the Faculty Senate, not the University Senate, and because it had answers to some of the questions that had been raised at the previous meeting. The proposal was defeated again, 59-42.

The senate approved revisions to the constitution and bylaws, following recommendations of the SCC committee that developed them after the report of the Select Committee. The constitutional amendments did not receive sufficient votes to pass at one meeting, but enough so that they could be brought back for a second vote at the next meeting. The senate minutes do not record what the proposed constitutional and bylaw changes were.

April 16, 1981

The changes voted on in February were approved again, and thus went into effect. "The amendments included (1) continuing membership on the Consultative Committee and the Committee on Committees for Crookston and Waseca, (2) a change in registration requirements for Continuing Education and Extension senators, (3) notice in the *Daily* or the *Daily Bulletin* of committee meetings, (4) establishment of a Committee on Services for the Handicapped, and several editorial changes."

The Senate Consultative Committee and the Committee on Faculty Affairs moved that " the Senate endorse the Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment and the Procedures for Handling Complaints of Sexual Harassment Against Academic Staff." "Sexual harassment in any situation is reprehensible. It subverts the mission of the University, and threatens the careers of students, faculty, and staff." The policy provided a definition and lengthy procedures but left up to the Senate the decision on the composition of the Sexual Harassment Board. The Senate approved and "added a provision that a Board member of any class could participate in hearings or appeals without regard to the class to which the complainant belonged" (rather than limiting membership to the employee class of the complainant).

The Judicial Committee, noting that "the Faculty Senate voted without dissent to amend the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure to allow the Judicial Committee to provide in its rules for a system of making its hearings and findings public" and that "unless any such proposed rule or amendment is deferred by majority *vote* of the Faculty Senate" it would become effective, presented such a system. The Senate did not vote to override it.

"The University Committee on Business and Rules met several times during winter quarter to consider the issue of representation in the Senate and its committee structure for persons who will be included in the new personnel appointment category called Academic Staff Professional Personnel. . . . [The administrative] document requests of Business and Rules and the Senate Consultative Committee that both committees undertake development of 'a recommendation to the Senate on the question of representation and participation of the Academic Staff in the University, and on Senate and University Committees and councils, as appropriate. . . .' We have not yet been able to resolve other questions, such as the kind of representation, or the areas or degree of representation for the new professional category, because we lack information on the

numbers of people involved and the units to which they are or will be appointed." Business and Rules promised to return next year with a recommendation.

May 14, 1981

The Committee on Faculty Affairs moved that "the Senate reaffirm its support for the current defined contribution retirement plan as the primary retirement plan of the faculty and, in so far as is consistent with the continuation of that plan, adopt in principle" several improvements. The Senate approved.

The Committee on Educational Policy reported that it had adopted a policy on associate degrees and forwarded it to the Regents for approval; it recommended "the following guidelines be adopted by the Regents for implementation by all units of the University as policy for awarding associate degrees: 1. Programs using the term "Associate" in their title should encompass the equivalent of at least six full-time quarters, thereby requiring at least 90 credits of work" and more.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported that the president "and the Regents approved, a budget request for a 31% increase over the biennium (17% the first year, 14% the second). SCFA was pleased with the University's position that increasing faculty salaries would be their top priority item. The Legislature has not acted at this writing." (In the abstract of the discussion, " President Magrath expressed great disappointment and frustration that the committee would not move ahead with any salary increase requests for faculty and staff. He said the governor had not yet made a recommendation, and he believed that the legislative judgment was the outcome of two factors: first, the fiscal crisis in the state, and second, the committee's view that, if it took action on the University request at this point, a "floor" would be set for all other state systems engaged in collective bargaining. It appeared that the decision would be made in the fall, he said."

December 3, 1981

The Committee on Educational Policy offered recommendations on inloading, which were approved, that included "(2) The University should pursue a policy of integrating the curricular offerings of day school, Extension, and the Summer Session, with increasing responsibility lodged in the colleges and departments. (3) Since there is no necessary connection between outreach and inloading of instruction, the two issues should be separated. (4) The University should not make significant reductions in opportunities for faculty members to receive additional compensation for overload teaching, especially in a time of declining real income for the faculty."

The Senate approved a new bylaw: "Committees of the Senate shall have a policy of open meetings. Closed or executive sessions may be held only after approval by a two-thirds majority of the committee members present and voting and only when personnel matters are discussed, when quasi-judicial functions are carried out, or when closed sessions are required to protect the rights of individuals."

The Finance Committee reported it had been discussing the fact that "on October 21, the Governor requested the President to present plans for an 8-12% reduction in state funds during the current biennium. This was estimated to be from \$37-57 million." "Of major importance was the committee's concern that consultation on budget adjustments to meet emergency situations was proving very difficult. She said that her committee, involved as it was in the ongoing planning process, had been concerned about problems arising when a decision by one unit would precipitate budget problems in other units. . . . The Consultative and Finance Committees have been working with central administration on criteria for establishing priorities. When it is time for decisions, she said, there will be subgroup of the two committees to meet with the administration about those criteria and then it will meet with the budget executive to review the first setting of program priorities. . . . A principal feature of the consultative sessions has been the continued emphasis on the primacy of faculty salary needs. . . . Vice President Keller had made it clear that he wanted to separate the long-range planning effort from the actions to be taken to meet the current crisis. He noted there was some concern that the public perceives that the University has not made any dramatic statement about cuts as other systems have done." One senator "advised that a recent newspaper statement alluding to layoffs of tenured faculty should be corrected. Vice President Keller said that statement had been the reporter's conclusion about what was likely to happen if the Governor's proposal went into effect. He emphasized, however, that there was a serious possibility that the University would be forced to take such action in view of the fact that about 78 percent of the University budget is for 'people.'"

The president presented his policy agenda, which included salaries, retrenchment, institutional planning, collective bargaining, the Rajender consent decree, reorganization of Academic Affairs, and graduate program reviews.

One senator introduced a motion: "That the Senate approve the following resolutions:

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs is the Chief Academic Officer of the University under the President.
2. The Vice President for Health Sciences reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on academic matters.
3. When a new Vice President for Health Sciences is appointed, this officer shall not be a member of the Budget Executive.
4. Any plans to create a new vice presidency at the University shall be submitted to the Senate for its recommendation before the post is established."

He said that "it was an appropriate time to examine the relationship of the health sciences vice president with the academic affairs vice president. He called for uniform application of academic standards throughout the University by a single person and added that an administrator serving a particular constituency should not be a member of the budget executive." The Senate approved the resolution 71-50 after considerable debate.

February 18, 1982

The Finance Committee reported that "the budget balancing bill passed by the legislature in January reduced the expected University appropriation (through June 30, 1983) by \$19.6 million in the general operating fund and \$6 million in salary increases. . . . In response to the decreased state appropriation, the president has recommended an additional tuition increase of 13%,

beginning in the summer of 1982. Thus, the fall 1982 tuition rates will be 23% greater than the rates for fall 1981. . . . The budget cuts scheduled in academic programs are directly related to the planning that has been done in the collegiate units. Programs assigned low priority will be reduced to size and scope or in some cases, phased out. No involuntary termination of tenured faculty is planned. . . . In the month of December, the Senate Finance Committee joined with the Senate Consultative Committee in a series of five meetings on the subject of anticipated budget cuts and related matters. . . . The Finance Committee has had two meetings in January (and anticipates three meetings in February before the University Senate meeting) to review proposed budget cuts and program priorities for the 1982-84 budget. We have been reviewing proposed cuts in terms of how the criteria have been defined and applied. We have tried to ascertain whether these criteria have been applied appropriately. The planning and evaluation of nonacademic programs are hindered by the fact that their planning process is not well developed and it has been difficult to obtain necessary information for making budget decisions. The vice president for finance is placing considerable emphasis (within the constraints of budget) on obtaining better information for making management decisions. . . . As of this writing we are beginning to review academic program priorities. We are asking how the criteria, discussed at length during fall quarter, have been applied in making priority decisions. These were quality, connectedness, integration, demand, and uniqueness. A sixth criterion, cost-effectiveness, was also used in setting priorities. We are examining whether these criteria have been applied appropriately across units and whether proper attention has been given to the effects of decisions in one unit on programs in other units."

One senator "called attention to the projected \$6 million cut in 1982-83 faculty salary funds. He said that in 1981-82 the faculty had received its first real increase in ten years, which had raised morale and built confidence in the administration after the past few years of great degradation for the faculty. He said that improvement of faculty salaries had been a stated principle of the University, but that its policy objective should be a return, in terms of real income, to the 1972 level."

The Consultative Committee and the Finance Committee reported that "the academic units of the University have been engaged in a program planning process that began in 1979. Planning documents, originally prepared by the colleges in the summer of 1979, were modified late in 1979 and reviewed by central administration during 1980. The president sent a planning memorandum (his response to college plans) to each college late in 1980. Several colleges revised their plans again during the summer of 1981. When it was learned that the University's appropriation from the state would be reduced, the president presented a plan for reducing the budget that involved selected rather than across-the-board cuts. Nonacademic support units were assigned deeper cuts while academic units were somewhat protected. It was decided that academic cuts would be made programmatically and that the cuts would be consistent with college plans." The Finance Committee chair "explained the role of the Finance Committee in the review of program priority-setting and consultation with the budget executive and the finance vice president. Referring to 1978 as "prehistory," she said an ambitious planning endeavor was set up shortly thereafter, in which each unit submitted a planning and mission statement. At that point, reallocation became a way of life, and units were given a monetary target. The Finance Committee realized then that some program choices would have to be made." The Consultative

Committee chair "reported his committee's concern that consultation occur throughout the process."

April 6, 1982

The Senate approved an amendment to the patent policy provisions on who is to receive patent income.

The agenda was short; following the meeting there was a forum sponsored by the Consultative Committee and the Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA). "During the past few weeks the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has been discussing, in addition to other matters, a policy statement regarding faculty salaries. Tentatively the Committee has concluded that the minimum long-range goal should be restoration of faculty salaries to the competitive position they occupied relative to other professional salaries during the early seventies, when faculty salaries began their serious erosion. How much salaries would have to be increased to attain this goal has not yet been determined." Given inadequate state funding for faculty salaries, "SCFA began to explore the desirability and feasibility of generating additional 1982-83 salary increase monies through further retrenchments or tuition increases. SCFA soon realized that it did not have sufficient information to recommend intelligently how much, if any, additional monies should be generated from these sources. It also recognized that drastic changes have occurred in economic conditions and the state's financial condition since the Committee established its salary increase goal for the current biennium. . . . Later this year SCFA intends to seek Senate endorsement of a long-range faculty salary goal that will serve as a basis for legislative requests and a factor to be considered in any internal reallocations, if necessary to achieve that goal." After considerable discussion, "a straw vote was taken, with senators asked whether they would favor a retrenchment in 1982-83 to provide further faculty salary monies. With the exception of a few votes, the Senate voted against further retrenchment.

One senator "inquired about recent news that the Board of Regents had received from a subcommittee of the Social Concerns Committee a recommendation with respect to divestment of stock in companies doing business in South Africa, which that subcommittee had referred to Vice President for Finance Fred Bohlen. Mr. Holt questioned the propriety of a body of the Senate bypassing the Senate and urged that the president inform the Board at its next meeting that the Senate had not yet acted."

One senator "asked the president what the prospects were for participation of the unionized faculties at Duluth and Waseca, whose relationship with the Senate had been suspended. He asked whether another opinion could be sought on the interpretation of the Public Employment Labor Relations Act (PELRA), under which the suspension took place. President Magrath reminded the Senate that the students on those campuses were still participating, but he was reluctant to comment further at the moment because the bargaining agent had identified governance as one of the critical factors in negotiations. He maintained the suspension was legally justified under PELRA, but said no one wished more than he for a clarification of the governance issue."

May 20, 1982



The Senate approved 117-0 elimination of the Committee on Liberal Education and dispersal of its responsibilities to the academic affairs vice president and the Committee on Educational Policy.

The Committee on Social Concerns reported at length on the recommendation to divest University ownership in companies doing business in South Africa and affirmed that any future recommendations would come to the Senate through the Consultative Committee.

The Senate Consultative Committee brought a draft Financial Emergency Interim Procedures (because the revision of the tenure policy approved in 1973 had never been adopted because of collective bargaining issues). Tenured faculty members could be dismissed only after a declaration of financial emergency. The existing tenure policy, dating from 1945 and amended since, was vague. "It is quite brief and lacks any detailed description of procedures to be followed in declaring and implementing a financial emergency.

"Throughout the year we have faced a series of financial crises. We have so far successfully averted a declaration of financial emergency, and of course hope to continue to avoid it. Some believe that it is bad for morale even to consider the possibility. However, we have had to consider the possibility. There are very few procedural safeguards of faculty rights in the 1945 document, and we believe that it is also bad for morale to remain uncertain about the procedures that would be followed and the ways in which faculty rights would be protected in the event that a declaration of financial emergency became necessary." So a subcommittee of FCC drafted a lengthy set of interim procedures, which were presented for discussion.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs introduced a new sick leave and family leave policy, which the Senate approved.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs also introduced a long-term faculty salary improvement objective. "During the last ten years University of Minnesota faculty salaries in real dollars have decreased drastically. Table I shows that this decrease has amounted to a loss of nearly 20% over the decade. Salaries in the Fall of 1982 will be 80.1% of the Fall 1972 level. Other professional groups have experienced a loss of purchasing power over the same period, but no group has lost as much purchasing power as the University faculty. . . . This substantial dilution of faculty salaries has made it more and more difficult for the University to attract and maintain quality faculty in many areas." The Committee thus recommended that "the Faculty Senate recommends that the University of Minnesota Regents adopt, as its top priority, the following policy for improvement of faculty salaries:

1. That yearly faculty salary adjustments include a 'normal' component which represents both the increase in the cost of living and the real growth in the economy.
2. That, in addition to the normal component of the salary adjustment, faculty salary increases include an annual augmentation for the purpose of bringing salaries in real dollars to the Fall 1972 level. Furthermore, the augmentation component should be adequate to meet the following minimal goals:

Date	Salary Level
------	--------------

Fall 1984	88% of Fall 1972 level
Fall 1986	92% of Fall 1972 level
Fall 1988	96% of Fall 1972 level
Fall 1990	100% of Fall 1972 level"

The Faculty Senate approved.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs also brought an amendment to the consulting policy on language that often been contested, to change "The full-day equivalence of activities carried out in a series of fractional-day blocks shall be computed by dividing the total number of hours expended by twelve" to "Faculty members who engage in activities less than a day shall report the fraction of the day devoted to those activities." The Committee recommended approval of the policy, which had been suspended since 1975 because of the cease-and-desist order related to collective bargaining, now lifted. "The change SCFA suggests would not define a day as twelve hours or any other number of hours. The Board of Regents has questioned the use of twelve hours; eight hours has been suggested as a possible alternative. To use eight hours would ignore the fact that regular University duties often cause faculty members to work more than eight or even twelve hours a day. To use any number of hours may result in differential treatment of full days (how many hours?) and fractional consulting days. The proposed treatment would permit each faculty member to define a full day in terms of his or her individual work habits."

In its third interim report, the Finance Committee informed the Senate: "The 1982-83 spending reductions will range from \$0.57 million in one college to none in one college. The average spending reduction will be 2.7%; the highest will be 11.3%. Reductions in the budget base of the colleges will range from \$0.43 million in one to none in three colleges. The average base reduction will be 1.6%; the highest will be 11.3%. The Finance Committee did not participate in setting the criteria whereby college reductions were made but did discuss these criteria at length with Vice President Keller. Reductions were assigned after considering the planning targets established in the president's November 1980 memo to each college and certain 'workload/productivity' factors. The latter included the hours each week that the ranked faculty is in the classroom, the numbers of ranked faculty, the student credit hours taught to graduate and undergraduate students, the numbers of M.S. and Ph.D. degrees awarded in 1979-81, the 'outside' dollars obtained for sponsored programs and the proportion of faculty salaries paid by 'outside' funds. . . . The Committee is currently analyzing budget reductions within the colleges, looking for overall trends and compatibility with planning."

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) reported it had met 17 times during the year, 8 of those times with the President, and in addition it met 8 times jointly with the Senate Finance Committee in meetings "which focused on the impact on the University of the state's financial crisis, and the process of program prioritizing within the collegiate and support units, and the process between the units and the budget executive."

SCC also reported: "Twin Cities Assembly Calendar Committee reported finding interest in a change to a semester system" so SCC created a "Special Committee on the All-University Calendar." The chair of the Calendar Committee presented "a progress report from the special University-wide committee that was reviewing the University calendar. Mr. Vesley reported that

the Calendar Committee itself had discovered that the majority of faculty and students surveyed did not favor an early start, but found there was some interest in such a move if the switch were made from quarters to semesters. However, the special committee discovered that there was insufficient dissatisfaction with the quarter system to recommend a change at present."

SCC noted the implications of state budget reductions: "(a) Appeals process for decisions on reduction, reorganization, and elimination decisions made in program prioritizing. The SCC was asked by individual units and by central offices to consider serving as an appeals body. The committee declined, believing itself too uninformed about the body of evidence relevant to each case. It instead recommended that, for a unit whose relevance clearly transcends college lines, the budget executive as a whole serve as a review panel. . . . (b) Faculty salaries. While affirming the priority of faculty salary improvement, the SCC opposed in principle additional tuition increases for '82-'83 beyond those already recommended to the Regents, out of attention to the principle of accessibility and in anticipation that greater tuition hikes in one year might well prove counterproductive by lowering enrollment."

"11. SEARCH PROCESS FOR A VICE PRESIDENT FOR HEALTH SCIENCES. President Magrath asked the Consultative Committee to recommend six faculty members and one student member to the search committee, and accepted the subsequent recommendations. The FCC was among the groups to interview the final candidate for the position and submit its assessment to the president."

One senator "asked the president for clarification of recent publicity concerning a research project at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs in which a large corporation had an interest and had had prior review of the study. She asked whether there had been any constraints on the rights of the faculty member conducting the research to publish. President Magrath said there had been no abridgement of academic freedom, that the work of the faculty member was still in process and had not been interfered with by the corporation. He added that an internal faculty mechanism had been set up to provide peer review of projects."

November 18, 1982 University Senate (1)

The president presented his policy agenda, which included the 1983-85 biennial request, the 1983-85 capital request, construction of University hospitals, planning activities, adoption of collective bargaining agreements, graduate program reviews, and completion of task force reports. "As part of an experiment in joint Senate/administration policy analysis, a committee was appointed to recommend steps that will facilitate the scholarly activities of the faculty."

The Consultative Committee brought lengthy recommendations for change in the policy and the statement of principles on the use of human subjects in research. Amendments were proposed but withdrawn or defeated and the changes approved.

The Planning Committee brought motions for action: "Each academic program to be reviewed shall be given the opportunity to see information that pertains to it and to supply any additional information judged to be important" and "All collegiate units of the University should establish for the second planning cycle a faculty and student group that represents the faculty and students

during all aspects of the planning cycle. . . . Each group should play an important role in the ranking of programs within its unit and in the establishment of priorities" and "In the future round of planning, central administration should only accept collegiate unit plans derived using procedures consistent" with the preceding two motions. The Senate approved.

The Finance Committee reported that it had examined budget plans for the colleges "to see what portion of reductions were to come from low priority programs and what other type of reductions were made. . . . The frequent meetings held this year did indeed improve the timeliness of consultation. Vice President Keller, chairman of the budget executive, was in attendance and consulting with the committee for 28 of the 29 meetings. We commend him for his commitment to consultation."

There was discussion about the relationship between offers made to the bargaining agent (as reported in the press) and salary proposals for the other campuses.

#### November 18, 1982 Faculty Senate (1)

FCC reported on a resolution it had adopted (and sent to the president and Board of Regents) "urging them to continue resistance to equalization of salary norms in the Duluth negotiations and not to submit that issue to binding arbitration." FCC was concerned that decisions remain based on merit and equity and comparison with appropriate and not settled by an outside arbitrator.

#### February 17, 1983 University Senate (2)

The Business and Rules Committee "proposes that the constitution be revised to allow academic professional staff on fixed terms of three (two) or more years, probationary, or continuous appointment full Senate membership. Such individuals would be eligible to vote for senators, serve as senators, and serve on Senate committees. They would also be counted in determining unit representation. The academic professional staff would participate in Senate elections as members of their academic units rather than as a new unit of academic professionals. Academic professional staff working in units not represented in the current Senate would not be included under the proposed changes." The committee asked for comment.

The Finance Committee reported: "In general, the 1983-85 O&M budget and 1983 capital requests appear to be well done and well supported. Our committee felt that, in principle, both were consistent with immediate University needs and future priorities. At the same time, they recognize the State's stringent budget situation. Similarly the biennial salary request for the next biennium (8% for 1983-84 and 9% for 1984-85) is consistent with University Senate action, with the principles of recapturing purchasing power lost by faculty in the 1970s, with modest recognition of some critical market and retention phenomena and with the State's critical budget situation." It also reported on retrenchment and fiscal planning.

The Senate approved two motions: "That the Senate approve the following resolution: That the University Senate considers the Military Selective Service Act of 1982 [(Section 1113a, Section 12), which requires all male applicants for financial aid to declare whether they have registered

for the draft; if not, they shall be ineligible for any Federally-based financial aid. This law takes effect July 1, 1983. J to violate the Constitutional protections and academic freedoms of students, and hereby declares its opposition to this law and its enforcement" and "That the University Senate commends the University administration for taking legal action against the enforcement of this law."

The Consultative Committee and the Planning Committee reported on "responses from deans and provosts on involving students and faculty in the consultative process to be followed in second-cycle planning, as requested by the University Senate at its November 18, 1982, meeting"; each college provided a report.

"The Consultative Committee asked the president to comment on three budget matters: the current budget retrenchment, the status of the second planning cycle, and the prospects at the Legislature for the University's 1983-85 request.

"With respect to the first, President Magrath indicated he hoped that the University was in the final stage of retrenchment for this fiscal year, that the biennium couldn't end soon enough for him. He pointed out that the University had lost \$32 million from its base during the past biennium, including a fiscal 1983 midyear retrenchment of \$3.6 million. The latter cut had to be made on short notice so there was not time to permit decisions consistent with the planning process. . . .

"In regard to 1983-85, he predicted that the state's economy would remain 'soft' for the foreseeable future and that the University must of necessity share in the pain."

The president said it was too early to tell on the biennial request.

#### February 17, 1983 Faculty Senate (2)

The Faculty Senate approved a motion "that the Faculty Senate hereby encourages faculty members to cooperate fully with the Senate Judicial Committee, both in the form of oral testimony during hearings and in the form of written information during the hearing process."

#### May 5, 1983 University Senate (3)

#### May 5, 1983 Faculty Senate (3)

Business and Rules recommended Academic Professional representation in the Senate; those "holding continuous, probationary, or fixed terms of two years' or more length"; those eligible "would be eligible to vote for senators in their unit" and "would count in the allocation of seats to the respective units" and those eligible for the Senate "may serve on committees of the Senate. For purposes of committee membership quotas, academic professionals will count as faculty members." They would not be eligible for Faculty Senate committees. The Senate approved.

SCC recommended a change in the rule about open meetings, which were to be closed only on a two-thirds vote for judicial or personnel matters: "As an exception to this rule, the Faculty Consultative Committee is granted the right to close a portion or all of a given meeting, after approval by a two-thirds majority of its members," with guidelines. It would not be permitted to do so beyond 1985-86 without explicit approval of the Senate. The chair explained that "the FCC has discovered after considerable experimentation that at times it cannot discharge

effectively *some* of its consultative (as opposed to its steering and executive) duties and responsibilities in open meetings." The FCC chair commented that "30 years ago the Senate had had a committee that met periodically with the president with no reporters present, and that continued for 28 years," then "two years ago the constitution and bylaws were changed to require all Senate committees to notify the Minnesota Daily of their meetings and to meet in open session, except for discussion of judicial or personnel matters. Since then Daily reporters have attended meetings of the Faculty Consultative Committee with the president." FCC voted "to close its next meeting so it could take up matters related to legislative concerns, and a useful exchange took place with Vice President Kegler." FCC did so again in March to take up "rapidly developing events and pressures related to the University's biennial request and certain leadership problems within the University would have been discussed. The committee's concern was that a story in the Daily on the day following would *have* been premature." The Daily challenged the action; FCC asked the University counsel for an opinion. The reply was that the Minnesota open meeting law had been interpreted to include governing boards and commissions and some of their committees but it had not been extended to advisory or consulting groups: 'It is my opinion that the Minnesota Open Meeting Law, MS S471.705, does not require Faculty Consultative Committee meetings to be open to the public.' The chair concluded that "there are matters that the 10 elected faculty members of the committee thought needed to be talked about; however, they found they were unable to do so because, before any committee member raised a topic, she said, she or he must ask themselves if a discussion of that topic in the Daily the next day would do more harm than good and, if the answer is yes, then the topic could not be raised." The executive committee of the local AAUP chapter opposed the proposal. After prolonged debate, the Senate approved 114-39, thus approving a bylaw change.

The Services for the Handicapped Committee made a series of 11 recommendations "for policy that will offer needed and appropriate direction to University efforts to provide access to persons with handicaps. The Committee believes that these recommendations meet policy development needs that have increased in significance over the last several years as a result of improvements in access for students with handicaps." The committee provided a long report; the Senate approved the recommendations.

#### May 19, 1983 University Senate (4)

The Research Committee introduced two motions: "1. That the dean of the Graduate School and the vice president for academic affairs immediately address the crisis of limited computer accessibility; and 2. That the search for a director of the University Computer Services should be a national one.

"The Senate Committee on Research has heard from a number of faculty members about the crisis in computing accessibility and use at the University. The dean of the Graduate School has also reported to the committee that, in his survey of thirty departmental chairs, computer access has been identified as an impediment to research and is of grave concern to faculty. The crisis has led to:

1. cessation of certain areas of research;
2. an inability to recruit high calibre candidates to vacant positions;
3. loss of faculty to other institutions; and
4. loss of competitive position relative to other major universities."

The first motion passed; the second failed.

A Subcommittee on the Future of the Summer Session reported: "One way to integrate summer instruction with the academic year is to transform the Summer Session into a "fourth quarter." However, the summer program is very different in scope and structure from the three quarters of the regular academic year. Summer programs have also served a somewhat unique set of student needs. The subcommittee does not agree that the Summer Session should be regarded simply as a "fourth quarter. . . . The subcommittee voted unanimously to recommend a plan which calls for the vice president for academic affairs to formulate policies and procedures to enable collegiate units to establish and implement plans to inload summer instruction over the next three to five years. We also recommend that a central Summer Session office with a designated director be retained."

The Research Committee annual report: "Testimony was solicited from faculty with suggestions for improving the research environment of the University. Cumbersome patent procedures and other delays in the delivery of physical and academic support services surfaced repeatedly. Prominent researchers reported that their activities were substantially impeded by ill-conceived procedures which caused delays by otherwise competent service sectors. A crisis of major proportions is computer accessibility; this led the committee to place a motion before the full Senate to charge the administration to address the problem immediately. It was apparent in the testimony heard that, due to changes in the research climate and the nature of research support, new ways of coordinating research activities are needed. The establishment of a vice president for research is favored."

#### May 19, 1983 Faculty Senate (4)

The Tenure Committee "has devoted this year to formulating a draft of a new set of Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, starting as a basis with the proposal adopted by the Faculty Senate in May, 1973. . . . Early in the year, the Consultative Committee asked us to advise Vice President Keller concerning a hybrid A/B appointment in which the University's obligation to pay nine months' salary would be firm but its obligation to pay the other three months would be conditional upon funding. The committee saw some dangers in this proposal unless the conditional nature of this obligation were made very clear to the faculty member. . . . In February the committee learned that Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow had asked the academic units of the University to make plans for restructuring themselves without regard to the constraints of tenure and related matters. The committee wrote to the vice presidents, reminding them that no such plans could be unilaterally implemented, and calling upon them to state publicly their commitment to the University's obligations in this regard. In a joint letter to the committee, they acknowledged the University's tenure obligations and they have since publicly stated that there is no intention to undermine tenure at this University."

One senator "noted that the Research Committee annual report included a recommendation that a vice president for research be appointed. He said that, although the University community loves the individual vice presidents, he was not sure that it wanted more of them. He asked whether the committee had considered any alternatives. The president offered assurances that there would be continuing consultation between the Research Committee and central administration.

The chair of SCC, Patricia Swan, addressed the Senate at her last meeting:

Universities are facing a decade of major change and declining resources, she predicted, and, while the faculties of most institutions are not actively engaged in determining the direction of change, either because they have turned their backs on the decisions or because they have been excluded from the decisions, such is not the case at the University. She said the faculty has chosen to spend, for the past two years, grueling hours deciding which programs and functions must cease in order that other programs would remain strong. She called the process "painful and demoralizing" but said such decisions had to be made and that if the faculty was not willing to be involved then someone else would make the decisions. And, she said, "We know that we are the ones best able to understand the relative quality and importance of our programs." She noted that the job was not yet finished, that a few units do not have thoughtful and workable plans and in a few cases agreement has not been reached between faculty and administrators or between departmental and college faculty groups. . . . She praised the faculty for its willingness to spend the time and make the decisions, and said that in some places where cuts had originated with administrators the faculty had had an opportunity to suggest alternatives. Direction as to where the cuts that were mandated by budget realities would fall within the academic programs was greatly aided by planning groups at all levels. She cited the hundreds of hours spent by the faculty in departmental decision-making collegiate decisions, and faculty governance committees. Of the latter, Consultative Committee members have spent over 100 hours with that committee alone.

November 17, 1983 University Senate (1)

The president's Policy Agenda was presented, which included a recommendation that "1983-84 faculty salary increases be distributed on a merit basis. The Board of Regents approved the recommendation, requesting that an analysis of the actual increases be undertaken sometime during the academic year." It reported that "the Regents also approved a Presidential recommendation that called for the creation of a special \$900,000 faculty salary augmentation fund. The fund has been divided into three components: \$300,000 to address individual retention cases; \$300,000 to reward programs or departments of recognized national quality; and \$300,000 to ameliorate the most serious cases of salary disparity between certain groups of professors and their colleagues at other universities or in non-academic positions. The distribution plan has been reviewed and endorsed by Senate groups, deans, and central administrators." There were also a series of task force reports that were in progress or completed as part of the third planning cycle, to be started in the fall: Higher Education and the Economy of the State, Graduate Education and Research, International Education, Student Experience, Computation and Communication Technology, and Facilitating Scholarly Activities of the Faculty.

SCC reported that the previous year it "met 28 times, of which four were joint meetings with the Senate Finance Committee. Eight meetings were held with the President and with Vice Presidents who accompanied the President at his invitation. Most of the SCC's meetings, including eleven with central administrative officers, were given over to discussion of University planning and budgeting."



Questions to the president were these: "In view of the fact that you consented to have an administrative review of your performance as President after you had been at the University for five years, do you think that it would be appropriate to have another administrative review now that you are in your tenth year as President?" and "In the Senate meeting November 18, 1982, you provided information on the 1980-81 9-month average cash salaries for comparable faculty groups at each campus. 1. Please update that comparison with figures for 1981-82, 1982-83 and, if possible, 1983-84. 2. Please compare salaries at the various campuses with those in the State University system over, say, the last four years." In response to the first, President Magrath reported that "it was certainly appropriate to undertake the review and said that he had been stimulated by the inquiry to ask the Regents to approve it, which they had done." The requested salary data were provided by Vice President Keller.

#### November 17, 1983 Faculty Senate (1)

"The Tenure Committee will be bringing a proposed complete revision of the University rules relating to faculty tenure to the Faculty Senate in winter quarter. Faculty Senate meetings will be scheduled every two weeks, beginning Thursday, January 19. Section by section consideration of the proposed draft will begin at that time. . . . The present Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure were adopted in 1945. They are relatively brief. In many respects they are either inadequate or have been overtaken by events. . . . In the early 1970's, the University Committee on Tenure began preparation of a new Tenure Code to replace the existing Regulations. This draft Code was the subject of substantial debate in the Faculty Senate from 1971 to 1973. When the final version was presented in 1972-73, the Senate spent 13 full sessions debating and amending it. The draft was adopted on May 31, 1973. It was then sent to the Board of Regents for their consideration. Before the Regents could consider the proposal, collective bargaining petitions were filed and a 'cease and desist' order was issued to the University. That suspended consideration of the proposed Code for more than seven years. After the collective bargaining elections were held, it was apparent that further revisions in the draft Code were necessary. The draft was withdrawn from the Regents and re-referred to the University Committee on Tenure. . . . The most frequently discussed parts of the new draft deal with the termination of faculty appointments in exceptional circumstances."

The executive committee of the AAUP chapter opposed the process. "In view of the complexity of the proposed revision of the Tenure Code, and in light of the disparate questions which are addressed in the proposed revision, the University of Minnesota AAUP urges that the University should not adopt an entire new code at this time, but rather should address individually any changes which are required in the existing tenure code. . . . The tenure regulations should be simple, consisting of general statements of principle. The proposed complex structure of precise, detailed rules simply invites a search for loopholes and a gradual adaptation of administrative practice to fit around the rules. . . . We do not think that ordinary programmatic change should be a basis for dismissing tenured faculty. . . . The AAUP Executive Committee is divided, however, as to whether or not there might be urgent financial circumstances in which tenured faculty might have to be let go, and in which it would obviously be better to decide whom to fire on programmatic grounds, rather than on any other grounds. If this were to be permitted in the revised tenure code, further definition of these circumstances would be required."

FCC's annual report noted that a "dinner meeting was held with the Board of Regents in November [presumably 1982]. At this meeting the quality of the University was discussed in light of national ratings of graduate programs, the numbers of undergraduate and graduate students, the competition for top faculty, and the expectations of the community regarding the University's role in development of high-technology business in Minnesota."

FCC also reported it had "pressed the administration to follow Senate guidelines in establishing search committees for major administrative positions; the committee expressed concern that the guidelines may have been violated in a case or two during the year" and that it had "pressed for an active policy on the periodic evaluation of administrators; there is a new policy conveyed in the summer of 1983 from Academic Affairs to deans, directors, and department heads."

#### February 9, 1984 Faculty Senate

First meeting: Amendments to the tenure policy. "The revision of the University Regulations Concerning Faculty was mailed to all University faculty members in January." The letter from the Tenure Committee began: "Dear Colleagues: The Tenure Committee presents for your consideration a complete revision of the University Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure. We believe that the Senate should recommend adoption of these Regulations to the Board of Regents. Early this Fall, we distributed copies of an earlier draft revision widely on campus" and revised it in light of the comments.

#### February 16, 1984 University Senate (2)

The Social Concerns Committee moved "that the existing administrative procedures of the University Consolidated Fund Drive be changed to permit payroll deductible contributions for organizations in addition to the United Way of St. Paul and Minneapolis and the Student Aid Fund. Decisions as to which organizations to include and procedures for the conduct of the Consolidated Fund Drive are to abide by" policies set out in the motion. The Senate approved.

The president was congratulated on the appointment of a new football coach (Lou Holtz) but it was noted that the "mass media have implied that a generous commitment of funds for athletic facilities has been made. While it is well recognized that our athletic facilities are in need of improvement, it is of concern, to those of us who teach in the trenches, as to what impact any such commitments will have on building capital improvements which are currently scheduled." The president said there would be none.

The School of Nursing raised questions about faculty salary allocations and the process used to make decisions.

The Senate Research Committee moved approval of a grant to a faculty member "with the Ministry of Planning for Panama through the United Nations Development Program be allowed despite restrictive language in the Instrument of Agreement. " The Research Committee had voted 5-4 to approve it. "The favorable vote was based on the assurance . . . that the agreement between the principals does not call for secrecy despite the instrument's language. The reason for

the 4 dissenting votes was a recognition that the signing of an instrument with no intention to abide by it was an improper act."

The chair of the Educational Policy Committee "advised that before any action relative to task force reports was taken, their findings and recommendations should come to the appropriate committee of the Senate. He cited several such reports, namely those from the Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy of the State; the Task Force on the Student Experience; the Task Force on International Education; the Task Force on Remedial Skills; the Task Force on the Library School; and the Subcommittee on the Future of the Summer Session. In effect, he said, 'We are overrun by initiatives of groups other than our own.'"

#### February 23, 1984 Faculty Senate

Second meeting: Amendments to the tenure policy.

#### March 5, 1984 Faculty Senate

Third meeting: Amendments to the tenure policy.

#### April 5, 1984 Faculty Senate

Fourth meeting: Amendments to the tenure policy.

#### April 19, 1984 University Senate (3)

A student senator asked "why the men's athletic program had had to make financial contributions for the women's programs over the past several years." Vice President Keller "said it was not true that the funding had taken place over several years; this would be the first year. In the past the Legislature had supported the women's program, but this year in accordance with the priorities that the University had taken to the Legislature, such support was not listed, so an internal transfer was necessary so the University would be in compliance with Title IX (Federal) requirements."

#### April 19, 1984 Faculty Senate

#### April 26, 1984 Faculty Senate

Fifth meeting: Amendments to the tenure policy.

#### May 3, 1984 Faculty Senate

Sixth meeting: Amendments to the tenure policy.

#### May 17, 1984 University Senate (4)

SCC and the Committee on Faculty Affairs brought three motions: "That the Senate endorse the Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment"; "That the Senate endorse the Procedures for Handling Complaints of Sexual Harassment Against Academic Staff"; and "That the Senate endorse the three recommendations contained in the Report of the Subcommittee on Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures." The policy noted federal law and institutional responsibilities and also cautioned that "consenting romantic and sexual relationships between faculty and student, or between supervisor and employee, while not expressly forbidden, are generally deemed very unwise. . . . The respect and trust accorded a professor by a student, as well as the power exercised by the professor in giving praise or blame, grades, recommendations for further study and future employment, etc., greatly diminish the student's actual freedom of choice should sexual favors be included among the professor's other, legitimate, demands. Therefore, faculty are warned against the possible costs of even an apparently consenting relationship, in regard to the academic efforts of both faculty member and student." The Senate approved the policy, the very long procedures, and the very long recommendations of the subcommittee.

### May 17, 1984 Faculty Senate (3)

The Committee on Faculty Affairs recommended "beginning July 1, 1985, a faculty member on leave without pay will receive no contributions from the University toward retirement benefits. Faculty members on partial leave of not more than 50 percent time will receive these contributions in direct proportion to the extent of their appointment." Exceptions were identified. The Senate approved.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs also presented three motions related to disability income "if a faculty member should become totally disabled for four months . . . he/she would receive a monthly income equal to 60% of monthly salary, not to exceed \$3,250 per month. . . . The eight disabled faculty who were adversely affected by the \$1 ,000 maximum set in 1968 and the \$2,000 maximum set in 1977 have their benefit level adjusted under the proposed \$3,250 maximum. . . . [and] Henceforth, that the appropriate maximum covered salary should be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs every two years. The next study should be made in 1985-86." The Senate approved.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs offered recommendations on "regularizing" instruction: "Protecting Individual Faculty Rights" and "Insuring Collaborative Processes." The prospect of declining enrollments has led University administrators to consider new ways of maintaining revenue levels and the University's commitment to a broad and diverse set of course offerings. These administrators have been weighing the advisability of folding summer session and 'for credit' extension classes into the regular course offerings of colleges. . . . These credit hours receive little, if any, state subsidy. However, by "regularizing" these same course offerings the hope is that state funding will follow." The Senate approved.

A "SCFA Sub-Committee on 1983-84 Performance Review and Salary Adjustments" provided a lengthy narrative and statistical report on faculty salaries and provided recommendations: "1) The Office of Academic Affairs should be encouraged to move forward with their plans to monitor faculty salary compensation. The SCFA should routinely be provided information about the process and outcomes of their efforts.

2) The negative association between length of service and salary increase should be further investigated to determine the true mediating variable(s) for the association signifies that this University may have some problems along one or more dimensions (e.g., faculty vitality, age discrimination, "all-merit" allocations that are, at least partly, "need" and/or "market" allocations, etc.).

3) Current efforts to keep the faculty "vital" should focus importantly on the faculty already here rather than rely upon schemes to bring in new faculty as a solution.

4) If allocations of percentage salary increase are to be made partially on a "need" basis and/or on a "market" basis (both of which may be defensible considerations in salary allocation policy), then this should be made explicit and the term "all-merit" as a descriptor of the allocation process should be avoided; it adds unnecessary insult to injury for those who fare poorer than others, not because they are less "meritorious" but because they are not as "needy" or "marketable."

The Senate Judicial Committee reported "two recurring issues were discussed at length with the President. The first issue was that of ensuring witness cooperation at hearings. . . . The second problem area was that of non-compliance with presidential decisions." The committee reported a procedure for compliance with the president's decision. "It is understood that in Judicial Committee grievance cases, the President will explicitly state, in his letter of decision, and expectation and intention of compliance by all parties concerned, and will request the appropriate administrative officers within the academic unit to send in writing the statement of their intent and specific actions to implement the corrective actions that the President has requested within three weeks" and that the president would take action against those who did not carry out their responsibilities.

#### May 24, 1984 Faculty Senate

Seventh meeting: Amendments to the tenure policy.

#### June 7, 1984 Faculty Senate

Eighth meeting: Approval of the tenure policy.

#### November 15, 1984 University Senate (1)

The Student Academic Support Services Committee, with the endorsement of SCC, reported on standards for financial aid for students: "The standards require that students complete a prescribed number of credits within a quarter academic year with a minimum grade point average (GPA). Additionally, it is expected that students will complete their educational objectives (e.g., degree, certificate) within the prescribed eligibility periods." And much more.

The SCC chair John Howe, chair of "the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, opened his discussion by observing that he had known there was increased interest but that he had not expected such a turnout. He reminded the Senate that the deadlines for receiving nominations was at hand and said his committee had 390 names, many of which were strong candidates."

A faculty senator (Patricia Swan, former FCC chair) moved that "In order to achieve the following objectives: 1. To encourage students to focus their efforts on those parts of the University's governance structure in which their contributions can be most fruitful—on committees at all levels of the system, in the campus assemblies, and in their own student government institutions. 2. To change the composition of the University Senate to eliminate the student representatives, except for the student body presidents of the five campuses; to abolish the Faculty Senate, whose functions will be taken over by the University Senate; and, through these reforms, to provide a governance structure (the University Senate) in which the voice of the *faculty* can be heard more clearly," the constitution and bylaws be amended accordingly.

Until 1969, the main governance structures at the University were the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee. In 1969, two additional structures were grafted on—the University Senate and the Senate Consultative Committee—so that students would be represented. At that time, too, a special effort was made to give the students representation on the campus assemblies, on task forces, and on most committees at all levels of governance. . . . One of the purposes of this motion is to abolish the Senate Consultative Committee (the body composed of both faculty and students), leaving only the Faculty Consultative Committee. Under the existing arrangement, the faculty meet as the Faculty Consultative Committee, and then subsequently the faculty meet with the students as the Senate Consultative Committee. Administrators attend both meetings. Having to hold the *two* meetings consumes the time of both faculty and administrators. Most, if not all, members of the Faculty Consultative Committee during the past two years would agree that the FCC meetings are much more valuable to the University than are the meetings of the Senate Consultative Committee. The work of the latter tends to be "added on" or duplicative. Furthermore, one of the former chairs of the Committee recently appraised the students' contributions to the SCC discussions as "at best modest." This was a generous appraisal.

For a good number of years, faculty members have been criticizing the present format for student representation in the Senate. Lacking the background needed to deal with issues that appear on its agenda, the students do not participate very much in the debates: they offer very few "inputs" and gain little leadership experience. They encounter great difficulty in filling their seat allotments, their attendance record is poor, and they tend to vote as a bloc. When the Senate acts, we are not entitled to say that it is the voice of the faculty because more than one-third of the seats are given to students. This motion, however, permits the student body presidents of the five campuses to be members of the Senate and to participate and vote even on matters that were hitherto reserved for the Faculty Senate.

Professor Swan "expressed confidence in the faculty and asked whether it should have a clear voice in matters under its jurisdiction or, as is now the case, be indistinguishable. She said that under her proposal the Senate, including the five student heads would take up all matters, not just those pertaining to tenure and faculty affairs. She said it would be important for the Student Senate to develop students with leadership capabilities and that student time would be spent most effectively in other parts of the governance structure, which would include the assemblies and committees.

The motion debated and then referred to the SCC.

SCC reported that "In the interests of collegial communication, SCC published two newsletters: the winter issue largely described the year's agenda for a number of Senate committees, and the spring issue reported a number of actions and positions taken by the committees. . . ." In response to a number of task force reports, it also "adopted and submitted to the president a "Policy Statement Concerning Administrative Task Forces and the Senate Committee Structure." The statement reiterates SCC's advocacy of the use of special committees of the Senate in place of administrative task forces whenever possible."

#### November 15, 1984 Faculty Senate

FCC reported, for the previous year, that "No business required more careful and sustained attention than the work on the revised tenure code. FCC was among the groups which examined the draft and forwarded suggestions to the Tenure Committee in the fall of 1983. The FCC's objective was to facilitate the work of the Faculty Senate so that it could complete its work within the academic year and approve a text to forward to the administration and the Board of Regents. . . . In the summer of 1983 the FCC constituted from among the membership of the Consultative, Faculty Affairs, and Finance Committees, an *ad hoc* committee to consult with the academic vice president on the use of special faculty salary monies for the 1983-84 year. The committee's charge was to offer advice on the criteria and principles of distribution of funds for three targets: to especially meritorious departments, to departments impacted by market factors, and to individual retention cases. . . . FCC organized faculty input into the review of President Magrath's administration by the following means: the Regents' office, via a notice in the *Daily*, solicited letters from the faculty; FCC invited current and recent members of Senate committees which have substantial interaction with central administration to meet with FCC members."

#### January 24, 1985 Faculty Senate

Ninth meeting: Amendments to the tenure policy. In a memo to the Senate, Tenure Committee chair Fred Morrison explained that "the University Administration and the Board of Regents have reviewed the proposed Tenure Code which was recommended by the Faculty Senate last June 7. They have asked us to reconsider certain items and, if appropriate, to propose amendments. In the course of their deliberations, we have also found a few technical details which require further attention.

"In the course of the Regents' deliberation, two principal questions of policy emerged. One of these related to the role of service in the granting of permanent tenure. The other related to the ability of the University to take its programmatic needs into consideration in making tenure decisions. The question of the definition of service is one about which there is little controversy in substance, but much in the verbal formulation."

Senate vice chair Shirley "Clark reminded the Senate that questions of policy in the 1984 Senate document had been raised by the Regents. They had been reviewed by the Tenure Committee and explained by letter to all faculty members by that committee's chair, Fred Morrison, professor of law. The meeting's agenda, she said, would consist of the proposed

amendments developed since June, and she called attention to the rules adopted at the 1984 meeting when the Senate first took up the tenure document."

#### February 14, 1985 University Senate (2)

SCC reported that "Following Consultative Committee discussion of the motion and of related governance questions in its meetings of November 15, December 6, and January 17, including a discussion with Professor Swan, the SCC on January 17 voted 15-0 with one abstention to recommend that the Senate *not* adopt the motion." In addition, "The Senate Committee on Educational Policy considers the motion before us but one alternative, and one that does not serve the best educational interests of this scholarly community of students and faculty. We recommend that the motion being presented by Professor Swan be rejected." The motion was defeated 125-42 after lengthy debate (primarily focused on whether there was a mechanism for the faculty to clearly express its views on issues.)

SCC recommended two bylaw changes: "(2) Faculty Consultative Committee (first clause): "to meet separately, when necessary, to discuss with the president, or others, matters of [primary] concern to the faculty" and (3) Student Consultative Committee (first clause): "to meet separately, when necessary, to discuss with the president, or others, matters of [primary] concern to the student body." SCC reported that "at its meeting of January 17 voted 15-0 with one abstention in favor of the above change. Members believe the two subgroups (Faculty Consultative Committee and Student Senate Consultative Committee) should not be constrained as to what they discuss with the president or with others." (The word "primary" deleted in both cases.) The Senate approved.

The Research, Educational Policy, and Consultative Committees introduced a resolution: "Whereas the effective use of recovered indirect costs requires flexibility in furthering the research activities in the different segments of the faculty and whereas there is a strong feeling among the faculty that the different colleges should have a voice in their distribution, the Senate Committee on Research moves that the Vice President for Academic Affairs, in implementing the present flexible policy on recovered indirect costs distribution, submit a record of the distribution of recovered indirect costs to the Senate Committee on Research at the end of each fiscal year." The Senate approved.

Faculty senator Edward Ney moved that "RESOLVED, that no definitive action be taken on the possible changeover from the quarter system to the semester system until there has been adequate opportunity—after the relevant factual information has been gathered—for the Senate Consultative Committee to discuss the matter thoroughly and for the Senate to debate the issue." The Senate voted unanimously in favor.

#### April 18, 1985 University Senate (3)

The third meeting of the University Senate for 1984-85 was preceded by a University Senate Forum on the subject of the semester system.



A student senator moved that "the question of change to a semester system be submitted to a vote of the faculty as a whole and a random sample of students from each college. Be it resolved that the present state of mind of the University Senate would be not to approve the change unless the vote of the faculty and students reaches a 60 percent or greater majority in favor of the change." The motion was referred to the Consultative Committee.

#### April 18, 1985 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Faculty Affairs moved that "the question of change to a semester system be submitted to a vote of the faculty as a whole. Be it resolved that the present state of mind of the Faculty Senate would be to not approve the change unless the faculty vote reaches a 60 percent or greater majority in favor of the change." The motion was referred to the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly.

The Tenure Committee reported that "The Board of Regents has approved the new tenure code, in the form recommended by the Faculty Senate in January. It will take effect July 1. . . . In the final Senate session considering the new tenure code, the Senate instructed the Tenure Committee to adopt an interpretation of Section 7.11, dealing with the criteria for achieving tenure. The Committee . . . has recommended the following official interpretation to the Board of Regents:

The use of any factor other than teaching, research, and service in making the decision about a probationary faculty member must be specifically stated and justified at the time of the decision. This rule applies both when that factor is a criterion for judging the candidate's progress and when it is an element in establishing or modifying the standard which the faculty member should achieve."

#### May 16, 1985 University Senate (4)

A faculty senator moved that "Whereas the Board of Regents will meet on June 13-14, 1985, to review University investments in companies which do business with South Africa; . . . Be it further resolved that it is the sense of the Senate, in so far as the University's investments represent support for apartheid, that the Regents should divest out of all corporations and financial institutions doing business in or with the Republic of South Africa." The Senate voted to suspend the rules and approved 132-4-3.

The SCC report: "By June the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) will have held 18 meetings, 9 of which will have included a discussion with Dr. Kenneth Keller as Academic Vice President, Interim President, and President. One of these meetings was closed at Dr. Keller's request so that he could brief SCC on the developing draft of what was to become the "Commitment to Focus" paper and SCC could offer its comments, critique, and suggestions."

SCC reported, inter alia, that it "Discussed fundamental, interrelated aspects of governance at numerous meetings: (1) how to enhance the effectiveness of the faculty and joint faculty-student governance systems through increased participation on issues of importance to the University community; (2) how to increase Senate/Assembly influence and make it timely through informed

communication between Senate and Assembly committees and central administration; (3) how to improve faculty members' sense of representativeness and confidence in the Senate committee system through effective communications and through follow-up on implementation of Senate policy" and also that it "Received interim reports from Professor Wesley B. Sundquist, the SCC member on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, held a joint meeting with that committee midway through the search process, and received an oral report from Professor John Howe, the Advisory Committee chair, upon completion of the search. SCC is convinced the entire process was thorough, fair, and successful." It also "Discussed extensively at three meetings the 'Commitment to Focus' and ultimately endorsed the proposal with the understanding of appropriate and timely consultation on implementation. . . ." It also discussed "what evaluation should take place in 1985-86 of the experiment of non-voting, *ex-officio* membership by civil service employees on nine Senate and Assembly committees. (Civil service employees are full members on two Senate and three Assembly committees.)"

SCC "helped structure faculty and student participation in the study of whether to convert to a semester system; requested the Planning, Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, and Consultative Committees to advise the special working group; sponsored an April Senate forum on the question." At the meeting, President Keller was asked his view about semesters; "the President replied that he was comfortable with the proposal to survey faculty and students as to their sentiments and that he personally favored semesters because they provide better depth of study and good flexibility."

#### May 16, 1985 Faculty Senate

FCC "held 16 meetings, all but three of which were open. Seven included discussions with the President. Two meetings were closed to encourage complete candor in discussions on rewording sections of the tenure code to respond to regental concerns. A third meeting was closed at the request of President Keller when he invited FCC to join him in a discussion of the proposals he was developing for restructuring central administration. . . . FCC met once each quarter with the regents: the tenure code was the subject of the fall and winter meetings; the spring discussion revolved around the two questions of what it means to become a world class university and how FCC and the regents can work mutually for the greater good of the University."

The Judicial Committee provided a report on cases and indicated that in its annual meeting with the president, "a major focus . . . centered on an assessment of the effectiveness of the Judicial Committee, which depends to a great degree on the perception of its integrity and credibility. . . . Another issue that was discussed involved the *de novo* hearing in sexual harassment cases. The President urged the committee to find a way to eliminate the need for this *de novo* hearing. . . ."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported that tuition remission for faculty dependents "has not ceased to be of interest since it was killed in the Senate over a decade ago by the observation that "faculty should not be subsidized for procreation." Correspondence from Associate Vice-President for Administration and Personnel William C. Thomas indicates that the costs and possibilities are under active investigation by the administration, and that five Big Ten universities have had such a plan in effect for three years or more, four with 50% reimbursement and one with 80%, two of the five accommodating graduate as well as undergraduate study."

President Keller was asked about Department of Defense research; he responded "there was not a policy except the one banning secret research. He said it is important not to trample on the academic freedom of faculty members, and that there are areas of non-classified research that are appropriately funded. He said that the Research Committee should be informed of any areas where it is felt research should be proscribed so that the matter could be brought to the attention of the Senate, but he warned that any such recommendation should be examined carefully.

The Tenure Committee (Fred Morrison, chair) reported that it "is presently at work on a new set of procedural rules to guide departments, collegiate review committees, deans, and other administrators in making tenure decisions. These procedural rules were called for by the new regulations, and will replace the old Koeffler-Ibele memorandum. . . . After we receive comments, we will be preparing a final draft (probably early in fall quarter), which will be forwarded to the Senate for information."

#### November 14, 1985 University Senate (1)

Preceding the meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly and the University Senate there was an open forum on the University's "Commitment to Focus" as outlined by President Kenneth Keller and approved by the Regents. . . . The President commenced with background as to why the document arose and what it should accomplish. It was not created by the administration out of a vacuum, he said, but evolved through planning stimulated by the recession in the state and the longer term issue of demographic changes forecast through 1994. . . . To achieve a better balance of graduates and undergraduates, the University would become smaller. Higher quality would be the goal and ultimately the University could become among the top five of institutions of higher public education. . . . In the near future budgets would be kept constant but enrollments diminished, providing more dollars for fewer students. The investment in the University would be a good one measured by improved quality. The end product would be three undergraduates to each graduate student. He maintained that access would not be diminished." And considerably more. ("Asked which were the top five institutions, the President said there are probably 15 in the top five, including Berkeley, UCLA, Wisconsin, Michigan.")

At the Senate meeting, the president "explained that the Senate was a student-faculty body charged with recommending policy on issues that do not fall within anyone unit. It operates under the authority of the Board of Regents so actions are reported to the Board, not just to the administration. Thus, even if the President disagrees with Senate action, he must report it to the Regents. He noted that because the Senate was limited to a few meetings a year it is important to try to keep actions confined to broad issues. He said when the Senate had failed in the past it was because it had gotten involved in too much detail. The process works best, he said, when the body decides a policy issue and then turns it over to a committee for the job of filling in the details. . . . Committee effectiveness, he said, depends on the relationship with the administration and committees, that the committee structure was designed to be parallel with the administrative organization so better consultation could occur. He said it is important that when issues come up each committee with an interest should have a "crack" at them. . . . He said it would be useful to have as broad a discussion as possible by related committees on proposed policies before they are brought to the Senate, where a document can be decimated in a single session."

#### November 14, 1985 Faculty Senate (1)

The FCC chair reported that the "committee had recently met with the Board of Regents and would do so each quarter, and he said meetings with the President were scheduled regularly as an aid in selling the agenda for the Faculty Consultative Committee meetings. The committee is trying to develop a structure for participating in Regents' committee meetings and having early access to their agendas."

#### February 20, 1986 University Senate (2)

"The meeting was preceded by an open forum on *A Commitment to Focus* in which a draft report of the Special Committee on Unified and Increased Preparation Standards was discussed." A motion was presented: "That the University Senate endorse establishment of unified preparation requirements for students entering Twin Cities, Morris, and Duluth colleges of the University of Minnesota to pursue baccalaureate degrees. . . . The Special Committee on Increased and Unified Preparation Standards believes that increasing and unifying preparation standards will improve the quality of teaching and learning at the University, thus improving access to a quality education for all students." And much more. The Committee on Educational Policy offered comments.

Under New Business, a senator moved that because the implications of "the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) . . . are an acceleration of the arms race and the destabilization of the strategic balance; and, WHEREAS, the rights preserved by academic freedom need to be balanced with the recognition that the participation of University faculty in SDI research is a *de facto* political and institutional endorsement for SDI and will reflect on the University of Minnesota; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the University Senate urges the University of Minnesota to refrain from participating in research specifically for SDI." The Senate referred it to the Consultative Committee for consideration for the next meeting.

Also under New Business, a senator moved that the University Senate "supports the position taken by President Keller with regard to the charges of alleged sexual misconduct brought against certain University of Minnesota athletes in Madison, Wisconsin. In essence, the President stated that the overriding consideration in this matter must be the well-being of the victim, and the well-being and reputation of the University. The University community shares in the need to sustain that reputation with responsible, mature behavior that reflects respect and concern for others." The Senate approved with one negative vote.

#### February 20, 1986 Faculty Senate (2)

The Tenure Committee chair, Professor Fred Morrison, reported that "the Tenure Regulations require the Senate Tenure committee and the Academic Vice President to adopt procedures for departments and colleges to use in considering candidates for tenure. The Regulations require that these procedures be reported to Senate and to the Board of Regents for information, but no action by either body is required. . . . The new Procedures merely implement the requirements set forth in the Tenure Regulations themselves. The Tenure Committee has adopted them after a

long series of public hearings, the circulation of two drafts to members of the Senate, consideration of comments received in writing, in the public hearings, in a recent Senate meeting, and in individual communications with members of the committee. . . . With the adoption of these Procedures, the long process of revising the Tenure Regulations and its subsidiary documents comes to an end. The committee views the conclusion of that process with a certain degree of relief."

The Tenure Committee also reported that it was holding open hearings on two questions upon which it wished to know faculty views: " 1. Should the University seek an exception from the "open files law" which permits tenure candidates to review letters of evaluation, as well as other documents in their files? . . . 2. Should the University require outside evaluations before making tenure decisions?"

#### April 17, 1986 University Senate (3)

"The meeting was preceded by an open forum on A Commitment to Focus in which a draft report of the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus was discussed." The report offered five recommendations: "1. There should be established on the Twin Cities campus an Undergraduate Center, responsible to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. . . . 2. The Undergraduate Center and Student Support Services should be linked under Academic Affairs in such a way as to facilitate and encourage cooperative work in recruiting, prospective-student relations, admissions and records, financial aid, and other important student services. . . . 3. Major administrative responsibility for protecting and enhancing the quality of undergraduate education should be focused on a senior officer in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. . . . 4. The faculty should seek to provide in all undergraduate classes, but especially in large classes, structured experiences that promote active learning and work to lessen the anonymity that students too often encounter. . . . 5. Faculty and administrators should seriously consider establishing on the Twin Cities campus a coordinated research program in higher education." The Committee on Educational Policy offered comments.

The SCC moved to amend the bylaws so that SCC, FCC, and the Student Senate Consultative Committee "are granted the right to close a portion or all of a given meeting, after approval by a two-thirds majority of their respective members." The change would make the 3-year experiment permanent. For FCC, "its experience during this trial period has convinced the Consultative Committee of the desirability, even the necessity, of continuing its ability to close all or a part of a meeting. This ability enables FCC to begin discussions within itself and with the President on emerging or "likely" issues or problems. It permits the members to be briefed in exploratory ways that bring faculty influence to bear upon the administration at the earliest stages of planning and decision-making. It also permits all parties in the consultations to achieve a degree of candor and openness that would in some instances be difficult to sustain in a public setting. For these reasons we think that the right to close meetings, sparingly and judiciously used, is essential for maintaining the full effectiveness of the FCC's consultative role." The same logic applied to SCC and the SSCC; the motion was approved 125-13.

The Senate approved the final report of the Special Committee on Increased and Unified Preparation Requirements.

May 15, 1986 University Senate (4)

The Senate approved adding a civil service staff member to the Finance Committee and to several other committees.

The Educational Policy Committee and the Research Committee presented a motion that "indirect cost recovery funds retained by the University should be distributed as follows: 50% should be retained by central administration to support research activities, to be allocated by the Graduate School and by central administration, and the remaining 50% should be distributed on a proportionate basis to the colleges that generated these funds. Should budgetary circumstances warrant consideration of less than 50% distribution to the colleges, consultation with the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Research Committee is required." "Lengthy discussion, over a two-year period, resulted in a consensus that an equitable distribution would be: (a) no more than 50% to be retained by central administration; (b) of the remaining funds 33 1/3% should be distributed to each of the following: 1. the generating colleges, 2. the generating departments, and 3. the generating principal investigators (each in proportion to their contribution)." The Senate approved.

The Senate approved changes "in the University Policy and Procedures with Regard to Proposals for All-University International Exchange Agreements."

The Social Concerns Committee brought back a resolution on the Strategic Defense Initiative, changed the last clause to "Now, therefore, be it resolved that the University will not accept research projects or grants where the funds are identified as originating with the Strategic Defense Initiative" and recommended Senate adoption. The Committee comment observed that "a central problem is academic freedom. The original motion attempts to limit research, which is an unacceptable infringement on the rights of individual faculty members. . . . The motion as amended by the Social Concerns Committee still represents a restriction on the freedom of faculty members to seek funding from any source, and this generated protracted discussion by the committee. The minority held that each individual should have the choice to participate in this program or not. The majority considered that, as a major new weapons development project, SDI represents not only a serious escalation of the arms race but also the beginning of the irreversible militarization of space. As such it threatens society as a whole and jeopardizes the future of the human race; therefore the University as an institution should repudiate it." SCC opposed the motion 10-4. The Senate voted 79-55 against the resolution.

("A group of about 20 persons then marched to the podium with loud shouts of "SDI off campus!" and proceeded to commandeer the microphone. The President gave them one minute to vacate and when they stood their ground, two University police officers escorted them from the room, where they continued the noisy demonstration. President Keller commented that the demonstration illustrated "how justified our concern is for academic freedom on campus," and Ms. Steidl [the student senator who introduced the original motion] later expressed her concern

to professors who might look unfavorably on those who chose the wrong avenue, pointing out that not everyone chose to participate. Both statements were applauded.")

The Finance Committee reported it "had endorsed the plan to restore faculty purchasing power and it agreed to take up the proposal to fund child care. He said the charge to the committee was to work with the administration to establish criteria to develop the University budget and the biennial request, but he indicated that it had not worked this year, and that the process might have to be reviewed if the committee were to fulfill its responsibilities. President Keller admitted that the process did "slip" this year and that the whole procedure needed to get back on track.

May 15, 1986 Faculty Senate (4)

(nothing noteworthy)

June 5, 1986 University Senate (5)

The Research Committee proposed "Industry-University Interaction Guidelines" that covered monitoring, openness of research, appropriateness of research, faculty and institutional conflicts of interest, commitments of University equipment and personnel, indirect costs, and transfer of rights in discoveries. The Senate approved.

The Research Committee also recommended a revised long Patent and Technology Transfer policy. The Senate approved.

The Senate approved a change in the necrology section of the dockets to begin including students.

SCC reported that it "named a Special Committee on Governance which has studied the use this University community makes of its governance structure and which in late spring reported its discoveries and recommendations on retaining the current structure and making better use of it." The Senate accepted the report and numerous recommendations from the Special Senate Committee on Governance (SSCG).

On the role of the Senate: "A good understanding of the Senate is essential to effective use of our governance system. For in a rough sense all our other governance bodies are subsets of the Senate. SSCG strongly believes that as the most broadly represented body in the University, legislative authority correctly resides within the University Senate. The size of this body not only commands legislative power, but it also dictates the ideal format for the Senate, a forum for debate. To enable this type of discussion the Senate depends on its components to bring forward thoroughly investigated proposals. If used properly, the Senate is a useful forum to establish policy and voice concerns.

RECOMMENDATION I: Clarify the ability of all constituent bodies to deliberate on issues and to adopt or promulgate advisory resolutions on the initiative of that body, yet not claim more exclusive legislative authority than that which the Senate has delegated to it. . . . Should the need arise, the respective steering body of either the Student or Faculty Senate should ensure that there are adequate meetings for that component to form opinions.

RECOMMENDATION II: Ensure that the Senate is as discussion oriented as possible. . . ."

On communications: "Constant effort to improve communication is imperative if the governance system is to function well. All parties need to have access to the same information in order to make enlightened decisions. . . . Communications problems lie with failure on the part of committees to understand or implement their charge, to have been given historical perspective on the work of their committees, to plan agendas for the year, and to be in sufficient contact with the Consultative Committee to function in concert with other committees' activities. In addition, elected members of governance bodies apparently neither seek counsel of their constituencies or keep them adequately informed.

RECOMMENDATION I: Encourage faculty/academic professional members and students to know and understand University governance and how individuals can bring items of business to the Senate.

RECOMMENDATION II: Require that reports of Senate committees go through the Senate if action is to be taken based on those reports. The Senate cannot and must not be held responsible for actions taken on reports of its committees without having had the opportunity to discuss and vote on them.

RECOMMENDATION III: Expect and require that the Senate Consultative Committee exercise its steering function with regard to committee reports, such that conflicting reports do not go forward to central administration. . . ." And more.

The recommendations also called for orientation for committee chairs and that committee chairs have orientation for their members.

The report also made recommendations about accountability and structure, e.g., "RECOMMENDATION I: The President of the University should report to the Senate on the status of its recommendations at least once a year.

RECOMMENDATION II: The Senate Planning Committee should monitor the progress of important recommendations of the Senate and advise the President which are essential to report on to the Senate" and "SSCG felt strongly that most problems are a result of insufficient use of the present structure and are not a reflection of a structural problem.

The Minnesota tradition values consultation and participative decision-making. The chair of one important committee that met with SSCG asserted that Minnesota is known across the country for its good governance. This report reflects the desire to continue to move in that direction.

The current structure has three key strengths upon which any changes should be based: 1) the hierarchical network of committees, 2) the consultative links with the administration, and 3) mechanisms to create special committees so as to minimize the need for task forces. By enhancing the communication links between committees, assigning appropriate administrators to each committee, and insuring that committees have significant responsibilities, governance will be strengthened."

SCC reported that it "met 10 times this year. Seven of those meetings included discussions with President Keller. The chairs and co-chairs of FCC and SSCC met monthly to plan the agenda for each upcoming meeting. There were fewer meetings of the full committee and more meetings of its component parts, the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Student Senate Consultative Committee, than had been the case in recent years." It also reported that the "the letters charging the special committees to make recommendations for implementing broad aspects of Commitment to Focus were jointly signed by President Keller and sec chair Dean D. Stuthman.



The sec heard frequent reports on the work of the committees from the SCC member serving on each. . . ."

In its annual report, the Senate Finance Committee noted that "According to the Senate bylaws, the Finance Committee is to share responsibility for developing criteria according to which biennial and budgeting requests are examined and ranked, and to test the consistency of biennial requests and operating budgets against the criteria stipulated at the outset.

However, members have not found a way to bridge a gap which exists between the charge to the committee and what it is able to accomplish. The committee made repeated requests this year for the opportunity to participate in developing criteria for the 1987-89 biennial request and the 1986-87 budget and was disappointed that, although SFC was provided with a copy of the 1986-87 budget principles, strategy, and plan, the occasion did not present itself when SFC could contribute to formulating the rationale of either the budget or the legislative request. If the charge to the committee is no longer functional, we urge that representatives of the Senate and of central administration work together to clarify the role the Senate Finance Committee is to play in the governance of the University."

#### June 5, 1986 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate approved a motion from FCC: "Resolved, that the administration and the Faculty Consultative Committee jointly appoint a small committee of faculty and administrators to develop a plan for faculty development over the next decade, consistent with the University's commitment to focus and its stated goal of becoming one of the best five public universities in the country. This plan should address, possibly among other matters, (1) goals for faculty compensation, based on compensation at those schools with whom we compete for faculty and graduate students; (2) the proper size of the faculty; (3) support for faculty research and teaching, through the system of sabbatical leaves and other support; and (4) general working support—teaching loads, graduate assistants, etc."

FCC reported that it "has made new efforts this year to respond to a faculty perception of too much "top-down" decision-making and insufficient faculty voice. The FCC met 19 times in addition to the 10 meetings of the full SCC; seven of the 19 meetings included discussions with President Keller. Communication with the administration was enhanced through the innovation of monthly meetings between the FCC chair and associate chair and the president and his senior assistant."

FCC also reported that it "discussed with the president and with the search committee chair the search for an Academic Vice President and Provost, and the new scope in the job. . . . [and that it] met once each quarter with the Regents to discuss Commitment to Focus and the future of the University, especially as regards attracting and supporting the development of outstanding new faculty."

#### November 6, 1986 University Senate (1)

The President's Policy Agenda included:

1. Faculty Development Committee

2. Continuation of Planning for Commitment to Focus
3. Undergraduate Implementation Committee
4. Undergraduate Education Research Center
5. Development of Detailed Policies for Implementing New Preparation Requirements
6. Academic Program Planning Process
7. Program Budgeting
8. Administrative Reorganization
9. 1986-87 Program Reviews

Among many items, the SCC chair reported that "the [Twin Cities Campus] Faculty Assembly approved a resolution that the administration and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) jointly appoint a small committee to create a plan for faculty development to guide University planning and legislative requests over the next decade in all matters relating to faculty support . . . that will address: (1) goals for faculty compensation; (2) support for faculty research and teaching; and (3) general working support-including teaching loads, faculty-student ratio, etc."

The SCC chair also reported that "in 1985-86, the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) initiated formal evaluation of the system by appointing an SCC Governance Subcommittee, which was charged with making a self-study of the governance system, preliminary to examination of the system by an external review team. The self-study was completed last spring, and we now have invited three outside evaluators to review this document and others." In addition to responding to the self-study, the external reviewers would be asked two specific questions: "first, whether meaningful faculty and student participation in University governance requires the magnitude of time commitment our system demands of those who accept governance responsibilities or whether there is a more efficient design by which the same goals could be achieved; second, whether the system allows the administration and the Board of Regents to hear a clear and strong faculty voice on all issues where there should be a vigorous voice."

The SCC chair reported that "committees of the Senate and Assembly need adequate staff and other support if they are to succeed in carrying out their charges. In response to our request, central administration has indicated it is sympathetic to the problem and we are currently working on solutions."

The Senate approved a motion from the Educational Policy Committee that "any faculty member who has received the Horace T. Morse-Amoco Foundation Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education since its inception in 1965 be designated by an asterisk and accompanying footnote in the appropriate college catalogs for the duration of the recipient's academic career at the University of Minnesota."

The Senate voted to amend the bylaws to create a standing Committee on the Faculty Retirement Plan, to report to the Faculty Senate through the Committee on Faculty Affairs.

The Strategic Defense Initiative motion came back, with a student senator resolution concluding with "be it resolved, that the University Senate urges that an open hearing on the University's role in SDI research be conducted and the full Board of Regents be invited to attend this open

hearing." The Consultative Committee "recommends that for reasons of propriety the Senate reject the motion; the Senate Consultative Committee feels it improper for the Senate to attempt to set the agenda and priorities for other organizations and individuals." The motion was defeated 87-66. "Mr. Carter [the student senator who had introduced the resolution] then addressed the Senate to tender his resignation from that body. He indicated that he had immigrated to the United States, and thence to the University, and he described this country as a land of an open society that was willing to question itself. He asked, 'What is going on with this country, and what is going on with this University?'"

Under New Business, a senator introduced a motion concerning the CIA: "WHEREAS the CIA has violated international law and has committed acts of violence against people and property in many nations; WHEREAS the University policy concerning recruitment needs to be studied at a Senate committee level; THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate Committee of Social Concerns be urged to investigate University recruitment policies and to discuss the intent of the CIA's presence in a University setting; AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the sense of the University Senate to discontinue providing University offices and services for the CIA in their interviewing of students on the University of Minnesota campuses." The motion was referred to the Senate Consultative Committee.

#### November 6, 1986 Faculty Senate (1)

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported that the "position of Academic Staff Assistance Officer has been established by a settlement agreement resolving a petition filed under the Rajender consent decree. The position is a 50 percent appointment (plus clerical assistance), and will run for at least 18 months." The person is to be supervised by the Committee on Faculty Affairs.

The Judicial Committee reported that when it met with the president, "the chief topic of discussion was presidential acceptance of panel decisions. In the past, the President has routinely accepted panel recommendations when they were unfavorable to the complaining faculty member, but recommendations that favored the faculty member were accepted completely in only about one-third of cases in the 1980's. Usually these recommendations have not been completely rejected; rather, some action has been taken, but it has been less comprehensive than that recommended by the panel. The committee has for some time believed that the rate of acceptance is unsatisfactory. (The acceptance rate described in this paragraph includes actions taken during President Magrath's administration. So far, the acceptance rate has been satisfactory during President Keller's administration. . . .)"

#### February 19, 1987 University Senate (2)

"The meeting was preceded by an open forum on Commitment to Focus at which the following proposed motion regarding the Report of the Special Committee on Minority Programs was discussed. . . . That the University Senate endorse the establishment of programs to expand and coordinate recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty on the campuses of the

University of Minnesota, as specified in the recommendations of the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus." (The motion had more text following.) There was lengthy discussion.

President Keller reported, apropos of the proposal adopted concerning distribution of indirect cost funds adopted in May, 1986, that "he had at that time indicated he could live with that proposal but could not recommend it positively to the Regents. He said that the principle that funds should go to the colleges that originate the research projects should be continued, but that centrally there was still need for a process that would recognize that there were real expenses that had to be paid and projects that needed funding that would not fit into a formula approach. He said he would bring the Senate recommendation to the Regents, but he would speak to an 'accountability' rather than a 'formulaic' approach. . . ." The former chair of the Senate Research Committee expressed dismay.

#### February 19, 1987 Faculty Senate (2)

The Faculty Development Task Force provided its first interim report; the chair "provided charts of salary comparisons for Big Ten public universities by rank and length of appointment and a salary table for 31 top research universities, which showed for Minnesota a quality rank of 16.5, and a salary rank of 24, both based on 1986 AAUP data."

#### April 16, 1987 University Senate (3)

The Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research proposed a Rules amendment creating three human-subjects committees (expanding from one).

The Social Concerns Committee recommended that a Senate/Assembly "committee be given the task of monitoring [CIA] on-campus recruitment and responding to similar issues as they occur in the future; . . . the University, perhaps through the above mentioned committee, strive to make available to the students comprehensive and accurate information about the CIA and its activities, e.g., by providing literature or sponsoring forums; . . . [and] that the Senate state explicitly its non-endorsement of CIA activities, and that the Senate ask the administration to address the widespread concern that the University condones, if not endorses, controversial activities of the CIA by virtue of allowing the CIA to use its placement services." The Senate approved.

Under Questions to the President: "One cannot help but notice that the central administration at the University is inclined to embrace corporate management techniques such as Strategic Planning. One can hardly pick up the business section of a newspaper these days without reading stories about major corporations reducing middle-level management. . . . Is the central administration at the University also considering reducing middle management? Certainly, one of the most cost-effective things the central administration could do to enhance the quality of the University of Minnesota would be to send the associate deans and assistant deans back to their libraries and laboratories. Not only would the University benefit from their renewed scholarly activity, but the process would serve to reduce the burden of administration on other faculty members. . . ." "President Keller responded that University-wide there was one dean to each 100

faculty members, and that in general corporations had a much larger middle management group. He said 6 & 1/2% of the academic budget is devoted to administration of all kinds and that the University is in the lower half of Big Ten institutions in that percent figure."

Also in Questions to the President: "Is it anticipated that faculty now with tenure or on tenure track may fail to be retained as a consequence of the reorganization or abolition of departments or programs?" "President Keller said he could not say whether there would be reorganization, but that any changes would have to follow the provisions of the tenure code and observe the terms of protection in the section on financial exigencies."

#### April 16, 1987 Faculty Senate (3)

The Faculty Development Committee submitted its second interim report and outlined what its report would look like: "Section I: New plan for faculty salaries, based on new goals. . . . Section II: Sabbatical and Single Quarter Leaves. . . . Section III: Support for the work of the faculty. . . . Section IV: Workshop for department chairs/heads." And other matters.

#### May 14, 1987 University Senate (4)

The Consultative Committee proposed guidelines for selection and review of administrators, including that all people in certain positions (middle management: Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Provosts, Associate and Assistant Chancellors, Associate and Assistant Deans. . . . "will, at the commencement of the appointment of a new person to whom they are responsible, be given a trial term appointment of up to six months, or for as long as is required for notice under the terms of their contracts, whichever is longer. At the end of the period their appointment will be terminated; however, the responsible official may at that time choose instead to continue their appointment without a new search." It also recommended a larger role for search committees in ruling candidates unacceptable, very few acting appointments, annual reviews for the administrators identified, and that the same provisions be incorporated in college constitutions. The Senate approved.

The Committee on Educational Policy moved that "the University Senate endorse the establishment and maintenance of programs to expand and coordinate recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty on the campuses of the University of Minnesota, as specified in the recommendations of the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus." The Senate approved.

SCC reported that it "discussed at length with President Keller his model for a reorganized central administration. . . . The committee acknowledges that the President is free to design his administrative structure. However, faculty members expressed their apprehension about the substantial non-academic, operational burdens on the Provost."

SCC appointed a task for on AIDS.

Under Old Business, a senator moved that "it is the sense of the University Senate to discontinue providing University offices and services for the CIA in their interviewing of students on the

University of Minnesota campuses." The motion was defeated.

The SCC introduced two motions, following whereas clauses: " BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate endorses the development of an ongoing all-University open forum that permits expression of multiple viewpoints on issues, and that the Senate Committee on Social Concerns should develop and report back to the Senate on possible methods of implementation no later than winter quarter, 1988. (MOTIONONE)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University Senate condemns actions that prevent persons invited to speak at the University of Minnesota from expressing their views and also condemns actions that disrupt their presentations. (MOTION TWO)" The Senate approved both.

#### May 14, 1987 Faculty Senate (4)

"The Committee on Faculty Affairs presented a motion for Faculty Senate approval of a proposal to establish two benefit options for the faculty-dependent care and medical reimbursement—with established ceilings for each." The Senate approved.

#### October 29, 1987 University Senate (1)

The Senate voted to establish a Computing and Information Systems Committee.

The President's Policy Agenda was presented.

1. Continuation of implementation of Commitment to Focus.
2. Formulation of administrative recommendations for organizational restructuring and programmatic development.
3. Consideration of assessment of quality of education.
4. Improvement and expansion of recruiting efforts for minority faculty and students.
5. Examination of issues pertaining to planning for faculty development over the next decade.
6. Development of policy for space management.
7. Development of policy for credit/class hour relationship.
8. Examination of alternative approaches to health staff insurance.
9. Examination of alternative approaches to financing of education.
10. Examination of public service opportunities for University of Minnesota students.

11. Program reviews.

#### October 29, 1987 Faculty Senate (1)

(nothing noteworthy)

#### February 18, 1988 University Senate (2)

The Senate approved a policy on Disclosure of Financial Arrangements with Industry. "W. Phillips Shively, professor of political science and chair of the Consultative Committee, reported that the motion had been worked out by the Senate Research Committee after lengthy and sometimes tumultuous negotiations with the administration. The object was to clarify the

obligations for financial disclosure of faculty who are doing research which is sponsored by corporations in which they have financial interests." There was lengthy debate.

Professor Shively also "reported that a change to the semester system had been proposed by the administration in its recent planning document, which indicated that reasons for the change would be reported to the relevant governance committees. He pointed out that that was not the usual procedure followed for other proposals such as changes in the tenure system, questions of faculty development, and so on, in which proposals went through the governance structure for consideration and consultation." He said a proposal would be brought back in the spring.

"The Task Force believes AIDS should receive special attention from the University of Minnesota and that the University has a special role to play in regard to AIDS. The University must respond as both a community and an educational institution. Four areas of response are suggested, each with a budgetary recommendation." The report was to be returned to the Senate after further study.

A student senator "suggested that the profits from the sale of books, parking lots, and food service that were being used in the renovation of Eastcliff, the president's residence, were mostly contributed by students and should be siphoned back into expanding parking lots and possibly bringing down the price of books. Mr. Shively reported that the Finance Committee, which he chaired last year, had considered the pooling of the support service profits into a fund to go into general University revenues (over which the Finance Committee exercises accounting oversight) and had approved the idea. It recommended a general policy of an aimed-for profit level of one percent. He said he had had conversations with the provost's office to ensure that the committee would get proper accounting on an interim basis and in the future of current expenses. There should be, starting at the end of the current year, a public accounting annually in the Finance Committee of the way in which the pooled service fund surplus account is allocated and used."

February 18, 1988 Faculty Senate (was not convened)

April 14, 1988 University Senate (3) (Interim President Richard Sauer presided)

The Senate had a discussion of the implications of the elimination of mandatory retirement, to take effect in 1994. The chair-elect of the Consultative Committee, Shirley Clark, posed a long set of questions for the faculty to consider: "There are those who believe there will be a shortage of positions for the more recently trained and younger scholars. Others say that if people follow the present retirement patterns there will be an inadequate supply of faculty members. . . . What is the demographic profile of University faculty by department and college? When do University faculty retire? What role does the existence of a mandatory retirement age play in that decision? . . . Another set of issues dealt with institutional policies that could be modified in at least three areas—tenure, salary in relation to costs, and retirement incentives. Regarding tenure, the committee would ask whether the probationary period should be extended, whether a system of post-tenure faculty evaluation should be instituted, and if so what its purposes, design, and consequences should be. What are the legal implications? What are the effects on faculty morale and vitality? Salary issues could include such questions as, should annual salary reviews be more like tenure and promotion reviews in their intensity? Should the basis of individual faculty salary

increases be changed? Should there be a system that would include part base salary increase, part bonus salary increase? With regard to the retirement incentives issue, how do we move toward a managed retirement system that functions to encourage less productive people to retire earlier and more productive people to remain active longer? What are the legal implications? What are the implications for faculty morale and vitality? What are the costs and benefits of incentive retirement programs?" And more.

April 14, 1988 Faculty Senate (convened following an open faculty forum on the state of the University)

The Tenure Committee offered a new interpretation of section 7.11, "Discipline-Related Service. Discipline-related service, as one of the primary criteria for tenure evaluation, is limited to those endeavors specifically related to the individual's academic expertise and faculty appointment in accordance with the academic unit's Mission Statement. This service must be defined in the Mission Statement as central and necessary to the operation of the academic unit. An equivalent term might be "unit mission-related service"-for example, clinical service in a teaching hospital situation that does not involve students directly."

The Tenure Committee also reported that it disagreed with Vice President Benjamin about a proposal to eliminate "the requirement of University-level faculty committee review of the tenure recommendations of non-departmentalized colleges. The Tenure Committee held an open forum on this issue. . . . The Tenure Committee has voted 7-2 not to propose this amendment to the Faculty Senate. For the seven committee members in the majority, retaining the present "two-tier" faculty review promises greater faculty protection from mistakes by either the Vice President or the academic unit itself. It also affords all faculty, regardless of collegiate or University structure, uniform treatment in the tenure process."

SCC chair W. Phillips Shively reported that "in an effort to get better information out to the University community . . . his committee was now circulating Faculty Consultative and University Consultative Committees' minutes to department heads and deans."

May 19, 1988 University Senate (4)

The Consultative Committee, Business & Rules Committee, and Committee on Committees brought to the Senate, and endorsed, a proposal to reduce the number of Senate/Assembly committees from 41 to 19. The Senate approved. Appropriate constitution, bylaw, and rules amendments would be brought in the fall. A subcommittee appointed to make recommendations "determined that the current 41-committee system is too large and unwieldy to carry out effectively the business of the Senate/Assembly." SCC chair W. Phillips Shively reported that the proposal "was to a great extent the result of a concern about the large number of committees and the low level of activity of some of them. Occasionally there would be a sad annual report from a committee stating that, since it had no business and no one had asked it any questions, it had not met in a year. . . . Also, it is difficult to track the business across the whole array of committees and some business falls between the cracks. The present committee system has bred cynicism among many faculty and student members; many of the committees do not seem to have clear and important mandates; and some have overlapping jurisdictions."



Acting on the basis of a Senate resolution in May, 1987, the Committee on Social Concerns moved "that the University Senate, acting through the Committee on Social Concerns, should on a regular basis, preferably quarterly, sponsor campus fora on current controversial issues, with provision made for presentation of the full range of opinions held by members of the University community." The Senate approved.

"Leonid Hurwicz, Regents' professor of economics, said he knew that very few souls were saved after five o'clock but he wanted to make a few comments nevertheless. He said he would be retiring at the end of the academic year and so would not have another opportunity. In 1951, he first attended Senate meetings as a new member of the faculty, and at that time all tenured faculty members were automatically senators. He fought very hard against making it an elective body, he said, and was punished for it by being elected to it almost continuously ever since. . . . He went on to observe that the governance of the University and of the Senate in particular are of major importance; that fact is sometimes forgotten in the routine and tedium of the many items that are brought to the Senate. Sometimes very major decisions are made, such as the tenure code programmatic change issue, and he was sure that the Senate would continue and flourish. He went on to make a comment, which he said he could do because he was perhaps beyond suspicion of bucking for promotion or salary increase, to the effect that the University was indeed fortunate that Richard Sauer had consented to take over the reins of the University at a very difficult time and had done so with genuine integrity and efficiency. He thought the University community should be very grateful. There was prolonged applause."

#### May 19, 1988 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Affairs Committee moved that the "Faculty Senate supports the principle that alcohol and drug dependency assistance be made available to the faculty. The Faculty Senate requests the Faculty Affairs Committee to explore the possibility of providing this assistance through existing offices and services of the University." The Senate approved.

#### November 17, 1988 University Senate (1)

The Senate received a report of an "*ad hoc* committee's work this past summer, as directed by the vote of the Senate in May 1988 to implement a streamlined committee structure." The report indicated changes made, changes not made, and reasons for both. The three required motions implementing the changes were all approved unanimously.

The Senate Committee on Computing and Information Systems made recommendations in two broad categories: "The first set addresses the problems associated with the need for coordination among units, especially in wider and longer-range planning. The second set are budgetary in nature and primarily address those immediate needy areas that are connected to academic computing." On the first, . . . It is our belief that practically everyone who thinks about present computing would agree . . . that computing is a vital and important activity in all disciplines and that computing is a diversified technology that continues to change rapidly. . . . This problem is all the more poignant in that the University has never had a systematic and coherent policy or planning process for computing. . . . We recommend that there should be a Chief Information

Officer in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs." The committee also laid out budgetary implications.

The president was asked about "the legislature's apparent intention of uncoupling tuition from University appropriations or the published reports that appropriations would necessitate a tuition increase to cover the usual 33% of total instructional costs was correct. President Sauer said he had not heard of an intention to uncouple tuition from the appropriation; the intent was to separate the appropriation from average cost funding. . . . State policy requires that for every two dollars that the state provides for instructional cost the University must generate one dollar from non-state sources. It does not explicitly say it must come from tuition but that has been the traditional way to do it."

"When asked whether there is a formal mechanism for evaluating administrators, the president said the Senate had approved some proposals two years ago, but that his own method had been to ask administrators to develop annual objectives, which would be available to the people in that unit. Evaluation would be based on performance related to those objectives. Mr. Shively, in recalling the Senate document, observed that it called for evaluation of all administrators in a thorough-going way at some regular interval and that the evaluation should be publicly announced with comments from those who deal with the administrator to be solicited. . . . President Sauer added that it would be an appropriate issue to raise at the next Senate meeting if a new president were in office by then."

SCC chair Mark "Brenner said that with regret and great warm thoughts he extended the thanks of the Senate to Interim President Sauer for the decisive leadership he had provided in the past nine months. . . . He provided leadership in having the academic priorities document passed by the regents and was leaving the University a better place for his efforts, he concluded. There followed prolonged applause."

#### November 17, 1988 Faculty Senate (1)

(nothing noteworthy)

#### February 16, 1989 University Senate (2) (President Hasselmo presided)

An ad hoc committee appointed by the Senate Consultative Committee brought for discussion a draft of new (lengthy) grievance procedures. "Fred Morrison, professor of law, proceeded to outline the principal features, which he hoped would simplify and expedite the grievance process. The first point was that sharp jurisdictional lines would be drawn. . . . The Judicial Committee would hear tenure denial and removal for cause cases only; the Academic Staff Professional Committee would hear similar cases; the civil service processes would be similarly restricted; and the Student Behavior Committee would hear student behavior cases only. Everything else would go to the centralized University Grievance Committee. . . . Also provided was a central Grievance Officer to serve as a filing and processing center, to provide uniformity in the process, access to some mediation services, and encouragement for the parties to talk to one another, which may not have occurred before. It would also serve as a central repository of information that could indicate whether the University has many of the same types of problems

recurring. Finally, the committee had set a series of timetables for action in an effort to eliminate cases dragging on and on, he said."

SCC chair Mark Brenner "went on to say that, during a meeting he and others had had with Governor Perpich regarding their grave concern for the Governor's proposed budget for the University, they had asked him to provide a message for the faculty to allay some of their fears. As a result, the Governor has agreed to come before a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on Thursday, February 23."

February 16, 1989 Faculty Senate

(Nothing noteworthy)

February 23, 1989 Faculty Senate

(Special meeting with Governor Perpich; no minutes appear to have been kept)

April 27, 1989 University Senate (3)

The Senate approved new grievance procedures previewed at the previous meeting.

An academic professional staff member was added to the Committee on Faculty Affairs.

The president highlighted a number of issues.

April 27, 1989 Faculty Senate

Pursuant to the reorganization of Senate committees, the Tenure Committee was abolished and its duties transferred to the Committee on Faculty Affairs.

May 18, 1989 University Senate (4)

The Committee on Educational Policy moved a policy (for information at this meeting) that "there generally be a one-to-one ratio between the number of credits awarded for completion of a course and the number of hours per week that the course meets. In the case of laboratory courses, it is understood that one laboratory meeting per week shall be the approximate equivalent of one credit. This general policy explicitly recognizes that there are sound pedagogical reasons why some courses and some subjects may deviate from the one-to-one standard; this policy does not bar such variations." There was lengthy discussion.

"The Senate Committee on Educational Policy recommends, in as strong a fashion as possible, that the central administration of the University make available as soon as possible sufficient funds to computerize the Continuing Education and Extension records in a way which makes them compatible with, or a part of, the day school records of every student who attends the University." From its letter to the Consultative Committee: "We frankly think it is intolerable to have dual systems of records, the operation of one of which is reminiscent of office procedures

which existed at the turn of the century. The current condition of having two separate systems seriously diminishes our ability to deliver high quality and efficient undergraduate education."

The Social Concerns Committee reported, apropos of ROTC, that it "is strongly committed to the existing equal opportunity policies and, further, to action of some sort to resolve the situation. We are also strongly committed to the importance of the ROTC presence on university campuses, and feel that actions leading to termination of ROTC here would be more or less washing our hands of an important issue, rather than taking proactive steps to resolve what appear to be grave constitutional questions, substantially beyond the conflict with our internal policies."

A senator "and former chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, had asked whether the recently announced plan for priority seating at athletic events had been approved by the committee; if so, would it have been a reversal of its stand. The President pointed out that Intercollegiate Athletics was basically a self-financing enterprise, and that he . . . did not intend to go to the legislature to ask for state funding. . . . [the athletic director had] decided that football priority seating (4,700 out of 63,000) was necessary to provide the financial base for the future, a move which the President supported."

"President Hasselmo said the appointment [of a Chief Information Officer] had been discussed when the structure of central administration was considered and, because of the large number of existing administrative vacancies, the decision was made not to act on it. The same was true of the proposed vice president for research position. Those issues would be raised later, he said, and he suggested that the Consultative Committee add the item to its agenda."

#### November 16, 1989 University Senate (1)

The Social Concerns Committee presented a motion on the conflict between the University's equal opportunity policy (in this case, with respect to sexual orientation) and ROTC policy: "that the Senate reaffirm the University's equal opportunity policy" and that it "request the president and administration to work to place the matter on the national agendas of the appropriate educational associations and the Minnesota congressional delegation, with the objective of resolving the conflict." "The committee concluded that the policy conflict cannot be settled on our campus. . . . We also concluded that the University of Minnesota cannot tolerate the existing policy conflict indefinitely. . . . While hesitating to set an absolute deadline, we recommend that the Social Concerns Committee and the administration review the situation annually." The Senate approved.

The Senate approved a bylaw change permitting SCC to act on behalf of the Senate "when a decision is required prior to the next scheduled meeting" and when it would not be possible to convene a special meeting. The Senate would have the authority to overrule the decision of SCC.

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Committee on Educational Policy that "it shall be the policy of the University of Minnesota that there generally be a one-to-one ratio between the number of credits award for completion of a course and the number of hours per week that

the course meets." Lab courses were recognized as different and the policy would not preclude variations based on sound pedagogical reasons. The proposal engendered long debate but passed 118-41.

SCC chair Warren Ibele reported on a number of topics, including discussion of "proposed policies concerning administrative leaves and severance policy arrangements which had been proposed to the Regents" and lengthy discussion of changes to health insurance.

#### November 16, 1989 Faculty Senate (1)

The Faculty Affairs Committee introduced a motion expressing "deep concern to the President and the Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations over the lack of consultation by the University administration with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs on the change in health insurance from Blue Cross's Aware Gold Plan to the state health insurance plan. The process completely failed. Hence, the faculty was prevented from expressing its views and engaging in the policy analysis of acceptable alternatives through the Senate committee process." The Senate approved. President Hasselmo said that Finance Vice President Donhowe would appoint a task force to look into the possibility of a separate health plan for the University.

#### February 15, 1990 Twin Cities Campus Assembly (2)

SCC [Assembly Steering Committee] chair Warren Ibele moved adopt of "enabling legislation for the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (ACIA) so it could exercise judicial functions in the area of eligibility of players, which is an educational concern, emphasizing that the faculty has a right and a responsibility on behalf of the institution and on behalf of the student athletes. "Hans Weinberger, professor of mathematics, introduced a motion to remove from the Assembly all exercise of control over major sports by March 1, 1991, because working qualifications and remuneration of athletes are not academic matters. He said the University is aiding and abetting a fraud on the public by representing itself as a place where students come to learn and then decide to go out for one of the major sports for a little glory." After lengthy debate, "Byron Marshall, professor of history, said he had seldom seen an issue that had generated more heat and less light than this one." Both the main motion and the Weinberger amendment were defeated.

A student senator "called attention to the presence at the meeting of a group of students representing a coalition seeking to restore the University's sexual violence program. She then yielded to Gwen Mueller, student, CLA, who reviewed a list of demands that had been drawn up following a confrontation in the president's office when he refused to negotiate with them, she said." The president said the program had not been cut and provided information about it.

#### February 15, 1990 University Senate (2)

The Senate approved adding the names of deceased academic professional staff members to the necrology section of the minutes.

Professor Fred Morrison introduced "a memorandum of understanding regarding the adoption, implementation, interpretation, and intent of various provisions of a revised grievance policy

which has been approved by the University Senate (hereafter referred to as the "Grievance Policy"). The parties to this memorandum are the Senate Consultative Committee, on behalf of the University Senate, and the President, on behalf of the University administration. The parties jointly recommend that the Board of Regents adopt the Grievance Policy in the form passed by the University Senate subject to the following understandings" that were enumerated.

In the annual report for the previous year, SCC chair Mark Brenner reported on several areas, including "Finance and Budget: The committee devoted lengthy parts of several meetings, as well as the special meeting in September, to a discussion of the biennial request, legislative priorities (in particular, coordination of the request with academic priorities), criteria for capital request items, the impact of the biennial request on tuition, the decentralized budgeting proposal, and the tuition task force recommendations. In each instance the discussions were held with the President or other senior administrators or both. Searches: The committee began the year by clarifying what its role in the presidential search would be (separate meetings of faculty and students with the finalists for the presidency). At the request of President Hasselmo, it also agreed that the faculty and the students would separately nominate individuals to serve on the numerous vice presidential search committees which were appointed."

#### February 15, 1990 Faculty Senate

"Pursuant to Rules 14.4 and 15.5 of the tenure code, if the President's decision in a case brought before the Judicial Committee is less favorable to the complainant than the panel's recommendation, the President must give substantive reasons in writing for that decision. The tenure code then calls for the full text of the President's written statement to be printed in the Senate docket unless the faculty member requests confidentiality, in which case a summary of the relevant considerations must be so published without identification of the faculty member." The president's statement in three cases were included in the docket.

In the annual report of FCC, chair Mark Brenner reported, inter alia, that " FCC spent long parts of three meetings, after President Hasselmo was elected, developing its advice to the President on how he might capitalize on the many vice presidential vacancies to restructure the central administration of the University. . . . FCC developed a list of questions to be asked of presidential finalists; the chair of the committee sat with the Presidential Search Advisory Committee when it interviewed the finalists for the presidency. FCC served as the nominating body for the search committees for the six vacant vice president/vice provost positions. . . ; it also supported the President's decision to appoint Gus Donhowe as Acting Senior Vice President for Finance. The committee members met with the candidates for vice president for academic affairs and provost and made its views known to the President. The committee also advised the President on the position descriptions for the vice presidential vacancies."

Vice President Kuhl reported that in the upcoming spring "review of administrators would take place from department chairs up as a uniform system of appraisal is introduced, including assessment of performance, both as a manager and as a leader, from the point of view of the department or college and from the central administration. A pilot program would be put in place first in the president's office and in his own office and in one or two colleges. Terms of

appointment for recently appointed administrators have been changed to start with three-year initial terms, then subject to annual reappointment thereafter."

#### April 19, 1990 University Senate (3)

The Senate approved placing the chair of the Committee on Educational Policy on SCC as an ex officio member.

The Senate approved establishment of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, over the objection of the undergraduate students.

SCC reported for information that it had given "conditional approval to the uniform undergraduate tuition proposal" and listed its concerns. The Committee on Educational Policy provided a statement on the report of the Tuition Study Group, which had made the proposal.

The Senate approved a policy and procedure on the inclusion of students on search committees for positions that "clearly involve students or directly affect students" and would include "appropriate administrative positions, faculty positions, and academic professional positions."

#### April 19, 1990 Faculty Senate

FCC introduced a motion: "That the Faculty Senate advise the University administration that mandatory retirement for faculty should end effective July 1, 1991, and that the Faculty Senate, through its committees, devise a periodic post-tenure evaluation process pursuant to the recommendation (3.2) of the Task Force on the Elimination of Mandatory Retirement." The Senate voted to divide the motion; it approved the first on 63-43 and defeated the second one 44-57 after extensive debate on both.

The Faculty Senate approved a recommendation to eliminate the "notch" in the faculty retirement program and have a uniform contribution for all participants.

On recommendation of SCC and the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, recognizing the expiration of the Rajender consent decree, the Senate approved a policy statement on women academic employees because there was no statement about academic women apart from the general non-discrimination policy: "The University of Minnesota shall not tolerate discriminatory practices against women in any personnel actions including instruction, hiring, evaluation, promotion, pay or any form of institutional reward or recognition." And more.

#### May 17, 1990 University Senate (4)

The Committee on Educational Policy introduced a proposed policy on program reviews: "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 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." The Senate approved.

The Senate defeated 70-75 a proposal to establish a uniform institutional policy on grade changes, setting out conditions when grades could be changed.

The Senate approved a bylaw amendment extending the life of the Senate Committee on Computing and Information Systems for another two years (it had been slated to be eliminated in the reorganization of Senate committees, subject to a recommendation from SCC that it be retained).

The Senate discussed a discussion draft of a report from an ad hoc committee on Senate diversity. It directed that any person or group responsible for preparing election slates or nominating committee members will "provide fair and ample numbers of candidates qualified to represent the interests" of several protected groups. SCC had discussed it at length and had not reached agreement on it.

#### May 17, 1990 Faculty Senate

The Senate Judicial Committee presented a lengthy annual report noting several issues and problems.

#### November 1, 1990 University Senate (1)

The Senate approved a policy barring "extracurricular events which require the participation of students" from the beginning of Study Day to the end of Finals Week. Exceptions may only be granted by the Committee on Educational Policy.

The Senate received for information, and discussed, a statement on the conflict between University equal opportunity policy and ROTC policy. "Be it further resolved that the Senate request the President and administration to continue to work to place the matter 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, if the conflict has not been settled by January 1, 1993, then the Senate shall establish a sanctions committee to oversee the severance of University ROTC relations. Be it further resolved that, if the conflict has not been settled by the end of June 30, 1993, then the University will begin the process of severing relations with ROTC, disallowing the admission of any new students into any University-affiliated ROTC program." "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."



The president presented his Policy Agenda for 1990-91:

1991-93 biennial request

Improvement of quality and internal reallocation

Financial management system

Personnel systems and administration

Recruitment and retention of faculty

Diversity goals

Search procedures

Quality of undergraduate education

Graduate School program review

#### November 1, 1990 Faculty Senate

The Senate was provided for information the framework to be used for academic searches (full national search, limited search, and noncompetitive appointments).

#### February 14, 1991 University Senate (2)

The University Senate approved the resolution on ROTC discussed at the previous meeting.

Following from its May 1990 resolution, the Senate approved a recommendation 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." The recommendation contained the 34 questions formulated by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.

FCC reported on a "STATEMENT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS ON RESTRUCTURING AND REALLOCATION," which it described as "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. . . ."

"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. . . . 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. . . ."

"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" and adopted a resolution strongly supporting the president's plan, including the point that "the plan addresses the issue of quality, which has long been a faculty concern in the planning process. . . . 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." The Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Student Senate Consultative Committee also endorsed the plan.

#### February 14, 1991 Faculty Senate

(nothing noteworthy)

#### April 18, 1991 University Senate (3)

President Hasselmo reported that at the legislature 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 student senator, in questions to the president, reported that "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."

Three faculty senators asked the president " 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?"

"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." And more.

#### April 18, 1991 Faculty Senate

FCC reported: 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. . . . 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. . . . 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."

FCC, Faculty Affairs, and the Judicial Committee recommended changes in the tenure policy "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 other language in the policy could be construed to forbid it. The Faculty Senate approved.

#### May 16, 1991 University Senate (4)

The Senate accepted from the Senate Research Committee and the Consultative Committee a report on a policy regarding the use of indirect cost recovery funds: "The purpose of this document is to establish a set of operating principles for the use of the Research Support Fund to directly improve the research environment for the faculty. During the past decade, several factors have changed leading to increased constraints upon the growth of our future research activities. The cumulative effect of the factors listed below has raised the ire of many of our most productive researchers: . . ."

The Senate approved amendments extending the conflict-of-interest (disclosure of interests) policy to sponsored funding as well as grants from companies.

#### May 16, 1991 Faculty Senate

(nothing noteworthy)

October 31, 1991 University Senate (1) [The afternoon of the start of one of the largest blizzards in the history of Minnesota]

The SCC chair reported that an "Ombuds Committee had been appointed by the Senate Consultative Committee in the spring of 1990 to review and evaluate various dispute resolution models and to make recommendations for an organizational structure to serve all campuses and all constituencies of the University community." The Senate discussed its preliminary report.

President Hasselmo presented his policy agenda in the form of goals for the year; each also included priorities:

**"GOAL 1:** Reaffirm and communicate the mission and aspirations of the University of Minnesota.

**GOAL 2:** Ensure continued responsiveness and accountability in managerial decision making across the University.

**GOAL 3:**

Pursue resources for the University from state, federal, and private sources.

**GOAL 4:**

Promote and facilitate the well-being and effectiveness of University faculty and staff.

*Priorities:*

**GOAL 5:**

Maintain and enhance the University's teaching programs and student environment.

**GOAL 6:**

Maintain and enhance the University's research and scholarly and artistic activities.

**GOAL 7:**

Maintain and enhance the University's outreach , and public service contributions.

**GOAL 8:**

Ensure a sense of community that recognizes, appreciates, and fosters unity with diversity." Graduate program reviews were also identified.

President Hasselmo reported, inter alia, that "in response to the ROTC resolution approved by the Senate last spring, . . . he has discussed the issue with the Board of Regents, which in turn held an open forum on the issue. He will continue discussions with the chair and the vice chair of the Board of Regents concerning the timing of further considerations by the Board" and that "State funding to the University had been cut by \$27 million for the biennium, resulting in no inflationary increases for salaries or supplies and equipment. . . . Taking into consideration those cuts, a budget plan has been prepared . . . that will not only cover the shortfall in the budget for this year, but also plans for a salary increase for the second year of the biennium." The president also reported on appointment of the Council on Liberal Education and implementation of new liberal-education requirements for the Twin Cities campus, approved at the Campus Assembly meeting immediately preceding the Senate meeting.

October 31, 1991 Faculty Senate

(nothing noteworthy)

February 20, 1992 University Senate (2)

The Senate tabled to its next meeting a policy on "Makeup Examinations for Legitimate Absences" ["A student who is unable to take an examination owing to verified illness or absence on other legitimate account is entitled to take a make-up examination as soon as possible at a time mutually acceptable to the student and the instructor, and in accordance with any special terms that may be announced by the instructor at the beginning of the term. . . ."] because of lack of clarity about certain terms.

The Senate approved a policy on scheduling final examinations: "There shall be no exceptions from the University final examination schedule except by concurrence of the department chair, the dean of the college concerned, and the University scheduling offices. **This prohibition precludes moving a final examination from a scheduled time to study day or to the last or earlier meetings of the class.**"

The Senate approved a statement on the faculty role in advising: "The faculty of the University is ultimately responsible and accountable for all academic aspects of the educational enterprise. Whereas teaching and research are readily recognized as major responsibilities of the faculty, the advising of students also clearly falls under faculty purview. Because of the variation of circumstances in the several colleges of this University, it is not feasible to define highly specific and inclusive faculty activities in advising. However, it is both feasible and appropriate to outline general principles to guide faculty involvement in advising. . . ."

The Committee on Educational Policy presented information on how it would administer the policy on athletic events during Study Day and finals week: "In those instances where post-season competitive events occur during Study Day or Finals Week (either of Day School or of Extension Classes), the Senate Committee on Educational Policy will consider them approved (that is, without requiring explicit action on the part of the Committee) subject to the following conditions.

1. The event is in logical progression in the sport, leading from in-season competition to conference or regional championships and then to national championship competition; and
2. The coach or other staff member in the athletic program can demonstrate to the Director of Academic Counseling-Intercollegiate Athletics that satisfactory alternative academic arrangements have been made; and
3. The event is conducted under the aegis of the NCAA or the appropriate national sport governing body if it is not the NCAA."

#### February 20, 1992 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved a policy, recommended by the Tenure Subcommittee, on taking a department into receivership: "Taking a Department into Receivership is defined as an administrative process in which the dean of a college or unit appoints temporary additional faculty or a chair or both from *outside* the faculty of the department for the purpose of restoring order in a department. Deans are encouraged and expected to anticipate problems in a department and to exhaust all routes to restore order by internal reorganization of the department or other solutions short of receivership. . . ."

April 16, 1992 University Senate (3) [no Faculty Senate]

The Senate approved a policy on Makeup Examinations for Legitimate Absences: "Students should not be penalized for absence due to unavoidable or legitimate circumstances. Such circumstances include, but are not necessarily limited to, verified illness, participation in athletic events or other group activities sponsored by the University, serious family emergencies, subpoenas, jury duty, military service, and religious observances. It is the responsibility of the student to notify faculty members of such circumstances as far in advance as possible. It is the responsibility of faculty members to provide makeups for major examinations, ordinarily including midquarter and final examinations. . . ."

May 14, 1992 University Senate (4) (which followed the Faculty Senate)

"Provost E. F. Infante presented a report on the University's budget. . . . [and] noted that actual appropriations from the State Legislature have decreased by 5.9 percent since 1991. With inflation factored in, it implies a 13 percent loss in total resources available to the University from the Legislature. As a result, he said, it has been necessary to increase tuition to offset the loss of State funding."

The Committee on Educational Policy and SCC introduced a policy evaluation of teaching contributions. "1. The teaching performance of all faculty, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, must be subject to evaluation. . . . 2. The required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student surveys. . . . 3. Details of the required assessment of teaching contributions should be drawn up by SCEP and brought back to the Senate for approval prior to implementation." The Senate approved.

"The University of Minnesota Grievance Policy and Memorandum of Understanding (UMGP or procedure) became effective in September 1990. These documents mandate that after two (2) years, a committee be appointed to review and recommend changes to improve the UMGP. Consequently, the University of Minnesota Grievance Policy Review Committee (Review Committee) was appointed by University President Nils Hasselmo and Senate Consultative Committee Chair Thomas Scott in late January 1992. Between mid-February and the end of April, the Review Committee met on twelve (12) occasions to receive and review information relevant to the procedure and to discuss implications for change." The Senate discussed it.

May 14, 1992 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Faculty Affairs and FCC introduced for discussion a policy on academic staff (faculty) compensation. "Highlights of the policy include: 1) establishment in each academic unit of clear criteria for annual salary increases; 2) development of procedures for making salary decisions by the faculty and administrator of each unit; 3) establishment of a salary committee (or committee-of-the-whole) to determine annual salary increases; 4) fixed promotion increases for promotion to associate and full professor; and 5) establishment of a standing administrative and faculty compensation committee to examine and make additional recommendations on salary issues."

The Senate Research Committee and FCC introduced for discussion a lengthy "UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT" that provided among other things that "Once an allegation of academic misconduct has been made, the procedures that should be pursued to resolve the allegation are detailed below in the following stages: (1) an inquiry to determine whether the allegation or related issues warrant further investigation, (2) when warranted, an investigation to collect and thoroughly examine evidence, (3) a finding and appropriate personnel action, (4) a hearing by procedures beyond this policy to be initiated by the respondent that will result in a formal finding, and result in (5) appropriate disposition of the matter."

May 21, 1992 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved the Faculty Compensation policy after debate.

The Senate approved the policies and procedures for dealing with academic misconduct after debate.

November 17, 1992 University Senate (1)

The Senate Committee on Computing and Information Systems presented a "Vision and Strategy for Computing and Information Technology" at the University, a long report and recommendations from an Advisory Users Committee.

The President presented his policy agenda in the form of goals:

GOAL 1: reaffirm and communicate the mission and aspirations of the University of Minnesota

GOAL 2: ensure continued responsiveness and accountability in managerial decision-making across the University

GOAL 3: pursue resources for the University from state, federal, and private sources

GOAL 4: enhance the well-being and effectiveness of University faculty and staff

GOAL 5: enhance the university's teaching programs and student environment

GOAL 6: enhance the University's research and scholarly and artistic activities

GOAL 7: enhance the University's research and public service contributions

GOAL 8: ensure a sense of community that recognizes appreciates, and fosters the unity with diversity that is essential to the fulfillment of the University's mission

GOAL 9: enhance the infrastructure of the University.

The SCC chair reported that the University "finds itself in a time that demands greater accountability. Consequently, the Senate Consultative Committee has found itself in a position of reminding the public what a land-grant university is all about. . . . In response to the need to communicate with the citizens of Minnesota, a subcommittee of the Faculty Consultative Committee has been appointed to work with central administrators to explore untapped ways of telling the University story."

November 17, 1992 Faculty Senate (1)

The Faculty Senate approved the long report and recommendations of the Faculty Workload Task Force, which noted in its introduction that "the University community has been prompted to define and clarify the expectations of faculty effort at the University of Minnesota. One reason is that the pressure to make the best use of the faculty's time is increasing. Demands for teaching, research, and service/outreach output are generally growing while available resources fail to keep pace with inflation. Another reason is that, in this time of economic difficulty and constricted budgets, the general public is demanding more accountability from tax-supported institutions. Most importantly, our mutual responsibilities as a community of scholars who support the tripartite mission of the University require us to develop the means to guide our efforts." The report contained principles, the effort determination process, collection of data, and a long list of the elements of faculty effort. The chair of the task force commented that the report "outlines principles to be used to develop a clear understanding between each faculty member and the appropriate University department/ college/unit regarding expected effort, and a process to follow in developing effort expectations. . . . He assured Senators that the initiative for the document came from the faculty through the Faculty Consultative Committee and is not being thrust upon the faculty by any individuals or groups of individuals. The FCC and others believe there needs to be recognition of the professional responsibilities of the faculty."

The Faculty Senate heard a report on the Bush Sabbatical Supplement Program, which "provides supplementary income for faculty who seek to enhance their ability in scholarship, creative work, teaching, or service to the community. The program provides support to those faculty for whom an award will result in significant benefits for the University and the individual, and for whom the benefits would be otherwise difficult to obtain. . . . Bush Sabbatical Supplement awards may focus on research, writing, creative activities, or on improving instruction (particularly at the undergraduate level) or outreach programs. . . . With approximately \$300,000 to distribute among 20 faculty members each year, it is a highly competitive program designed to encourage scholarly or creative work that will make a definite and visible contribution to the University of Minnesota."

December 10, 1992 Faculty Senate [no University Senate]

The Faculty Senate approved a new section 5.5 of the tenure policy, to stop the tenure clock: "Exception for New Parent. The maximum period of probationary service will be extended by one year at the request of a probationary faculty member on the occasion of the birth of that faculty member's child or adoptive/foster placement of a child with that faculty member. . . ."

The Faculty Senate approved a long document amending the Policies and Procedures for Dealing with Academic Misconduct on recommendation of the Research Committee and FCC.

February 18, 1993 University Senate (2)

The Senate adopted without debate as part of a consent agenda a protocol on administrative responses to Senate actions, including this language: "The guiding principles for administrative response to Senate actions will be 'prompt reply' and 'full disclosure' in order to ensure that the Senate and its committees are able to address questions or problems which the administration may identify. In the event the administration has not responded to a Senate action within 90 days



of its adoption, or requested an extension, then the matter will automatically appear as a question to the President on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled meeting of the University Senate."

The Senate also approved without debate a protocol for involving Senate committees in searches for senior administrators.

The Senate accepted a report recommending the regularizing of financial support for certain committee chairs.

The Senate approved a revised (lengthy) grievance policy.

In his report to the Senate, "ALG continues to be a matter of public concern, the President said, and because of the duration and severity of the problems, recent decisions were made to remove the ALG program from the Department of Surgery and to change the administration of that department. The action was taken with regret, the President said, because it required asking for the resignation of an outstanding member of the University community. A truly outstanding Medical School has had its reputation questioned because of a few grave, but nevertheless relatively isolated problems. . . ." FCC introduced a motion it had adopted: "The Faculty Consultative Committee . . . supports President Nils Hasselmo in his decision to require managerial accountability by changing the administration of the Department of Surgery, removing the ALG program from the Department of Surgery, and reviewing the Medical School's structure and management practices [and FCC] appreciates Dr. John Najarian's decades of leadership as a world-renowned teacher, scientist and surgeon. Dr. Najarian's life-long commitment to academic excellence will continue to reflect positively on the Medical School and the University's student and scientific communities."

#### February 18, 1993 Faculty Senate

"The Faculty Senate approved the Faculty Compensation Policy on May 21, 1992, and forwarded it to the President for disposition. Subsequent administrative consultation surfaced concerns in several areas. One major concern is the appropriate level of faculty involvement in the judgement of compensation changes. A second major concern relates to a perception that across the board increases are to be expected as a part of the annual compensation plan. One lesser concern addressed the funding and administration of promotion increases. To address these concerns, the administration has proposed new wording for the policy. In reviewing the changes, the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA) recommended adoption of the revised wording." The Senate approved the changes.

FCC recommended adoption of advice to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs about reviews of administrators, including (among several recommendations) that "faculty should routinely participate in the review and evaluation of academic administrators in order to provide, on a regular basis, constructive information to the administrator being reviewed about the management of the unit, and to the administrator's superior about the administrator's job performance." The Senate adopted it on a voice vote.

The Faculty Senate adopted 79-4 the resolutions reported to the University Senate on ALG and Dr. John Najarian.

April 1, 1993 University Senate (3)

The Senate approved unanimously the continued existence of the Computing and Information Systems Committee (through 1996-97).

SCC and the Committee on Committees reported on professional staff representation in the Senate; instead of only considering those with continuous appointments, they "believe that a better way of defining eligibility of individuals holding limited time academic professional appointments is in terms of their length of service to the University. Thus, they believe that once academic professionals holding limited-term appointments fulfill a five year length-of-service test of long-term involvement with the collegiate units' academic programs of teaching, research, and service, they should be eligible for Senate representation within their academic unit. Finally, please note the added parenthetical statement about the academic professional class defining them to be 'faculty-like' in their academic background, qualifications, and duties. To the extent that the class has been or will be changed to include individuals who are not faculty-like in their training and in their duties, such individuals should not be eligible for representation in the Senate." (The motion failed only because there were insufficient senators present to adopt a bylaw; it was subsequently approved at a later meeting.)

"On May 14, 1992, the University Senate adopted a policy on the Evaluation of Teaching Contributions by the faculty. . . . The purpose of this policy is to facilitate evaluation of teaching for purposes of promotion and salary decisions, by defining what shall constitute adequate documentation for peer review of faculty teaching contributions. In the final portion of the motion approved as a policy, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was directed to draw up and bring back to the Senate . . . "details of the required assessment of teaching." In particular, SCEP was to propose "protocols for peer review [of teaching contributions], timing of assessment activities, institutional procedures for ensuring the accuracy and confidentiality of the results, procedures for administering student evaluations, and procedures for interpreting numerically scored evaluations." The committee did so at this meeting and the Senate approved them.

The Committee on Educational Policy recommended that it "shall be the policy of the University of Minnesota that each college should evaluate the work done by its students in each course in terms of the conventional credit which represents the expected amount of learning effort necessary for a student in that course. One conventional credit is hereby defined as equivalent to three hours of learning effort per week, averaged over an appropriate time interval, necessary for an average student taking that course to achieve an average grade in that course." This deleted the link between class/contact hours and credits for a course, and returned the policy to the one the Senate adopted in 1922. The Senate approved.

A question was posed to President Hasselmo: "The Governor's budget proposal articulates a philosophy of funding for higher education which is significantly different from that understood in previous years. In addition to recommending a lower level of funding than the University has

requested, the Governor's proposal promotes the privatization of public higher education, recommends that funding be attached to the student rather than the institution, and proposes the elimination of state subsidies for professional education. . . ." The president responded.

April 1, 1993 Faculty Senate

(nothing noteworthy)

May 20, 1993 University Senate (4)

The Committee on Faculty Affairs recommended that

"-- the University of Minnesota system implement domestic partnership registration for same sex couples and that

-- the benefits and privileges extended to the spouse of married employees/students also be extended to the partner of registered same sex domestic partners and that

-- the definition of "eligible dependent" for the purpose of health care coverage be interpreted to include the domestic partner and the children of either the employee/student or the partner and that

-- the attached affidavit and registration procedures be used to register domestic partnership relationship at the University of Minnesota."

After considerable debate, including opposition to recognizing same-sex relationships ("one senator said he did not see the proposal as an issue of civil rights but instead as an issue about what kind of social approbation should be extended to different kinds of living relationships. There is a strong public interest, he said, in privileging the marriage relationship and the University should not endorse any proposal to extend benefits to couples not in that kind of relationship, whether they be homosexual or heterosexual"), the Senate approved the recommendation 83-27.

May 20, 1993 Faculty Senate

The Senate received a report that "the President joined the chancellors of the Minnesota community college system, the Minnesota technical college system, the State University system, and the Higher Education Coordinating Board's director in the signing of an agreement to undertake collaborative efforts to develop programs that will better address the emerging needs in the state and the region, and particularly within the Twin Cities area. A particular focus of these efforts will be developing baccalaureate level programs that are more practitioner oriented and more tailored to the rapidly changing and continually emerging needs of business and industry."

A task force on supercomputing issued a report to the Senate, which endorsed its six recommendations.

June 3, 1993 Faculty Senate

The Senate overwhelmingly approved a resolution citing the fact that "negotiations between State management and the labor unions representing State employees over the health care

options offered to State employees are proceeding, . . . the recent proposal from State management contains major reductions in health benefits for those employees currently enrolled in the Medica Choice Select option or in the State Health Plan option" and because the proposal would increase employee contributions, "the Faculty Senate strongly urges the University administration to exert its influence with State management to minimize the impact on University employees."

October 4, 1993 University Senate (1)

President Hasselmo delivered his State of the University address.

November 18, 1993 Faculty Senate (1)

President Hasselmo has set forth his vision of University 2000 in the draft planning document. . . . The President has asked the Faculty Senate to consult with him on the directions contained in the planning document. Because of the importance and complexity of this item, the Faculty Consultative Committee believes that it should be considered at two meetings of the Faculty Senate." At the first meeting, "members of the Faculty Senate or other faculty members may make their points in discussion or may propose non-binding "straw vote" motions to assist in further development of the policy. Faculty Senate members or other faculty members who wish to propose "straw vote" motions should submit them in writing to the Clerk of the Senate." The Faculty Senate approved the procedure.

Professor Judith Garrard, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), outlined guidelines for the planning discussion . . . [and] said the FCC would like senators to think about framing the debate around four fundamental questions:

"1. Do we need a strategic plan at the University of Minnesota?

"2. Are the 5 areas outlined in Strategic Directions the ones we as an academic community should be focusing on? The five areas are

- research
- graduate and professional programs
- undergraduate education
- access and outreach
- user-friendliness

. . .

In order to gather more data, FCC members have made site visits over the past month. Teams of FCC members met with groups of faculty senators throughout the Twin Cities campus. Those who met with us tended to be informed and interested in the content of U2000. . . ."

"3. Finally, we come to the crux of the matter. If these are the five areas for the Strategic Directions, then what is right and wrong with them? Which parts are acceptable? What needs to be modified?

"4. How can the planning process be improved?

There was lengthy discussion with the president.

December 2, 1993 Faculty Senate (2)

FCC presented a motion concerning strategic planning:

"The Faculty Senate strongly endorses the need for a strategic plan;

The Faculty Senate endorses the five strategic directions identified in "U2000: Mission, Vision, Strategic Directions, and Performance" (research, graduate and professional education, undergraduate education, outreach and access to the University, and a user-friendly University community);

The Faculty Senate expresses appreciation for the consultation which has gone into the current draft of the "U2000" documents;

The Faculty Senate emphasizes that passage of this Resolution does not constitute endorsement, expressed, or implied, of any specific plan for implementation of the "U2000" vision, and further emphasizes the need for increased participation by members of the faculty, as well as by staff and students, in the continued planning and the implementation of "U2000"; and

The Faculty Senate calls for:

1. a continuation of active consultation with the faculty governance structure (1) of the Senate and (2) of the colleges; and with appropriate representatives from the staff and student body;
2. a clearer elaboration of University College and the cluster planning process in the very near future; and
3. further clarification of the steps remaining in the planning process this year, including identification of the tasks to be accomplished, the participants, the deadlines, and the expected outcomes.

The Faculty Senate also calls for the Administration to submit for action, through the regular governance structure, including the Senate, major matters of implementation or action prior to their submission to the Board of Regents."

The Faculty Senate approved 116-14.

#### December 2, 1993 University Senate (2)

SCC proposed two changes in vice chairs: "one a constitutional amendment requiring Regental approval and one a bylaw amendment that the Senate can approve on its own authority, create a vice chair of the Faculty Senate, to be elected by the membership of the Faculty Senate when the vice chair of the University Senate is a student. The vice chair of the Faculty Senate will also serve as a voting member of the Faculty Consultative Committee (but not the Senate Consultative Committee) when the University Senate vice chair is a student. When the University Senate vice chair is a faculty member, that individual will also serve as vice chair of the Faculty Senate--and serve as a voting member of both the Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees."

The Senate approved a resolution providing that "(1) the current policy prohibiting investments in companies with existing operations in South Africa is rescinded effective when free elections are held in South Africa in April, 1994; and 2) to avoid a potentially adverse impact on investment performance due to companies re-entering the South African market prior to the date of free elections, investments in companies entering the South African market after December 31, 1993 will no longer be prohibited.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that if, as determined by the African National Congress, elections are not conducted in a free, open, and appropriate manner, a moratorium will be placed

on any changes to the University's South African related investment policy until such time as free elections are held."

The Senate approved a policy on Hazardous Biological Materials Controls and Institutional Biosafety Committee. "Professor Albert Yonas, chair of the Senate Research Committee, presented the motion to replace the Regents' Policy "Hazardous Biological Materials Control, Recombinant DNA." The policy, he said, has been rewritten to take a rather long detailed document and divide it into two sections; one that describes policy issues and a second detailed addendum."

The President's Policy Agenda was presented for information (each item had several bullets):  
Priority: Develop a strategic plan to guide the future course of the University of Minnesota.  
Priority: Strengthen and clarify the management infrastructure including personnel and systems, to ensure the capability of the organization to execute the strategic plan as well as the policies of the Board and management.  
Priority: Improve the operating and capital budgeting processes to provide the Board and management the capability to allocate resources in accord with the strategic priorities set by the Board.  
Priority: Develop an external relations program to provide the Board and management with an ongoing means of ensuring that institutional goals are responsive to the needs of Minnesotans and to enable the University to secure support for critical priorities.

A senator asked: "Will planning discussions include consideration of changing to the semester system?" The president responded that "that issue will come up again and the University should consider moving away from the rigidities of its current scheduling--perhaps even to a 12-month use of its facilities."

February 17, 1994 University Senate (3)

SCC moved and the Senate approved establishment of a Faculty Senate vice chair, who serves with vote on FCC (who also serves as vice chair of the University Senate), in those cases when a student is elected vice chair of the University Senate.

SCC and the Committee on Educational Policy introduced the "Report of the Review Committee on Awarding Credit For Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate at the University of Minnesota." The Senate approved the recommendations.

The Senate approved a student academic grievance policy.

The Senate was provided an update on U2000 planning. "President Hasselmo reported that 68 stakeholder meetings have been held throughout the State in recent months and that a comprehensive report from those meetings has been prepared and is available in the President's Office. Efforts have already begun to incorporate suggestions into the U2000 planning. There has been encouraging support for quality improvements and an understanding that the University does have specialized missions. . . ."

The president was asked about administrative costs. "Organizational theory usually says that an administration proliferates during a time of growth. It appears that faculty ranks are either shrinking or staying the same. Why then is there a proposal to increase the layers of central administration and how much money is currently being expended on administrative positions as opposed to faculty and support positions?" The president supported the "policy to minimize administration, simplify administrative structures, and reduce administrative overhead wherever possible and that is the intent of the proposed reorganization. During recent restructuring and reorganization efforts, steps were taken that have lead to considerable savings in administrative costs."

#### February 17, 1994 Faculty Senate

FCC and the Committee on Faculty Affairs introduced a lengthy Conflict of Interest policy ("A conflict of interest occurs when an ACADEMIC EMPLOYEE compromises his/her professional judgment in carrying out University teaching, research, outreach, or public service activities because of an external relationship that directly or indirectly affects the FINANCIAL INTEREST of the ACADEMIC EMPLOYEE, any FAMILY member, or any ASSOCIATED ENTITY.") After lengthy discussion, the policy was approved.

The FCC chair, Judith Garrard, reported to the Faculty Senate on her quarterly report to the Board of Regents: "We are deeply concerned that continuing programmatic cuts will undermine the base from which U2000 is to be built. If the strategic planning process is to be realized and implementations for U2000 is to begin, then a commitment must be made to the underlying quality of the academic programs, with long term investment in competitive salaries, a strategic investment pool, and realistic tuition levels. . . . We urge you, the Regents, to make this commitment to the future of U2000 by making the hard decision to hold retrenchments to the level contemplated in the Resource Allocation Guidelines as originally proposed by the administration in January."

#### May 19, 1994 University Senate (4)

SCC introduced a resolution concerning "a growing crisis stemming from the decay and obsolescence of existing buildings and facilities" and resolved "that the University Senate supports the administration's emphasis on these matters at the Legislature; [and be] it further resolved that the University Senate encourages the University administration to develop a specific long-term strategy with the Legislature to define and fund the needed improvements so essential to the University's academic mission." The Senate approved.

The Senate approved a policy on the use of human subjects in research: "The Board of Regents at the University of Minnesota adopts and continues its policy that all research involving human subjects conducted at the University of Minnesota shall be conducted in accordance with federal regulations including but not limited to the "Guidelines for Protection of Research Subjects" 45 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 46 established by the National Institutes of Health, revised June 1991 and regulations to protect human subjects, 21 CFR 50, 56, 312, 812 as established by the Food and Drug Administration. . . ."

In a discussion about U2000 planning, "one senator raised a concern about the performance measures, particularly the lack of Senate discussion on them. The chair of the Senate Consultative Committee responded that the measures have been and still are being discussed in a number of key Senate committees, including the Educational Policy Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Consultative Committee, and Finance and Planning Committee. The President anticipates that a set of institutional measures will be presented to the Regents in July with the collegiate measures following sometime later. . . ."

In response to an inquiry about a resolution developed and approved by the Senate Research Committee relating to the Animal Care and Use Committee, Professor Al Yonas, chair of the Research Committee, explained that it "strongly encourages the University of Minnesota General Counsel to consider, a high priority, the personal safety and health of all individuals involved with animal care, and especially protecting these individuals from possible litigation." The resolution has been forwarded to the General Counsel's Office.

#### May 19, 1994 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved an amendment to the tenure policy allowing extension of the probationary period "when the faculty member is a major caregiver for a family member who has an extended serious illness, injury, or other debilitating condition."

#### October 6, 1994 University Senate (1)

President Hasselmo gave his State of the University address.

#### November 3, 1994 University Senate (2)

The Senate had a lengthy discussion of planning, including "the overall principles, technical principles, principles for using measures, and the sources used to develop the measures. The latter included review of U2000; review of preliminary strategic plans submitted by colleges, campuses, and support units. . . . [and] the eighteen recommended critical measures. They have been divided into "input measures," "process measures," and "outcome measures." Plans for implementation of the critical measures was also reviewed. The first phase will be presented to the Board of Regents in November for action, . . . The critical measures to be presented to the Regents later in the month include: characteristics of entering students, graduation rate, underrepresented groups/diversity, sponsored funding, and investment per student."

The president's policy agenda was presented, as a set of priorities.

**PRIORITY:** Continue the development of University 2000 as a strategic plan: specifically, develop action plans for the implementation of strategic directions of University 2000; research; graduate and professional education; undergraduate education; access and outreach; user friendliness, and diversity, with good stewardship of resources and in partnership with other institutions.

**PRIORITY:** Continue to develop a program to ensure that institutional goals are responsive to the needs of Minnesotans, are properly understood, and properly supported: specifically, organize a major campaign to inform Minnesota leaders and the public about the University's ongoing



contributions to the state, the importance of the University 2000 plan, and the need for continued state and private investment in the University.

**PRIORITY:** Continue to clarify and strengthen the management infrastructure, including personnel and systems, to ensure the capability of the organization to execute the strategic plan as well as the policies of the board and the administration: specifically, implement the new organization for the Twin Cities campus and recruit and reassign personnel to new or redefined positions.

**PRIORITY:** Continue to improve the operating and capital budgeting processes to provide the Board and the administration the capability to allocate resources in accord with the University's strategic priorities: specifically, determine the extent to which further decentralization of resource management to responsibility centers should be undertaken and assign appropriate authority and accountability to provosts, deans, directors, and department chairs.

**PRIORITY:** Continue to improve the personnel policies, processes, and practices: specifically, review and revise as necessary the policies, processes, and practices for recruitment, career development, compensation, retention, and retirement for faculty and staff, and preservation of morale in a time of change.

In questions to the president, one was "What is Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) and what are the expected costs and benefits for faculty, staff, and students?" The president explained that "RCM means that all costs and all income are attributable to each academic unit and assigned to that particular unit. It identifies the flow of revenues and the costs associated with certain activities. It is also intended to provide appropriate incentives for academic units to increase income and reduce costs. The overhead associated with activities such as student services and the library will also be allocated to the academic units. RCM is a part of decentralization and a change in how the University manages itself. . . ." The president was asked if the University will adopt RCM. It "is still under review but is expected to be introduced at the University within the next few months."

The SCC chair, John Adams, noted elements of his quarterly report to the Board of Regents: "1) the FCC's support of the partnership budget proposal, 2) the need for improved communication and consultation within the University, 3) the importance of addressing the issue of salary competitiveness, 4) transition activities associated with the restructuring of central administration, and 5) the status of the Senate's review of the Regents Policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility."

SCC chair Adams also reported that FCC, during the summer, had adopted resolutions supporting "the president's plan to reorganize central administration and move to a provostial [sic] structure."

Under Old Business, a question that had been raised at previous meetings, "concerning the high fringe benefit rates for graduate students and whether steps have been taken to alleviate the burden that these high rates are placing on research programs. Senior Vice President Infante responded that the task force established to study this issue has recently completed its work and has suggested three possible options: 1) to stay with the present system, which obviously offers both advantages and disadvantages, 2) to go to a method of direct charging, and 3) to eliminate tuition benefits altogether. The administration is currently reviewing all three options and hopes to reach a decision within the near future."

### November 3, 1994 Faculty Senate

The Senate endorsed five critical measures:

- "- Characteristics of Entering Students by Campus
- Graduation Rate by Campus
- Underrepresented Groups/Diversity
- Sponsored Funding by Campus
- Instructional Direct Expenditures per Student by Campus

and the process whereby specific performance goals will be defined and redefined in the future."

FCC chair John Adams "reported that the Board of Regents has requested the FCC to review the three existing Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statements (1938, 1963, 1971). There was consensus among FCC members and others who were consulted in this matter that the 1938 statement is one of the earliest and strongest statements of its kind in American academia and deserves to be endorsed with some modifications. It is the hope of the FCC that one revised statement would replace the three existing statements. The committee is currently working on a revision keeping in mind the need to satisfy the administration's legal and administrative issues and the academic issues that lie at the very heart of what faculty are trying to do in the academy."

"Professor Carl Adams, chair of the Compensation Working Group, reported that the committee was established by Senior Vice President Infante and the chair of the FCC to address compensation issues for faculty and academic professional staff. . . . If the University wants to be one of the relatively few major significant research institutions in the country, maybe in the world, as U2000 suggests, the University must be able to attract and retain a faculty that is able to be competitive with the institutions it is trying to compete with. . . . If you look at these peer institutions you can quickly determine the size of the financial issue. Data . . . suggest that the University is perhaps \$10,000 per person behind its peer institutions. If there are 2000 faculty, this may be a \$20 million a year problem. . . ." And a few more paragraphs.

### February 16, 1995 University Senate (3)

The Senate approved joint preparation requirements with the Minnesota State University system, including: "English--Four years, including writing, literature, and speech, Mathematics--Three years consisting of two years of algebra, one of which must be intermediate or advanced algebra, and one year of geometry, Science--Three years, including at least one course each in the biological and physical sciences, and all three units to incorporate significant laboratory experience, Social Studies--Three years, including one year each of geography and American history, World Language--Two years of a single second language, Arts--One year in the visual or performing arts."

The Senate approved a recommendations that "a standing group chosen from the Morse-Alumni award winners be established, to serve as a resource and advisory group to the University about excellence in undergraduate education [and] that the financial portion of the Morse-Alumni award, beginning with new 1995 awards, be provided to recipients for the remainder of the time they

remain regular faculty at the University, that is, that the award be a continuing addition to the faculty member's regular salary."

The president led a discussion of planning and budgeting, including a next round of critical measures, including "1) student experience, 2) post-graduate experience, 3) scholarship, research, artistic accomplishments, 4) responsiveness to compelling State needs, 5) overall satisfaction of Minnesota citizens, 6) faculty and staff recruitment, satisfaction and retention, 7) facilities, and 8) resource development."

President Hasselmo reported the selection of the Provost for Professional Studies, the second of three provosts in the decentralized administration, and the search for the third one, Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, was in process. Also: "One of the important parts of that reorganization came to the fore suddenly when the President had to consider a retention case which involved the restructured Student Affairs position, renamed Student Development and Athletics, restoring to that position responsibility for intercollegiate athletics which the position had as late as 1987. . . ."

SCC introduced a revised statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility for discussion, prepared by a working group, eventually to go to the Board of Regents for adoption, at its request. It read in part:

"Academic Freedom and Responsibility at the University of Minnesota mean:

*Freedom:* of expression in the classroom on matters relevant to the subject and the purpose of the course and of the choice of methods in classroom teaching; from direction and restraint in scholarship, research, and creative expression and in the discussion and publication of the results thereof; to speak and write as a citizen without institutional censorship or discipline;

and

*Responsibility:* to perform faithfully the duties of membership in the University community and the responsibilities of position; to observe the special obligations of a member of a learned community and of an officer or member of an educational institution to seek and respect the truth; to make it clear that statements made on one's own behalf are not those of the institution."

#### February 16, 1995 Faculty Senate

"When the Senate adopted the U-2000 planning statement in December, 1993, [FCC] appointed a special committee on Excellence in Teaching and Research in the University Plan to ensure that the teaching and research missions of the University were properly furthered by action under the Plan. . . . We believed that we could assist the President and other members of the central administration in focusing on some long-range and cross-cutting issues essential to the continued excellence of the teaching and research missions of the University. . . . We share frustration at the limits which the funding situation have put on the possibility of implementation on the U-2000 goals. . . . The Committee is concerned that future budget adjustments within the University be targeted to enhance excellence in teaching and research. We believe that broadly distributed reductions of budget bases harm our efforts to achieve excellence."

#### April 20, 1995 University Senate (4)

The Senate approved a resolution on changing to semesters, declaring that "if such a change is to take place, the administration must, before the beginning of the next academic year, commit the University to a definite target date on which the change would take place, and . . . that the implementation of the change from quarters to semesters must include a sufficient budget to acquire adequate faculty time and resources to accomplish the transformation in an educationally sound manner, and . . . that any semester calendar must not result in a loss of instructional time and must be consistent with the education, research, and outreach missions of the University, and . . . that the planning process for a change from quarters to semesters must take place in close consultation with the Senate governance system and with academic units."

SCC presented a revised statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, ending with "These Principles are also refreshed by the Recollection that there is a Common Bond through all the Arts:  
COMMUNE VINCULUM OMNIBUS ARTIBUS

Academic Freedom is the Freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the Classroom, to explore all Avenues of Scholarship, Research and Creative Expression and to speak or write as a public Citizen without institutional Discipline or Restraint. Academic Responsibility implies the faithful Performance of Academic Duties and Obligations, the Recognition of the Demands of the Scholarly Enterprise and the Candor to make it clear that the Individual is not speaking for the Institution in Matters of public Interest." SCC chair John Adams explained that earlier "the SCC presented to the Senate a statement which built upon the brief but elegant statement on the books. In late winter a working group revised the draft, improving its content but losing some of its elegance in the process. At that point the SCC was in agreement with its content but not its form. It asked Regents Professor Rutherford Aris, one of the University's finest wordsmiths and a chemical engineer "to try his hand at transmuting our base prose into gold." The above statement is the result of Professor Aris' work. Professor Aris indulged his preference for the 18th Century style of capitalized nouns, which the SCC believes adds a nice but faintly archaic flavor to the presentation." (The statement was approved, with a minor edit, at the following Senate meeting.)

President Hasselmo "began his remarks with an update of U2000. A vision has been articulated, he said, that envisions the University as a global, land-grant, research university--a first rate institution for the 21st century--successful in meeting the changing expectations of higher education, . . ." including critical measures adopted by the Regents. "The administrative reorganization adopted by the Regents last September turns executive authority and accountability over to the three chancellors and three provosts on the Twin Cities Campus." He "welcomed and introduced Provosts Allen and Shively, both of whom received a warm round of applause from senators."

The SCC chair Adams noted "statements prepared by the Faculty Consultative Committee concerning the selection of the provost for arts, sciences, and engineering."

#### April 20, 1995 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved additional language for its faculty workload statement, which provided that for tenured/tenure-track faculty, workload principles are to allow "sufficient time to meeting their responsibilities as would reasonably be necessary: (a) for all ranks, to make scholarly contributions expected of their faculties, and (b) in the case of assistant and associate professors, to

sustain the quality of continuing contributions required in the respective unit to achieve tenure and promotion. This policy establishes a standard applicable to all faculty ranks. It recognizes that University research is inextricably interwoven with teaching and often with service, and that the proportion of effort devoted to research need not be identical for each individual faculty member in a unit, but may vary around the unit's average. . . ."

The Senate approved a resolution concerning the report of the Compensation Working Group: "The Faculty Senate wishes to express its support for the general concepts, principles and positions conveyed in the Report. Further, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Regents give careful consideration to the desirability of quickly establishing a long term compensation policy position for faculty and academic staff and to reinforcing the chosen policy position with the decisions regarding FY 95-96 salary increases." FCC chair Adams reviewed some of the assumptions and findings of the Group:

It assumed that "1) the U2000 agenda aims to place the U of M among the 20-25 major research universities that survive and prosper in the coming decade, 2) faculty and academic staff essential to the University's successful competition for inclusion in the top group are drawn from a national and international academic labor market, 3) a competitive salary position is essential to attract and retain needed faculty and staff, 4) inter-unit salary variations should reflect market realities but all units should be in the range of similar units in the set of peer institutions, and 5) individual salaries should be based on performance. . . . Some of the CWG's findings, views and recommendations, including:

- that the Change magazine list of 30 top research institutions serve as the appropriate peer set for salary comparisons for the Twin Cities--appropriate groups were identified also for Duluth and Morris and an appropriate peer group should be developed for Crookston
- that the 75th percentile position within each group serve as a long term critical planning measure and that over the next 5-7 years a realistic target of the 50th percentile be used
- before adjustments to the numbers of faculty and staff, current annual shortfall from the 75th percentile salary position is estimated to be \$40-50 million per year--achieving the 50th percentile would cost a little more than half that amount. . . ."

#### May 18, 1995 University Senate (5)

The Senate received a proposed policy on sexual assault. "The University of Minnesota is committed to creating a community which is free from violence in all forms, including, but not limited to physical assaults, and bias motivated actions based on gender, race, sexual orientation, or disability. Sexual violence, including sexual assault and sexual harassment, will not be tolerated at this University." The policy went on to define sexual assault and had other provisions. The Senate returned it to committee (Student Affairs) because of a lack of clarity about whom the policy covered and judicial issues.

SCC and the Social Concerns committee brought back the ROTC issue with a new resolution that read in part:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate request the President and the administration to continue their efforts to place the issue of federal military regulations discriminating against current and future members of the armed services in the matter of their 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 IF FURTHER RESOLVED that if the conflict has not been settled by June 30, 1996, then the University, at the time of renewal, 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 IF FURTHER RESOLVED that if the conflict has not been settled by one year after the beginning date for renegotiation of the contract, then the University will begin the process of severing relations with the ROTC. . . ." The Senate approved.

The president reported that the "administration is carefully looking at the Report of the Compensation Working Group (CWG) and is trying to find ways to put as much as possible into the compensation pool because it realizes that the future of the University depends on its ability to remain competitive. The only way to accomplish this, said the President, is by not providing "across the board" increases because different components of the University find themselves in very different market, competitive, and equity situations. . . . The Report of the CWG is being used as a guide by the administration, noted the President. It presents a very aggressive compensation report in the context of what 30 major universities in the country do. . . ."

The president also reported that "strategic investments are being made . . . and the institution will go forward according to priorities established under U2000. Investments in the undergraduate initiative are being continued to make sure that the best possible undergraduate education can be provided. Continuing investments are being made in the diversity effort as well as in the technology that is necessary for quality teaching and research. Administrative efficiencies are also under review. . . ."

The president reviewed Responsibility Centered Management, said "it enhances shared governance by transferring the decision-making and resource allocation processes closer to the academic departments and support units allowing significantly larger number of students and faculty to participate" and that it creates:

- "- incentives to enhance revenues and control costs
- recognition for the importance of tuition revenue and hence for students and the courses and professors that attract them
- recognition of the importance of the state subsidy and a clear sense of how, and where, the state subsidy is used
- explicit charges for space related costs
- explicit portrayal of indirect costs helps reinforce that indirect cost recoveries are to help cover real costs and hence are not discretionary revenues
- portrayal of revenues and expenses at the school/department level involves the faculty substantively at a level where they can make a difference
- the explicit identification of the sources and uses of overhead funds creates pressures to provide services more efficiently."

The president also said that "it is inevitable that the University convert from quarters to semesters and that it has placed that issue on its agenda. The Senate, he recalled, recently gave its preliminary endorsement for the change."

The president was asked about the term "fiscal emergency," a term used in the tenure policy when elimination of tenured faculty positions would have to be considered; he responded that "the term 'fiscal emergency' does appear in some documents but it is formulated in such a way that it cannot possibly ever occur because it means that the entire University would have to be in such dire straits that it would have to close its doors. It is something that cannot be applied to individual units. For instance, a particular unit cannot declare fiscal emergency and abolish tenure. The entire University can only declare fiscal emergency and that is a very unlikely scenario."

Asked about where funding for U2000 initiatives would come, the president noted that "it is important to understand that over the past five years the University has lost approximately \$50 million in funding that will not be recovered. Cuts have had to be made in certain areas in order to reinvest in others."

May 18, 1995 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved seven additional "second phase" critical measures:

- "- Student Experience
- Post-Graduation Experience
- Scholarship, Research, Artistic Accomplishment
- Overall Satisfaction of Minnesota Citizens
- Faculty and Staff Experience
- Facilities Infrastructure
- Resource Development

and the process whereby specific performance goals will be defined and redefined in the future."

The Tenure Subcommittee proposed three interpretations of the tenure policy, one of which was "Interpretation of Sections 3 9: Promotion and Tenure Decisions Permitted by Provosts and Chancellors during 1995-9[:.] To accommodate current restructuring of the central administration, final review and related aspects of the promotion and tenure process may occur at the level of provosts and chancellors during the 1995 96 academic year. . . ." "The Tenure Subcommittee concluded that changing aspects of the Tenure Regulations pertaining to promotion and tenure will impact on other aspects of the Regulations (e.g. fiscal emergencies, termination for cause), which are now responsibilities of central administration. Reassigning these administrative responsibilities described in the Tenure Regulations from central administration to provosts and chancellors could have major effects on the academic affairs and freedom of faculty. . . . In order to allow time for broad consultation with faculty and administrators and the preparation of carefully considered amendments to the Tenure Regulations, the Tenure Subcommittee proposes the above Interpretation to the Regulations" and will seek consultation during the year about the impact of the change. All three interpretations were approved at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

FCC and the Faculty Affairs Committee brought a long draft policy on Professional Commitment for discussion. "ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES may engage in EXTRA PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES within the limitations set forth in this policy as long as these activities do not interfere with University teaching, research, outreach, and administrative responsibilities.

1.2 The intent of this policy is to: 1) identify professional contributions and services rendered by ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES to the community; 2) establish mechanisms for assuring the accountability of the University and its ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES with respect to EXTRA PROFESSIONAL and BUSINESS activities; and 3) provide principles to reconcile, as equitably as possible, conflicts between EXTRA PROFESSIONAL and BUSINESS demands on ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES and their varied University responsibilities." Professor Carl Adams brought an alternative proposal, Policy on Academic Employees' Extra Work. The two proposals were debated extensively; no action was taken.

#### May 18, 1995 Faculty Senate

The Policy on Professional Commitment was brought back for action; an alternative proposal was substituted, and the entire matter was returned to committee after lengthy debate.

#### November 16, 1995 University Senate (1)

SCC and the Committee on Educational Policy introduced for discussion a Uniform Grade and Honor Point System and University Transcripts that included the option for instructors of using plus/minus grading. The proposal received considerable debate and will be brought back to a future meeting.

SCC and the Committee on Educational Policy also brought for discussion "Standards for the Semester Conversion." "In September, 1995, the Board of Regents voted that the University of Minnesota should convert from its current quarter system to a semester system. This change is to be University-wide.

"Because many of the issues related to the conversion to semesters reside within the purview of the University's Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), SCEP began the discussion of how the University could use this change as an opportunity to focus on maintaining and strengthening the academic integrity of the curriculum and educational processes of the institution. The questions and principles stated below represent the beginning of our deliberation.

"This version is intended to begin a discussion that will take place over the next several months. It begins with this November Senate meeting; it is expected that there will be additional Senate meetings in January, February, and April. The idea of this process is that as these discussions take place, the Senate will begin to converge on conclusions about the semester conversion standards." The proposal included possible calendars and credit rules.

The Senate approved 142-0 language granting FCC and the Student Senate Consultative Committee authority to act on behalf of their respective senates "when a decision is required prior to the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate and when a decision is required when it would not be possible to convene a special meeting of the Faculty Senate in a timely fashion; such actions will be reported to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting and the Faculty Senate may then overrule the Faculty Consultative Committee."

"Professor Carl Adams called senators attention to a handout distributed at the door entitled Faculty Consultative Committee Quarterly Report. The report, he said, was presented to the Board of Regents on November 10. Professor Adams briefly described the actions the Faculty



Consultative Committee (FCC) has taken with respect to tenure. A Tenure Working Group was jointly appointed by the administration and the FCC to coordinate the efforts of the administration and the faculty during the tenure review process. It will seek from the Tenure Subcommittee and the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee whatever modifications of the Tenure Code seem appropriate."

President Hasselmo gave his State of the University address.

#### November 16, 1995 Faculty Senate

The Senate endorsed changes to the Conflict of Interest policy that had been approved by FCC earlier.

The annual report from the Committee on Faculty Affairs indicated the division over the Professional Commitment policy: "Concerns were expressed by several SCFA members that the Faculty Senate might not pass the document. Apparently these were well-founded. After the final draft of the policy failed to receive Faculty Senate approval, a subcommittee was formed (including the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee) with the charge that a document which can be accepted by the Senate should be drafted as early as possible in the 1995-96 academic year."

The annual report of the Committee on Faculty Affairs also highlighted morale and tenure: "The Faculty Affairs Committee discussed at length what issues may be influencing the perceived decline in faculty morale. Issues such as salary, administrative policies, perceived worth of the institution in the state and within the Legislature, relationship between the faculty and the Board of Regents, variance in values between the Administration and the Faculty, and the very status of faculty governance within the stream of administrative deliberations and evolving policies were considered to have impact (mostly negative). . . .

#### "Faculty Affairs Committee and the Issue of Tenure:

The administrative restructuring into a 3 Provost and 3 Chancellor model presented the need for revision of the tenure code to the Tenure Subcommittee of SCFA. . . . The future of tenure at U-MN was discussed with President Hasselmo and Vice President Infante. . . . The goals of these discussions were to make faculty concerns known and to provide faculty input on evolving tenure deliberations that are taking place in general among higher education administrators and their constituents.

"Because of the complexity of the tenure issue, a formal revision of the Tenure Code was postponed. . . . [In 1995-96] formal input from faculty and administration will be sought by the Tenure Subcommittee with the intent of making carefully deliberated modifications in the Tenure Code. At the end of the 94-95 academic year, the Tenure Committee requested a "white paper" or philosophical overview of where our institution is going in its tenure posture. This information was solicited from Central Administration with the intent that it be used in the deliberations on the Tenure Code modifications that will occur in the upcoming academic year. "

#### January 11, 1996 University Senate (2)

The Senate considered and discussed at length a revised Uniform Grade and Honor Point System and University Transcripts policy; the major points of discussion were around plus/minus grading and campus autonomy in establishing grading policy.

The Senate again took up the long standards for semester conversion; the Committee on Educational Policy brought them for discussion at this meeting and reported it would do so again in February and for action in April. "Several senators expressed disappointment that the committee was moving away from a trimester system arguing that without it there will be incompatibility between the regular and summer session classes. . . ." There was considerable discussion of the calendar and various other points.

Under New Business:

"Professor Carl Adams reported that the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) recently endorsed the idea of a unified biweekly payroll system to be initiated in September 1996. The proposed merger has been met with mixed emotions, he said, and will cause some discomfort during the transition period. . . . The Administration has assured the FCC that an employee's cash flow will not vary from what it is now."

"Professor John Adams provided a brief update on the tenure discussions. He described the work of the various committees involved in the process and outlined the steps for amending the Tenure Code. Faculty can participate in the discussions on many levels, he said, and will be most effective in the early stages, which is now. He encouraged senators to attend some of the committee meetings at which tenure will be discussed or to forward comments/questions to the Senate office. Professor Adams also explained the role of the Tenure Working Group which was appointed jointly by the FCC and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the end of October to coordinate the tenure discussions. Professor Adams referred senators to a discussion document prepared by the Tenure Working Group to begin the debate on potential issues and finally announced the scheduling of two Faculty Senate Forums on Tenure for January 25 and February 8, the details of which will be widely publicized."

February 15, 1996 University Senate (3)

The semester conversion standards were again discussed at length.

The grading policy, revised from the previous meeting, was discussed at length.

The president's report included this item:

**Tenure** The President reaffirmed his goal to maintain a strong and vigorous tenure system at the University that will protect academic freedom and provide necessary employment safeguards. At the same time, he said, it is important to have a system that is flexible and one that can credibly be demonstrated to society. Tenure is one of the most important things in a democratic society, that is, the right to do free and open inquiry. However, it must also be a system that allows appropriate flexibility and change in the institution when research, teaching, and outreach priorities have to be changed. The President said he is encouraged by the discussions that have already taken place.

April 18, 1996 University Senate (4)

The Committee on Educational Policy brought for the fourth time, for action, semester-conversion standards: "There shall be two semesters, each of which shall include a minimum of 70 days of instruction and a maximum of 75 days of instruction, at least one study day, and approximately one week of final examinations (including Saturdays but not Sundays). . . . All campuses of the University shall have the same calendar. . . . Departments are urged strongly to prefer courses of three credits, and especially to prefer three-credit courses which are taken by significant numbers of students from other fields. It is understood that many courses, such as laboratory or mathematics courses, will be offered for more than three credits. . . . Baccalaureate degrees consist of a minimum of 120 semester credits. The liberal education requirements (including writing skills), as established by the appropriate body on each campus (the Council on Liberal Education on the Twin Cities campus), shall consist of at least 39 semester credits. . . . The Senate affirms the standard (first adopted by the University Senate on February 16, 1922, and reaffirmed subsequently) that one semester credit is to represent, for the average University of Minnesota undergraduate student, three hours of academic work per week (including lectures, laboratories, recitations, discussion groups, field work, study, and so on), or approximately 45 hours of work over the course of an enrollment period. . . . It is expected that the academic work required of graduate and professional students will exceed three hours per credit per week or 45 hours per semester. . . . The hours of contact time for a course shall equal at least the number of credits for the course times the number of weeks the course is offered. In the majority of cases, this would mean the number of contact hours per week would equal the number of credits for the course, but the contact hours need not be spread out evenly by week. . . . In general, with college review and approval, (1) all departments and programs should reduce the credit value of their undergraduate and graduate curricula by approximately one-third, and (2) the time required for a student to complete a program/degree may not be increased as a result of the change to semesters. . . . Exemptions from these standards may be granted by the President's Office."

President Hasselmo presented a lengthy statement on tenure, including a timeline of regental and other actions.

April 18, 1996 Faculty Senate

[This was probably the most dramatic and tension-filled Faculty Senate meeting in its history; the entire record of the meeting is reproduced here.]

**MOTION:**

To approve the following Resolution:

**RESOLUTION**

**RATIONALE**

The purpose of this resolution is to alert the leadership of the faculty governance, the administration, and the Regents that the Faculty Senate has grave concerns about the process and

progress to date of the revision of the Tenure Code. This resolution is the result of meetings among senior faculty from academic units throughout the Twin Cities campus. The purpose of these meetings has been to define the focus of growing faculty confusion, discomfort, and dissatisfaction about the way in which the revision of the Tenure Code is being handled. This resolution was considered to be a moderate and appropriate first step in communicating this faculty concern.

## **WHEREAS**

1. The Tenure Code review process has been flawed from the beginning. This has not been faculty initiated or faculty led as has been claimed by central administration, the Chair of the FCC and the Chair of the Tenure Working Group.
2. Final reports and recommendations of the proposed revisions are not available in writing at this Senate meeting from the three required faculty governance committees, i.e., the Tenure Subcommittee, Judicial Committee, and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA). The recommendations by these three committees may be quite different from the lawyer-prepared document of March 20 (consisting of 13 amendments) that the Faculty Senate has been given.
3. No information has been provided by the central administration nor by the Regents of the extent and cause of the financial crisis that justifies drastic changes in the Tenure Code. The reasons for the revision have not been given. If there are reasons other than financial, then these have not been given. In summary, there is no explanation of why the current Tenure Code is inadequate.
4. There is a growing negative impact of the process and actions concerning revision of the Tenure Code on the University of Minnesota. There is also evidence of increasing national concern by faculties at other universities throughout the U.S. about the revision of the Tenure Code at the University of Minnesota as shown by the attached resolution from the University of California at Berkeley. The negative impact has had serious ramifications for the prestige of the University of Minnesota which have begun to make faculty recruitment and retention difficult.
5. There is increasing lack of faculty confidence in the faculty governance leadership.

## **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE THAT**

1. The Faculty Senate has no confidence in the process of revision of the Tenure Code as it has been carried out thus far. The Faculty Senate mandates that the present process be stopped.
2. The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) direct the Judicial Committee, the Committee on Tenure, and SCFA to present in writing to the Faculty Senate at the May 2 meeting a revised plan for proceeding with consideration of the Tenure Code revisions, in accordance with the Regents' rules in Section 19 of the current Tenure Code.

3. The ad hoc Tenure Working Group be disbanded immediately and its functions be assumed by the three faculty governance committees, i.e., the Tenure Subcommittee, Judicial Committee, and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs.

## **DISCUSSION:**

*Senator Campbell explained that the intent of the resolution was to alert the leadership of the faculty governance, the administration, and the Regents that the Faculty Senate has grave concerns about the process and progress to date of the revision of the Tenure Code, and to restore consideration of the Tenure Code revisions to the proper procedure as detailed in Section 19 of the current Tenure Code. He emphasized that the resolution was not intended to stop the tenure discussion.*

*Several senators expressed frustration with the establishment of the Tenure Working Group and the fact that lawyers had been brought into the process, noting that there is no provision in the Tenure Code for such involvement. Section 19 of the Tenure Code clearly identifies the procedure for amending the Regulations. Responsibility for proposing amendments rests with the Faculty Senate after soliciting recommendations from the Tenure, Faculty Affairs, and Judicial Committees. The resolution calls for the Tenure Working Group to be disbanded and its functions assumed by the appropriate Senate committees noted above.*

*Other senators said they are displeased with the lack of information that has been provided to date, that senators have been asked to discuss issues without seeing specific language, that lawyers are drafting the amendments rather than the Tenure Subcommittee, that there appears to be a lack of involvement by the three appropriate Faculty Senate committees (Tenure, Faculty Affairs, and Judicial), and that timelines have been set that do not allow for appropriate debate to take place.*

*Professor Daniel Feeney, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), then spoke about the effects of the resolution, if approved. It would disband the Tenure Working Group, a committee that the SCFA and Tenure Subcommittee have been working closely with throughout the tenure review process. In fact, he said, the three committees hold their meetings jointly. Professor Feeney praised the work of the Tenure Working Group because its members have helped the Tenure Subcommittee and SCFA identify important issues. Professor Feeney said he believes there has been some misunderstandings about the Tenure Working Group's role in the process. In any event, he assured senators that the SCFA, Tenure Subcommittee, and Judicial Committee, will prepare the draft language for the Faculty Senate's consideration. It is the position of these three committees, added Professor Feeney, that it would be a mistake to stop the process now.*

*Professor Mary Dempsey, chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, reinforced Professor Feeney's comments and urged senators not to support the motion.*

*Professor Edwin Fogelman, chair of the Judicial Committee, added that he does not question the motives of the Tenure Working Group. It was intended to accomplish something constructive, but somehow along the way the process got confused. The important issue now, he*

*believes, is that the faculty clearly assert its own voice which has been compromised as a result of the way the process has unfolded. It appears the only way to correct that is to halt the current process and resume the discussions in the way that is prescribed in the Tenure Code, a process that all faculty can hopefully have confidence in. If at the end of the process the faculty doubts that this is in fact the voice of the faculty, that will be a most unfortunate outcome.*

*Senator Hy Berman commented that in the 35 years that he has been at the University of Minnesota he has never seen the mood of the faculty so negative, so questioning, or so suspicious. These feelings are real and need to be faced, he said. The faculty must also face the fact that a problem exists with the political establishment and the public. He acknowledged that some of the tenure rules may need to be modified but said it must be done under faculty control and jurisdiction and in a way that holds credibility with the faculty. For whatever the reason, there is a belief that the faculty do not currently have control of the process and that it is being driven by other factors. The only way to correct this perception and regain credibility is to adopt the resolution and begin fresh.*

*At this time the question was called and the motion was overwhelmingly approved on a voice vote by a majority of members present and voting.*

#### May 2, 1996 University Senate (5)

The Senate approved a motion providing, with more details, that "The Senate confirms that in general each degree seeking student enrolled at the University prior to September, 1999, shall neither be disadvantaged nor advantaged due to the change from a quarter system to a semester system."

The Senate asked each campus assembly to review the grading policy and report back in the fall.

The Senate approved by overwhelming majority a resolution with a number of "whereas" clauses and "**BE IT RESOLVED** that the University of Minnesota Senate hereby endorses and joins the international boycott of the Mitsubishi corporate family. It recommends that the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota shall instruct the University of Minnesota Administration to refrain from purchases of products that carry the Mitsubishi name until the Senate Social Concerns Committee shall determine that the logging, mining, and trading practices of the Mitsubishi companies are ecologically sustainable."

#### May 2, 1996 Faculty Senate

"In keeping with the Resolution approved by the Faculty Senate on April 18, Professor Daniel Feeney, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), outlined the process the SCFA, Tenure Subcommittee, and Judicial Committee will follow for the tenure review between now and the end of the academic year. He also announced the selection of Professor Fred Morrison (Law School) to serve as the legal counsel for the committees. Preliminary draft amendments have been prepared, he said, and will be presented for discussion at the May 16 Faculty Senate meeting. Additional Faculty Senate meetings have also been scheduled for May 30 and June 6 in the hope

that the faculty can complete the tenure review before the end of spring quarter as requested by the Regents.

"Professor Fogelman, Chair of the Judicial Committee, told senators that his committee will be attentive to proposed amendments it receives but is concerned about the timelines that are being imposed and, as a result, approved the following statement:

Depending upon the extent of the proposed changes and the moment at which they are available, the Senate Judicial Committee may or may not have time to complete a responsible and thoughtful review by May 30.

"Professor Morrison added that a decision has been made by the three committees not to publish proposed amendments until they have been routed through the committees. He assured senators that there is no proposal for anything other than University-wide tenure, for anyone to be assigned research, or for anybody's base pay to be reduced."

May 16, 1996 University Senate (6)

The Senate approved without debate a Code of Conduct policy. "All members of the University of Minnesota community are expected to adhere to the highest ethical standards of professional conduct and integrity. The values we hold among ourselves to be essential to responsible professional behavior include: honesty, trustworthiness, respect and fairness in dealing with other people, a sense of responsibility toward others and loyalty toward the ethical principles espoused by the institution. Additionally, all members of the University community are responsible for adherence to University policies and procedures and are expected to comply with State and Federal laws. It is important that these values and the tradition of ethical behavior be consistently demonstrated, and carefully maintained. . . ."

The Senate adopted a motion introduced under New Business:

**WHEREAS**, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Ettore Infante has resigned from this position effective July 1, 1996; and

**WHEREAS**, An interim Vice President for Academic Affairs will be appointed for a period that might well continue into at least the first year of the next President's administration; and

**WHEREAS**, The University of Minnesota students, faculty, staff, administration, and Regents are arguably engaged in the most important debate about its structure and future in the modern history of the University; and

**WHEREAS**, This debate and the resultant decisions and actions require articulate and energetic leadership by this chief academic officer of the University; and

**WHEREAS**, It is of the utmost importance that those who are represented by this Senate have the highest level of confidence in the leadership, knowledge and experience of the interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; and

**WHEREAS**, This interim appointment provides the opportunity to strengthen and re-invigorate the partnership between the faculty, administration and Board of Regents, and to unite us in a common goal to preserve the University during a year that could decisively determine its future;

**BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT** the Senate recommends that President Nils Hasselmo appoint an Interim Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs:

Who has a distinguished record of research and scholarship;

Who has a distinguished record of teaching and involvement with student affairs;

Who is highly respected by faculty, students and staff; and

Who has a distinguished record of service to the University and to the community.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** this appointment be announced as soon as possible in order that this opportunity to assure and enhance the partnership between the constituents of this Senate and the administration may benefit from the visible involvement of the Interim Senior Vice President designate."

#### May 16, 1996 Faculty Senate

The Senate debated a lengthy series of amendments to the tenure policy (22 pages in the docket) brought forward by the Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Tenure Subcommittee, the Judicial Committee, and Professor Fred Morrison. They were presented for information.

Under new business:

"(1) Professor Carl Adams, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), read the following resolution approved by the FCC earlier in the day.

The Faculty Consultative Committee commends efforts to improve informal communication between the faculty and the Board of Regents. The Faculty Consultative Committee very much regrets that Regent Keffeler gave a public report to the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents, and distributed a letter, BOTH summarizing part of the discussion that had been held at an informal luncheon she had initiated to "improve communication and dispel mistrust." These give the appearance of an attempt at unwarranted interference in the prescribed process for tenure review. The Faculty Consultative Committee feels that the chairs of its committees acted appropriately, and it joins with the committees of the Senate in reaffirming that the faculty governance system will continue its deliberations and makes no commitments on the outcome until the process is completed by the Faculty Senate.

"(2) A motion to suspend the rules to consider the following Resolution was approved:

We [University of Minnesota Faculty Senate] thank the faculty at the University of California at Berkeley for their support during these difficult times.

With no discussion, the Resolution was approved."

#### May 30, 1996 University Senate

The Senate approved a codification and consolidations of various statements and policies into the policy on Horace T. Morse-Minnesota Alumni Association Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education.

The Senate approved a resolution on reorganization: "

**WHEREAS** recent announcements concerning structural reorganizations within the University preceded broad discussions with students, faculty and staff in colleges and provostries, and



**WHEREAS** the members of the University Senate believe procedures must be followed to ensure such consultation,

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Senate requests that the University administration develop and follow a policy whereby both preliminary and final proposals for collegiate, campus, or provostal restructuring shall be brought to the appropriate Senate bodies and committees, including, but not limited to, Educational Policy, Finance and Planning, and the Student Senate for discussion by students, faculty and staff prior to announcement or formal presentations to the Board of Regents, and . . .

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** such proposals shall be brought to the full University Senate for endorsement.

Under New Business, the Senate approved a resolution directed to the Board of Regents about the presidential search process. It noted that the search advisory committee would consist of

"a student, three faculty, one dean, and one representative of each of the following: Governor Arne Carlson; the state legislature; the business community; organized labor; the Alumni Association; the Minnesota Foundation. The three faculty members are to be selected from a list of nine, chosen by the Faculty Consultative Committee, . . ."

"The University Senate notes that the composition of the committee represents a significant departure from past Presidential Search Advisory Committees in which representatives of the faculty and students constituted a significantly larger proportion of the committee and in which a faculty member was designated as the Advisory Committee Chair.

The Senate was concerned for several rules:

--The proposed composition of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee will convey to potential candidates that the Board of Regents does not view academic values and leadership to be preeminent considerations in the choice of the next President and, as a consequence, many candidates possessing these qualities may decline to be considered.

--The slate of presidential candidates chosen to be presented to the Board of Regents thus may not include an individual of the quality essential to lead the University into the 21st century and to maintain its rightful place as a major national research university.

--In the absence of more than the proposed symbolic faculty and student participation in the Presidential Search, the Board of Regents reduces assurance of faculty and student support for their presidential choice.

"Therefore, the University Senate respectfully requests the Board of Regents to reconsider the proposed composition of the University of Minnesota Presidential Search Advisory Committee to reflect the preeminent role that academic values traditionally play in the selection of presidents of major national research universities and the substantial role that University of Minnesota faculty and students have played in the choice of past University presidents."

The resolution was authored by Senator Hy Berman; Senate Samuel Krislov said it was "introduced because of the serious concerns that have been expressed by faculty and students concerning the proposed composition of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee and the adverse consequences it may have on the University. The last presidential search committee, it was noted, consisted of 13 faculty, one academic staff member, one civil service representative, and five students. . . ."

The motion was approved unanimously.

May 30, 1996 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Tenure Subcommittee, and the Judicial Committee presented the tenure policy amendments, this time for action; all were approved. They also presented a new set of amendments, for discussion, that included post-tenure review, a new section 7A of the policy (the minutes record three pages of discussion of section 7A). The proposed amendments, for action and for discussion, covered all 33 pages of the minutes.

#### June 6, 1996 Faculty Senate

Tenure amendments were brought back for action, including section 7A. The record of the discussion includes this: "The issue of post-tenure review has generated perhaps the most concern from the administration and Regents. The Subcommittee believes it has developed a proposal that is protective of faculty rights while still dealing with legitimate concerns. It focuses upon the inquiry, protecting academic freedom, and insisting upon peer participation at all points of the process." The Senate approved section 7A and the other amendments.

The Senate then approved a motion: "That, in accordance with Section 19 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, the Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Regents the adoption of these amendments to the Regulations [and]

1. That the Faculty Senate appoints the following persons as a committee to present the proposed amendments to the President and the Regents: Mary Dempsey, Daniel Feeney, Edwin Fogelman, and that they be authorized to obtain the assistance of other faculty in this effort [and]

2. That the Faculty Senate authorizes the above committee, with the assistance of the Senate Clerk, to prepare an engrossed copy of the amendments, incorporating the several amendments to a single section into a single amendment, correcting the numbering of footnotes and cross-references, and correcting any proofreading or grammatical errors that may have occurred." FCC chair Virginia Gray accepted friendly amendments to add Fred Morrison to the list and to add a clause at the beginning of the resolution: "WHEREAS, the Board of Regents requested changes in the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure,"

#### October 16, 1996 University Senate (1)

President Hasselmo gave his State of the University address.

#### October 24, 1996 Faculty Senate

The FCC presented a resolution on events related to tenure (a modified version of a resolution adopted by the Judicial Committee), and, for information, resolutions adopted earlier in the month by the Judicial Committee, Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Tenure Subcommittee, and separately by the Committee on Faculty Affairs (but rejected by the Tenure Subcommittee).

"Professors Feeney and Dempsey reviewed the sequence of tenure activities during the past six months, concluding with the most recent action in which the Board of Regents, at its October meeting, remanded to the Faculty Senate for consultation two tenure proposals (the Sullivan I and Reagan/Spence proposals). The Tenure Subcommittee, Judicial Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee considered a number of issues before preparing the above resolutions:

1. Would formal consultation on the proposals result in loss of further consultation opportunities?
2. Would the Faculty Senate's failure to consult on the proposals be viewed as obstructionist behavior by Legislators and the public?
3. Would deliberations on isolated Tenure Codes geared towards single units be opening the door for varied Codes across units and campuses?
4. Is it appropriate for the Faculty Senate and its committees to be involved with policies dealing with individual units?
5. Would action taken by the Faculty Senate trigger feuds among the faculty in light of the other deliberations that are taking place simultaneously?
6. Would action by the committees be viewed, unintentionally, as in favor of or against collective bargaining?

"Professor Fred Morrison was then called upon to briefly review the differences in the three tenure proposals presently before the Faculty Senate. They include: the June 1996 Faculty Senate proposal, the Reagan/Spence proposal, and the Sullivan [I] proposal. Copies of his outline were distributed to senators. It is the understanding of the committees, said Professor Morrison, that the Regents' proposal that was presented at its meeting in Morris is no longer under consideration."

The FCC resolution was divided and voted on in three parts.

**WHEREAS** the Regents of the University of Minnesota are currently under a cease and desist order preventing them from changing or negotiating about terms and conditions of employment regarding faculty members in units in which collective bargaining and severance elections are pending; and

**WHEREAS** the University of Minnesota Law School is currently the only academic unit in the University not covered by the cease and desist order; and

**WHEREAS** no circumstances within the Law School require immediate revisions to the existing Tenure Code; and

**WHEREAS** elections to be conducted by the Bureau of Mediation Services among faculty members within the next several months will determine which, if any, portions of the faculty will be represented for purposes of collective bargaining and therefore which faculty members will ultimately be governed by a common Tenure Code; and

**WHEREAS** appropriate discussion of proposed Tenure Code revisions for the Law School cannot take place without knowing whether the Law School will ultimately have a tenure structure independent of other units;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the Regents of the University of Minnesota take no action regarding any revisions of the Tenure Code to be applicable to the University of Minnesota Law School until all of the elections to determine collective bargaining structures at the University have been resolved and an appropriate consultative process with faculty has been conducted.
- (2) That, if the Regents insist on taking action now with regard to Tenure Code revisions for the Law School, they:
  - (a) Reject the Reagan/Spence proposal because it impairs academic freedom, denies due process and impedes appropriate change.

- (b) Adopt the Tenure Code revisions recommended by the Faculty Senate in May and June 1996, which were themselves the product of substantial compromise of interests between the faculty and the administration.
- (c) Not adopt the Sullivan proposal now because, although it may provide the basis for a possible alternative solution, it has not undergone a comprehensive review and this review would prolong the period of uncertainty which is demonstrably harmful.

**The Faculty Senate divided this question. It approved the Resolution as follows:**

- **The Whereas clauses and paragraph 1 were approved: 121 yes, 1 no.**
- **Paragraph 2 (a) and (b) were approved: 95 yes, 25 no, 4 abstentions.**
- **Paragraph 2 (c) was approved: 57 yes, 51 no, 5 abstentions."**

December 5, 1996 University Senate (2)

SCC chair Virginia Gray reported that SCC had approved on behalf of the Senate the third phase critical measures, which included "1. The University's Interaction with Society: Partnerships, Services, and Impacts (Goal: Continue and increase the University's successful interactions with and benefits to its external constituencies in research and discovery, teaching and learning, and outreach and public service) and 2. Information Resources (Goal: Increase access to and use of information resources to advance the University's three-part mission of teaching and learning, research and discovery, and outreach and public service)." Each had measures associated with it.

The Committee on Educational Policy recommended and the Senate approved a standard for grade due dates on semesters that allowed the Registrar to change the deadline if it fell on or near the Christmas holidays.

The Committee on Educational Policy brought for discussion a policy on classes and examinations that included provisions for a standard class schedule and class period, overlapping classes, mandatory attendance at first class session, final examinations, and classes and events during the study day/finals week period.

The president spoke about a number of matters, including tenure; one question he received was this: "Presently, most faculty are not confident the Regents will leave tenure alone. This lack of confidence makes recruitment of new faculty and retention of current faculty difficult. Is there any possibility that the Regents would be willing to make a public statement that they will not readdress tenure for some defined period of time?" The president assured the senate that the Regents would not take up tenure for some time.

FCC chair Gray, reporting for FCC/SCC, said that it "has been very busy with tenure and the presidential search. With regard to tenure, Professor Gray said several Regents have assured her that once settled the Board has no intention of raising the issue of tenure in the near future. She encouraged faculty with concerns about this matter to contact the Regents directly to satisfy themselves of the Board's intention."

FCC chair Gray also reported establishment of "a Committee on Public Understanding--the tenure crisis brought home how much misunderstanding there is about the University by the general public and the FCC believes it is important to dispel those misunderstandings. The purpose of the

committee is to develop a communications and public relations strategy to explain faculty activities to the public."

#### December 5, 1996 Faculty Senate

Following an hour-long debate and attempts to amend it, the Senate approved 47-37 the following motion from FCC: "The Faculty Senate requests the Tenure Subcommittee, Faculty Affairs Committee, and Judicial Committee to review the Sullivan II Tenure Code proposal as it pertains to the Morris campus and the Academic Health Center and to report their recommendations by December 12." The primary opposition came from those who wished the union election process to play out before any further action on tenure was taken.

#### December 12, 1996 Faculty Senate

FCC introduced a resolution: "The Faculty Senate objects to the position taken by the Administration and Regents that department heads and chairs are not part of the faculty for purposes of voting in the current collective bargaining elections. This objection does not depart from the Faculty Senate's neutrality on the topic of collective bargaining. . . ." It was approved overwhelmingly.

FCC introduced a second resolution:

**"WHEREAS** the Board of Regents have placed on their docket for December 13 adoption of a document entitled "Faculty Tenure: Specified Units" (previously called Sullivan II) as the applicable tenure policy for the Law School, Academic Health Center, and Morris Campus; and **WHEREAS** the Bureau of Mediation Services has renewed a Status Quo Order for the Academic Health Center; and

**WHEREAS** the Tenure Subcommittee, Judicial Committee, and Faculty Affairs Committee have begun a substantial effort to review "Faculty Tenure: Specified Units" and have identified a number of issues for resolution and possible amendment of the "Faculty Tenure: Specified Units" language, as contained in the appended report;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate requests the Board of Regents to defer consideration of adoption of "Faculty Tenure: Specified Units" for the Morris campus at least until its meeting in February, to give the Faculty Senate time on an expedited schedule to consider the "Faculty Tenure: Specified Units" proposal and report to the Regents its advice and recommendation on its provisions." The motion was approved unanimously.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Tenure Subcommittee, and the Judicial Committee presented proposed revisions to the tenure policy being considered by the Regents:

"The following pages contain (1) draft proposals for amending certain sections of the Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure: Specified Units (formerly Sullivan II), (2) draft proposals for interpretations of certain sections of the Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure, (3) descriptions of certain language in the Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure that raise significant issues for response, but as to which it is premature to offer specific amending language, and (4) descriptions of certain language in the Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure that differs in significant ways from the language endorsed by the Faculty Senate on May 30 and June 4, but as to which no recommendation for change is made.

"All items are presented for information and discussion only." They took 11 pages of the Senate minutes.

"If the Regents ignore the motion and vote to approve the document for the Morris campus, is the Faculty Senate prohibited from continuing its deliberations? The chair clarified that there is nothing prohibiting the continuation of deliberation and that the Faculty Senate will proceed with its proposed amendments regardless of the Regents action on December 13."

"Professor Gray reported that the Faculty Consultative Committee and Provostal Faculty Consultative Committee Chairs prepared a statement in support of the selection of Dr. Mark Yudof as the next U of M president. She said the statement appears to be consistent with what faculty have conveyed to their committees."

#### January 23, 1997 Faculty Senate

The Senate took up amendments and discussion of the tenure policy the Regents had adopted in December; the minutes of the proposals and discussion are 21 pages long. "The following contains (1) proposals for amending certain sections of the Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure: Specified Units (formerly Sullivan II), (2) proposals for interpretations of certain sections of the Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure, and (3) description of language in the Regents' Policy on Faculty Tenure that differs in significant ways from the language endorsed by the Faculty Senate on May 30 and June 4, but as to which no recommendation for change is made. Unless otherwise stated, all three committees support the proposed language."

Of great concern was section 4.5, financial stringency (Motion C). "At this time a senator moved to object to consideration of Motion C on the grounds that it is not appropriate to discuss it at a time when a majority of the University is under a Status Quo Order.

"In response to the motion to object to consideration, Professor Gray said the reason the Faculty Senate is considering the proposal at this time is because it is important that faculty provide input on the document before it is considered further by the Regents. She reminded senators that up to this point there has been no faculty input on this particular proposal. If the Regents adopt the Faculty Senate amendments, they can go back and retroactively approve them for the campuses already under the new Tenure Code. With respect to those units covered by the Status Quo Order, the AAUP/UFA and FCC constituted a group to meet with the Regents to discuss whether the Order can be amended to allow for a discussion of the Tenure Code. They agreed that they would begin that discussion with whatever comes out of the Faculty Senate. To advance that agenda, she said, the Faculty Senate needs to take some action at this meeting. . . ."

"The motion to object to consideration of Motion C failed 22 to 67."

#### February 27, 1997 University Senate (3)

The president's report was first on the agenda; the first item was this: "The President opened his remarks with a comment on the recent faculty unionization election, noting that while the union did not prevail, the faculty **had** sent a strong message to the Regents that faculty governance is still on trial. It is the President's opinion that continuation of faculty governance is critical to a major research university such as the U of M. The tenure issue, he believes, is close to resolution and the amendments approved by the Faculty Senate in January are being considered."

The Senate approved, 92-30, a change in the length of the class period from 55 minutes to 50 minutes.

The Senate approved policies on classes/schedules/final examinations, on grading, and on examinations for credit and proficiency.

SCC reported a letter chair Gray had sent to the president, which began:

" The Senate Consultative Committee unanimously voted to ask that I send you this letter concerning Incentives for Managed Growth (IMG).

"Following lengthy deliberation on IMG by the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Finance and Planning, and the Senate Consultative Committee, we remain deeply concerned about the its implementation.

"While we recognize that there are problems with the current systems of accounting for revenues and expenses, and that IMG is an attempt to respond to those problems by better correlating resources with student enrollment, we are concerned that the convergence of the change to semesters and IMG will create an environment that could cause a decline in the quality of our academic programs and our stature as a highly-respected academic enterprise. We believe that the direction this University is taking, through the implementation of IMG, may create an environment where decisions are driven solely by financial considerations, with little regard for academic issues and the educational mission of this institution." There was additional text itemizing concerns.

#### April 17, 1997 University Senate (4)

The Senate unanimously approved minor adjustments to the semester-conversion standards.

The Senate unanimously approved a transfer-of-credit policy.

The Senate approved a new policy establishing an award for outstanding contributions to graduate and professional education.

SCC and the Faculty Affairs Committee brought for discussion a revised policy on sexual harassment and consensual relationships.

"The current sexual harassment policy . . . was passed by the Senate in 1984, and in 1994 the Regents requested a report from the Sexual Harassment Board for the purpose of approving policies regarding sexual harassment. This opportunity was used to review the effectiveness of the current policy, related policies, federal and state laws on discrimination, policies at other institutions, polices of other professions, and research on sexual harassment and consensual relationships. Based on this extensive review, the Board concluded that some changes were needed in the current policy, particularly regarding consensual relationships.

"The current policy, Professor Frazier said, states that consensual relationships between faculty and students and between supervisors and subordinates are unwise. However, emerging case law in this area indicates that universities need to set clear guidelines for behavior, so the University needs to clarify the language in this section of the policy."

Under New Business, the Senate approved a resolution from the Equal Opportunity for Women Committee on "welfare reform" and students in training: "The University Senate strongly supports the efforts of Minnesota state legislators to create programs and guidelines that enable AFDC/TANK recipients to pursue a college degree, following an approved educational and training plan, including work-study jobs and internships."

April 17, 1997 Faculty Senate

(nothing noteworthy)

June 5, 1997 Faculty Senate

The Senate took up for action a revised tenure policy, proposed by FCC, the Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Tenure Subcommittee, and the Judicial Committee.

"Professor Virginia Gray, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), introduced the motion to accept the text of the document entitled Faculty Tenure: Specified Units. She commented that today marks the end of a long difficult process and the faculty should be commended for its tenacity on this issue. Since the last Faculty Senate discussion of tenure, the Committee of Eight has negotiated with the administration and Regents to bring the compromise tenure document forward for Faculty Senate action. The compromise document, she said, is acceptable to the administration, the Regents, and the senate committees, and she urged everyone to vote in favor of the motion to accept the document.

"Professor Sara Evans, Chair of the Committee of Eight, reminded senators that the committee was originally appointed jointly by the AAUP and the FCC prior to the collective bargaining election. After the election, Professor Gray reappointed the members to continue the discussions. At that point, the Faculty Senate had debated Sullivan II, approved amendments, and forwarded them to the Regents. The committee's job was to represent the views of the Faculty Senate in conversations with the Regents and administration, but they were not empowered to make any changes. The compromise document is now being presented to the Faculty Senate for consideration as a whole.

"Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Finance and Planning Committee, reviewed the differences between the January 23 Faculty Senate version and the present document. The proposed document reflects the Sullivan II document, as modified by most of the amendments proposed by the Faculty Senate in January. The differences involve five technical amendments and three issues in which substantive questions were raised with regard to the proposals brought forward by the Faculty Senate. . . . In each case the committee believes the document adequately protects the interests of the faculty. In conclusion, he said that this is not a perfect code, but it is an acceptable one that will protect faculty rights and academic freedom."

The Senate voted "with an overwhelming majority" to approve the revised policy.

" Professor Sara Evans and Senior Vice President Marvin Marshak then led the faculty in the following song composed by Professor Naomi Scheman:

Last night I had the strangest dream  
I never dreamed before. . . ."



#### November 13, 1997 University Senate (1)

The Senate, at the first meeting at which President Yudof presided, approved changes to the name of the committee from the "Senate Computing and Information Systems Committee" to "Information Technologies Committee," revised the charge, and removed the sunset clause in the previous bylaw so the committee became permanent.

President Yudof gave a report on a number of items, including that "through the governance structure, another task force has been established to consider the balance between tenured and tenure-track/term/P&A positions. The task force is just beginning its work and is expected to provide recommendations by the end of the academic year."

#### November 13, 1997 Faculty Senate

"Professor Victor Bloomfield, chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), reported that the FCC is focusing on two main issues. The first is to reestablish confidence in faculty governance, which was bruised after the tenure debates last year. Faculty governance does accomplish a variety of things, he said, but often quietly, and it is not just limited to the FCC. To increase this awareness, a Faculty Governance Update, modeled after the BRIEF, has been instituted. The Update is sent to all faculty via e-mail twice monthly.

"Second, FCC is focusing on major issues facing the University. It has taken on a coordinating role for faculty governance and established three task forces: 1) Task Force on Faculty Consultation to review the alignment of faculty governance mechanisms under the new administrative structure, 2) Health Plan Task Force to look at short and long term health care options and alternatives, and 3) task force to consider the balance of tenure-track and term/academic professional appointments. All are joint committees with members from FCC, Faculty Affairs, and Educational Policy. . . ."

The annual report of the Committee on Faculty Affairs included this: "The 1996-97 academic year for the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs was again dominated by the tenure code revision process as it was in 1995-96. The tenure revision process for 1996-97 started off with a bang when the Board of Regents disclosed the Hogan and Hartson version of the Tenure Code at the University of Minnesota-Morris in early September, 1996 (so-called Morris Code). This was considered far afield from an appropriate code for a research institution, at least one that wished to remain competitive for talented faculty. Among the Tenure Subcommittee, SCFA as a whole, and the Judicial Committee, much of the year was spent on reviewing editing, proposing, and negotiating on what became known as the 'Sullivan I and Sullivan II' versions of the code. These were submitted for consideration by Law School Dean Sullivan in response to the Morris Document and what seemed to be impending action by the Board on the Morris version. In the final phases of the tenure jockeying with the U-MN Administration and the Board of Regents, a 'Committee of 8' (which represented both Senate Governance structure and the AAUP) worked with the Faculty Affairs, Tenure and Judicial Committees to bring closure on controversial issues that sprung from the 'Morris Code.'"

#### February 19, 1998 University Senate (2)

The Senate approved a motion to "approve the following 10 questions to assist students in course selection, delegate to the Committee on Educational Policy the authority to make editorial or clarifying changes to the questions, direct that the Committee report to the Senate any changes it makes, and approve inclusion of these questions on all forms used for evaluation of instruction, with the results to be tabulated and provided only to the faculty member. The release of the data shall be entirely within the discretion of each faculty member."

The Senate approved a change in the grading policy: "The change incorporated in the recommendation is to set the "S" equal to the "C-" rather than the "C." Existing policy sets the S equal to the C; this sets it equal to the C-."

The Senate approved a resolution concerning University policies: "The Senate recommends that the administration undertake a systematic cost/benefits analysis of all major existing and new policies and procedures to see whether there is really any net gain from the complex regulations imposed upon the research community. If the costs outweigh the benefits then changes in policies and procedures would be clearly called for. The Senate recognizes the complexity of this task and recommends that the first step be a realistic assessment of all the costs involved, including faculty and staff time. The benefit side of the analysis would clearly be more difficult to carry out but should estimate the value of the actual changes in outcomes produced by the University's regulatory activities."

The Senate discussed two related policies, one on sexual harassment and one on nepotism and consensual sexual or romantic relationships.

#### April 16, 1998 University Senate (3)

The Senate approved a sexual harassment policy and a policy on nepotism and consensual sexual or romantic relationships.

The Senate approved a policy changing providing that "Examinations during the term (e.g., mid-terms) shall be given only during the regular class sessions, and may not be held at times other than the regularly scheduled class period, subject to the following conditions. . . ."

The Senate discussed a policy on degrees with honors and degrees with distinction. The proposal was withdrawn in order that the Committee on Educational Policy could revise it in light of the Senate discussion.

"President Yudof detailed the changes under the IMG model. Prior to IMG, all income streams were channeled through central funds and then distributed to academic and support units. Under IMG, state appropriations still go into central funds, but the distribution of tuition and ICR dollars has changed--49% of ICR dollars goes into the central pool and 51% goes directly to local units; 100% of tuition revenue goes directly to the academic units."

Under New Business, the Senate approved a motion: "The University of Minnesota Senate enthusiastically thanks Governor Arne H. Carlson for his energetic support of the University funding requests during the 1998 Legislature. Through his support of the University, Governor

Carlson has demonstrated the leadership required to more fully implement the land-grant, research University mission--that higher education can intellectually, socially and economically enrich the lives of all Minnesotans. Minnesota's 1998 investment in the University will provide significant dividends to future generations of citizens of our state, nation and world." Similar paragraphs thanked the Senate and the House.

Also under New Business, the Senate approved this language after a series of "whereas" clauses: "Therefore, the University Senate congratulates and commends President Yudof on his skills of leadership and effectiveness in dealing with the various external and internal constituencies, and conveys its sincere gratitude for his efforts. . . ."

#### April 16, 1998 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved a Faculty Retirees' Bill of Rights.

FCC chair Victor Bloomfield reported, among other things, that "the committee has continued to press the administration in the last few months to honor the commitment of the University to increase faculty salaries to the mean of the top 30 research Universities."

#### May 14, 1998 University Senate (4)

Despite this introduction, the Senate failed to change its voting requirements for constitutional and bylaw amendments: "Over the years the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly have experienced considerable difficulty in securing the required attendance at its meetings to adopt constitutional and bylaw amendments. Important legislation that oftentimes receives overwhelming support from those senators present and voting has been left unapproved due to the stringent voting requirements."

The Senate approved a policy on degrees with honors and degrees with distinction, following considerable debate.

The Senate approved a motion that "the University of Minnesota should not invest in Total Oil Company (Total S.A.) stock until the reestablishment of a democratic government and redress of human rights abuses in that nation, or until Total Oil Company suspends its operations in Burma, and;

The University carefully consider the social impact of future investments in companies which operate in Burma, until the reestablishment of a democratic government and redress of human rights abuses in that nation."

Under Old Business: "Professor Hy Berman asked for permission to address the Senate. He said that he has served 25 years in the Senate during his 37-year career at the University. Throughout these years he has seen the evolution of the governance structure of the University from an autocratic system into a democratic process. In the 1960s, he said, students were brought into the process bringing a breath of fresh air. In the years that students have been in the Senate, there has never been a sharp faculty-student split on any issue. He said that it has been a

pleasure to serve the University in this capacity and expressed thanks to senators and President Yudof.

"Senators gave Hy a warm round of applause and standing ovation for his long tenure of service to the University and the Senate."

#### October 15, 1998 University Senate (1)

After minor items of business, President Yudof gave his State of the University address.

#### October 15, 1998 Faculty Senate

The Senate received for information a report from the Joint SCFA and FCC Subcommittee on Academic Appointments, which included the reason for its creation:

- ◆ "Decrease in number of total faculty
- ◆ Decrease in proportion of faculty who are tenure/tenure track vs. non-regular
- ◆ Increase in P&A personnel
- ◆ Concern for invisibility, work conditions, lack of voice of P&A who are essentially doing faculty work
- ◆ Concern about increased numbers of part time, quarter at a time, faculty."

The Senate approved "a substitute interim policy to handle the faculty leave problem as the University moves to semesters. It is an interim policy because SCFA formed a subcommittee which worked for a year with the administration trying to develop a sabbatical policy that would be much more friendly towards the faculty. The problem with the old policy was that few faculty could afford to take a sabbatical leave. Unfortunately, at the end of the year, the administration decided that they still could not fully finance a new policy, so the committee was left with putting an interim policy in place until something better could be developed."

"Professor Sara Evans, chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), hoped that all senators had received the statement that FCC wrote in response to the Association of Governing Boards. That association has proposed a new policy which would establish principles for the governance of institutions of higher education. This new statement replaces one written by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1966. FCC debated this issue this summer, and then sent a response stating its disagreement with a description of universities as consisting of stakeholders, which is corporate language. Faculty were also just one among a long list of other groups, both inside and outside the university."

#### November 5, 1998 University Senate (2)

The Senate received for information "Guidelines for the Development of Applied Partnership Degree Programs": The University of Minnesota and the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) signed on January 15, 1998, the *Partnership Agreement for Public Higher Education*. The agreement provides an opportunity for the University of Minnesota to reflect on its experiences with applied partnership degree programs with community colleges in the Twin Cities, which evolved from the 1993 statement on partnerships, and to develop a general set of guidelines for new applied partnership degree programs. . . . In 1993, the Twin Cities Higher

Education Partnership recognized that the educational needs of students and employers locally, regionally, nationally, and globally were changing very rapidly. It further recognized that public higher education institutions in Minnesota had entered a period of tight fiscal constraints in which improved collaboration and responsiveness were more critical than ever in making the best use of available state resources. . . . This document frames a set of values and principles to guide thinking about applied partnership degree programs, articulates a set of criteria to be used in evaluating extant and proposed partnership degree programs, and suggests a strategy for identifying future collaborative efforts."

The Senate approved a change in the grading policy necessitated by the computer system:

"The Senate Committee on Educational Policy was informed that the new PeopleSoft computer program will not allow enforcement of the current policy with respect to Incompletes: it cannot discriminate between the passage of time for students who are enrolled and those who are not. It can, however, measure the passage of time generally.

"As a consequence, SCEP recommends the change indicated, TO BE EFFECTIVE FALL SEMESTER, 1998. Incompletes will continue to change automatically to an F or an N, depending on which grading system the student enrolled under, but will do so only after the lapse of one year from the end of the final examination period for the term in which the Incomplete was earned."

November 5, 1998 Faculty Senate

The Academic Appointments subcommittee submitted another report for information. "Both the composition and the duties of university faculty have changed radically over the past half century, sometimes by rational choice but often by the acquiescence of faculties, administrators, and trustees to what seemed brute economic and political force. The changes in the composition of the faculty often have been for the better when viewed from the perspective of social diversity, but they have been for the worse when seen from almost all others. Tenured and tenure-track faculty proportionally are fewer and in some instances absolutely so. In their places are sometimes those who do nothing but research, sometimes teachers hired by the term, which varies from a quarter or semester to several years in length. Recently, university faculties and professional associations have taken special note of these changes in what seems to be jointly a crisis of conscience and a recognition that reform must come now or never, that we are near the end of a road. We propose resolutions concerning both crises. The principal one would modify Minnesota's job classifications and hiring practices so that all of those whose work is "faculty-like" are classified as such. Other resolutions concern setting appropriate ratios of tenured and tenure-track faculty and non-tenured faculty and improving our treatment of the latter. . . .

**"Resolution 1.** All appointments for which the assigned duty is teaching or for which the assigned duties consist of teaching in conjunction with other traditional academic work of the faculty (research and scholarship, service and outreach) shall be made within the 'Academic' category 'Faculty.' . . .

**"Resolution 2.** No more than 15% of the faculty of the university may be NTTF, and no more than 25% of the faculty of a college or similar unit may be NTTF. Exceptions to the limitation placed upon schools, colleges, and departments may be granted by the Executive Vice President and Provost (or other presidential designee), but only with the concurrence of the Senate committees on Educational Policy and Faculty Affairs. . . .

**"Resolution 3.** In order to increase the quality of education and to improve work conditions in the employment of temporary and part-time faculty such as Teaching Specialists and Education Specialists, departments employing such Academic Professional "faculty" immediately should hire by the year rather than by the term and reward the best of such NTTF by granting, after an appropriate probationary period, two- or three-year contracts. . . .

February 18, 1999 University Senate (3)

SCC chair Sara Evans reported that SCC adopted a protocol requiring that "all resolutions adopted by a Senate committee shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee and the Senate office (for information) and to the Clerk of the Senate for distribution at the next Senate meeting for information."

The Senate approved a policy change from the Committee on Educational Policy requiring that final exams "which exceed two hours must be noted in the class schedule, in order that students are informed and can accommodate the longer examination in their schedule of final examinations."

The Senate tabled a proposed Policy on Reorganization in order to allow further consultation:

"Because the structure and organization of the University's academic units can have a profound effect on the financing and delivery of educational programs, the Senate adopts the following policy with respect to reorganization of academic units. In general, both the Senate and its committees should be involved in any organizational or structural decision affecting an academic unit made at the level of the campus or college or within or across colleges. The provisions of this policy calling for reporting information are also intended to provide the Senate a broad overview of the changes in academic programs that are occurring in the various colleges and campuses.

"It is the position of the Senate that program changes within colleges should be subject to appropriate consultation with faculty and students from the beginning of planning for such changes. The primary focus of consultation should be the impact that the changes will have on the delivery of education to students. . . ."

The Subcommittee on Grading of the Committee on Educational Policy presented a report on grade inflation, reviewed data and history, and made recommendations:

1. The Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy shall be amended to provide that every course syllabus shall include the grading standards set forth in the Uniform Grading Policy adopted by the University Senate (Appendix E) and the Senate policy on amount of academic work expected per credit (Appendix F).
2. Each college, department and program should discuss what the standards of the Uniform Grading Policy mean for its courses and programs, and what expectations the faculty have of students in their field of knowledge in order to achieve those standards. The Subcommittee believes that having such discussions would be a service especially for new faculty.
3. Data on the mean grade point average by designator and course level, on the percentage of As awarded by course level, and overall collegiate grade point averages should be prepared for grades awarded each Fall Semester. Data should be reported for all undergraduate students. Such a report can be seen in Appendix B. . . .

4. The data tables and graphs required in (3) should be reported annually to the Senate. These data should also be provided to all deans and department heads, placed on a web site which is publicized.

The Senate approved a resolution from the Disabilities Issues Committee: "The Senate recommends that the University of Minnesota allocate a minimum of \$75,000 in recurring funds to fund this service for the full calendar year. This amount should be adjusted annually to reflect inflationary changes, to reflect any growth in Paratransit Service user needs and to reflect possible expansion of this service to other University of Minnesota campuses."

The Senate approved a resolution concerning a change to OMB Circular A-110 "to require Federal awarding agencies to ensure that all data produced under an award will be made available to the public through the procedures established under the Freedom of Information Act. The new language potentially makes all data in whatever stage of analysis available to anyone asking for it." The resolution provided that the "Senate is strongly opposed to this new provision because of its potential deleterious effects on researchers' abilities to carry out their research without external interference and its potential to compromise the confidentiality of human subjects in sponsored research studies, . . . (2) The Senate strongly urges that the University support current national efforts to have this language removed from the appropriations bill so that the original intent of the Freedom of Information Act can be kept intact. . . ."

The Senate approved a completely revised policy on animal care and use. "Professor Len Kuhl, chair of the Research Committee, said that the University has received the designation of exceptional status by the NIH, which actually means the opposite of what it sounds like. One of the reasons for this status is that the University's policies concerning research, in the past, have been very loose and very fuzzy. Exceptional status has led to a concerted effort to revise the entire grants management process and a number of other policies, as well as creating new policies where needed. This policy tightens up the care and management of animal research on campus. It states who has the authority to appoint an institutional official who will manage and monitor the care of animals on campus and requires that all people involved in animal research be trained. It also brings University policy into compliance with federal and state law."

"President Mark Yudof addressed the issue of the proposed Rochester campus by saying that it would be a non-resident campus which would have classes for junior, senior, graduate, and professional levels. The hope is that there would be some joint programs with Mayo."

#### February 18, 1999 Faculty Senate

"The Faculty Consultative Committee, the executive committee of the Faculty Senate at the University of Minnesota, has read the draft *AGB Statement on Institutional Governance* and offers the following comments.

"The missions of a university are instruction, research, and service, or the conservation, production, and transmission of knowledge. No matter what words one chooses, the inescapable fact is that those missions are carried out almost exclusively by the faculty or under the supervision and guidance of the faculty, and institutional reputation rests on the quality of the

faculty. Therefore, any statement on the governance of universities which does not recognize that fundamental faculty role will be both incomplete and flawed.

"The faculty of the University of Minnesota recently experienced a crisis brought on by corporate notions of hierarchical structure and top-down management. We know now where that road leads. There was little consultation, the University began to lose faculty, research funding leveled out, and the quality and future of the institution was in considerable danger. Virtually all of the 'stakeholders' in Minnesota advised the Board of Regents that this was not an appropriate way to run a university.

"We believe that the primary lesson both the faculty and the Board of Regents took from that crisis was that cooperation and shared authority and responsibility were critical to a healthy university. We have spent the last year rebuilding relationships and reaffirming the joint responsibilities we have in conducting the affairs of the University. The faculty do not wish to pre-empt the proper role of the regents or administrative officers, nor do we oppose appropriate participation of the many constituencies noted by the AGB; we do seek appropriate recognition of the unique and powerful faculty role in achieving the missions of the institution.

"We believe the term 'stakeholders' is imprecise and obscures the reality of the university. Because of the role that the faculty must play if the university is to function, we believe the AGB report stumbles when it seeks to stretch the umbrella of governance to include others such as staff and students on a par with faculty, administration, and trustees. Faculty bear primary responsibility for curriculum, instruction, research and scientific advances, faculty status, and educational aspects of student life. Faculty set requirements for degrees, determine when they have been met, and authorize the president and trustees to grant those degrees. Instead of recognizing that role, however, the AGB report seems to perpetuate the image of the faculty as the obstacle to accomplishment rather than the experts essential to it. Administrators and trustees cannot perform faculty tasks, but when they do their own jobs well, they create the environment within which those tasks can be carried out and the institution made great. This collaboration is what we mean when we refer to shared responsibility and decision-making. . . ."

April 22, 1999 University Senate (4)

The Senate voted on, but could not approve because of a lack of sufficient number of votes, a proposal to change how the bylaws are amended.

"At present, it can be more difficult to amend the bylaws of the Senate than it is to amend the constitution, which is the opposite of what most deliberative bodies require. As the language now reads, constitutional amendments require EITHER a two-thirds vote at one meeting or a majority vote at two consecutive meetings, the vote totals based on the number of filled seats in the body. Bylaw amendments require a majority vote, with the vote total based on the total possible number of seats in the body, irrespective of whether or not they are filled. It is frequently difficult to achieve the majority vote needed simply because there are not enough of the members of the body present. . . ."

"This amendment changes the rules so that bylaws may also be amended by EITHER a majority vote (of seats filled) at one meeting or a majority vote (of those present and voting) at two meetings."



FCC "makes the following statement about the recent vandalism committed in Lions Research Building and Elliott Hall on the Twin Cities campus of the University. The Faculty Consultative Committee of the Academic Health Center and the Senate Committee on Research join in this statement.

"We are dismayed and alarmed at the recent acts of vandalism committed in University research facilities. These acts are a threat to academic freedom and to the integrity of the University. They reflect an anti-intellectualism and irrationality that is frightening. We are also saddened by the harm that such attacks have on research intended to advance human health.

"We encourage the University administration and the civil authorities to take all necessary steps to identify and prosecute those who committed these acts of vandalism against University research facilities. We also extend our deep regrets and support to those faculty members, staff, and graduate students whose work has been affected, and ask that the administration provide resources to restore the records and facilities of those faculty members and graduate students."

The Committee on Educational Policy reported for information a clarification in the grading policy: "In any class, instructors have the right to set the level of performance required for an S at any level. They may not set it at less than a C-."

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Committee on Educational Policy that the semester-conversion standard requiring a uniform calendar for all campuses be abandoned as unwise and unworkable.

The Senate approved a policy on Principal Investigator Eligibility on Sponsored Projects.

"1. Faculty who hold regular appointments are automatically eligible to serve as principal investigators.

2. Term and non-regular faculty, and other academic employees (such as P & A employees) may serve as principal or co- investigators on research grants and contracts and other sponsored projects upon approval by the department head and/or the dean of the unit in which the individual is employed, according to policies established by the unit.

3. Individuals holding "graduate student/professional training" academic appointments may serve as principal investigators on sponsored projects that the funding agency has specified as programs for which students are eligible. . . ."

The Senate approved a policy on *Education in the Responsible Conduct of Sponsored Research and Grants Management*.

"Faculty, staff and students serve in various roles on projects and activities in support of the research, scholarship and artistic mission of the University. The commitment to the highest standards of ethical behavior and fulfillment of the fiduciary duties of public funding are fundamental to the responsibility of serving as principal investigator or in another role on these projects. The University in turn has the responsibility to ensure that principal investigators, researchers, artists, scholars, and their staff and students have access to the necessary information and supporting resources to meet these expectations.

"To help meet these shared responsibilities the Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School has established a program to address the current and continuing educational

needs of all personnel involved in externally and internally funded research, instructional and public service activities."

The policy set out guidelines.

In his report, "President Yudof began by thanking the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) and the Student Senate for their resolutions on the allegations of academic misconduct in the Men's Basketball program. These resolutions are helpful and show that the University is united in its determination to see that this matter is quickly, thoroughly, and fairly investigated. Two independent law firms are investigating the allegations. Faculty and students will need to take a careful look at the policies in this area once the investigations are completed, since the academic integrity of the University must be valued above any game."

#### April 22, 1999 Faculty Senate

The Senate discussed a proposal for information for a policy on intellectual property that included this language, among many other provisions:

**"Subd. 1. University Ownership.** Subject to the exceptions identified in Sec. III, Subd. 2. (a) and (b), the University shall be the sole owner of all Intellectual Property created through the use of University resources or facilities, supported directly or indirectly by funds administered by the University, developed within the scope of employment by University Employees, agreed in writing to be a Specially Commissioned Work, or assigned in writing to the University. This shall include, but is not limited to, Intellectual Property developed by University Employees, persons receiving funding administered by or other compensation from the University, or graduate students and post-doctoral fellows regardless of funding or employment status.

**"Subd. 2. Exceptions to University Ownership.**

a) As provided in subd. 1, the University shall have no ownership rights in the following Intellectual Property, which shall be owned by its Creator(s):

i) Regular Academic Work Products, provided that the Regular Academic Work Product was not assigned in writing to the University or specifically ordered or commissioned and designated in writing by the Creator and University as a Specially Commissioned Work.

ii) Intellectual Property created by a student solely for the purpose of satisfying course or undergraduate degree program requirements, unless the student assigns ownership rights in the intellectual property to the University in writing."

#### May 20, 1999 University Senate (5)

The Senate approved the Policy on Reorganization that it had tabled earlier. It consolidated various policies dating back to 1956 (and itemized them).

The Senate received for information from the Committee on Educational Policy principles and procedures governing international exchanges.

The Senate approved the change in the bylaws: "This amendment changes the rules so that bylaws may also be amended by EITHER a majority vote (of seats filled) at one meeting or a majority vote (of those present and voting) at two meetings."

SCC chair Sara Evans "expressed appreciation for President Yudof's commitment to increasing faculty salaries and his analysis of other possible avenues to find funds." She also said that "shared governance is alive and well. While the faculty and administration might not always agree, they are talking before decisions are made."

#### May 20, 1999 Faculty Senate

The Judicial Committee reported the outcome of a case where the president had imposed a sanction (termination) greater than that recommended by the Judicial Committee.

The Senate approved a revised intellectual property policy.

The chair of the Joint Subcommittee on Academic Appointments, Kent Bales, reported that the administration had appointed a working group on academic appointments.

#### September 30, 1999 University Senate (1) (all bodies)

"Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), welcomed all senators to the meeting. He said that a few changes have been made in the operations of the meetings. First, the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly meetings have been consolidated into a single meeting. As a result, there are some items on the agenda which involve a subset of the full Senate. Agenda items have been grouped together depending on what group they pertain to and different colored voting cards are available for each group."

FCC/SCC chair Fred Morrison reported.

"Health Care: there is a task force looking at the health care options available to University employees. One of the issues, which might be included on the December 2 meeting, is a discussion of the option of separating the University from the state employees' system.

"Task Forces: two task forces have been created over the summer to deal with issues that were raised by, but are not totally related to, the athletic allegations. The first is dealing with Student Academic Integrity and is headed by Regents' Professor Tom Clayton. It will be examining how the University should deal with issues of academic misconduct. A preliminary report is expected at the December 2 meeting. The second task force, appointed by the President, is dealing with issues of sexual misconduct and procedures for dealing with sexual assault cases at the University.

"Joint Task Forces: two task forces, which are joint ventures between the faculty and administration, are also continuing this year. The first one is handling academic appointments, which was addressed by a joint Senate subcommittee last year. The second task force is addressing budgeting and other processes associated with IMG."

A bylaw change was approved giving Finance and Planning Committee members four-year terms, renewable once, for a total of eight years. All other committees remained at three-year terms, renewable once. (It was approved at the December meeting, on the second vote to obtain the necessary majority.)

President Yudof gave the State of the University address. During the Q&A session: " Q: Do you envision any changes in the promotion and tenure system? A: I do not envision any major changes at this time, although the Senate has presented some stylistic changes. Following the last battle, a peace treaty has been reached and tranquility is now seen on campus. I would therefore, not lightly undertake any changes. On the other hand, if the faculty have strong feelings, this would be a different matter."

The members of the Faculty Senate voted to approve a *Resolution on Retention of Faculty Lines When Departments Initiate Removal for Cause or Deny Tenure*:

"Decisions about hiring, retaining, and dismissing members of the faculty have long-lasting effects. . . . In addition, the practice of making principled decisions in these matters creates an ethos of choosing and rewarding excellence that serves well the University as a whole. This ethos is imperiled when lines are withdrawn from departments that initiate the denial of tenure to a probationary faculty member or proceed to remove a tenured faculty member for cause.

"Therefore, be it resolved that departments terminating probationary faculty, or dismissing tenured faculty for cause, should retain the line vacated by such action. The lack of such assurance weakens the collegiate units that do not follow this practice, and the weakening of these units weakens the University as a whole."

#### December 2, 1999 University Senate (2) (all bodies)

"Professor McGehee, chair of the Health Plan Task Force (HPTF), distributed a handout that detailed the background of this process. He noted that when he last reported to this body, a year ago, he expressed a degree of optimism that the state was heading towards a "Care System Approach." Returning to the handout, he noted that this did not happen. Other changes did occur, such as self-insurance which allows the state to get more usage data from the health care providers. . . . In the meantime, the HPTF will be expanding its membership to include union representatives and students, and the administration has agreed that the task force can seriously study what it would mean to separate from the state."

The Senate approved a change to the guidelines for committee minutes, including requiring that they be posted on the web and distributed to anyone who requested them.

SCC/the Assembly Steering Committee introduced a 22-point resolution in response to two task force reports dealing with problems in intercollegiate athletics and made a series of organizational recommendations, including creation of two athletic committees for the Twin Cities campus, replacing the existing committee. One was the Review Panel on Sexual Misconduct and Domestic Abuse Investigations; the other was Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity that dealt with athletics. The Senate approved.

February 24, 2000 University Senate (3) (all bodies)

Report from FCC/SCC chair Fred Morrison: "During the past month, the Exceptional Status by the NIH was lifted and expanded authorities for the researchers working on federal grants were restored. Much of this work was facilitated by a joint faculty-administrative task force, in particular, Professor Morrison recognized the special contributions of Professor David Hamilton. One week ago, the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) passed a resolution in appreciation of the efforts of all those involved in changing the University's status. He then made a motion to extend a special thanks to those who worked to restore the NIH status and in particular, Professor David Hamilton. . . . A round of applause was then given to Professor Hamilton and those who worked with him."

The Senate approved a resolution on the ethical conduct of research, including this text: "The faculty, students, and staff of the University of Minnesota support a University-wide program of education and training in the responsible and ethical conduct of research and scholarship, with the following roles for members of the University community: . . ."

The chair of the Committee on Finance and Planning wrote to SCC/FCC chair Fred Morrison to note a change in policy with respect to parking revenues. Certain language was to be deleted from policy: "Parking revenues will not be designated for projects unrelated or marginally related to parking, transit, or transportation." The letter from Finance and Planning noted that it "has long been the view of the Finance and Planning Committee (and, I believe, the Consultative Committee) that parking revenues should not be diverted to non-parking costs. We voted unanimously that the strike-out should be deleted and the language as recommended by the task force should be University policy. . . ." "Professor Fred Morrison, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, said that this item raises the question of whether revenues from parking and transportation sources should be used for other University purposes." No action was proposed.

The Senate approved a policy on international exchanges and activities.

The Committee on Educational Policy introduced for discussion a draft set of Classroom Expectations Guidelines that included expectations for the University, departments, instructors, and students.

The Committee on Finance and Planning and the Committee on Educational Policy "heard a presentation about plans for significant technological upgrades for general purpose classrooms on the Twin Cities campus. The plan calls for significantly improving the instructional environment and for support for faculty in the classroom. It also requires a one-time expenditure of about \$7 million to upgrade classrooms and recurring expenditures of about \$1.3 million to keep them equipped and functioning.

"The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning both unanimously endorsed the following resolution, which they present to the Assembly for information.

"The Committee receives enthusiastically and strongly endorses the recommendation for the general purpose classroom technology upgrade and urges it receive the highest priority for funding and implementation at the earliest possible date."

The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy recommended, "in this amendment to the Statement of Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies and Practices, that a student be required to complete 12 credits on the A-F grading system before he or she qualifies for the dean's list. Absent such a provision, presumably a student could take a 1-credit course, earn an A, take 11 other credits and earn Ss, and qualify for the dean's list. This is not what ACEP had in mind when it recommended the original language to the Assembly." The Assembly approved.

The Senate approved a policy recommendation from the Committee on Educational Policy:  
"1. Any student who elects to graduate under the quarter calendar system must do so by June 30, 2006, after which time all graduation and degree requirements must be met under the semester system.

"2. A department may, with the consent of the dean, waive provision (1) of this policy."

The Committee on Educational Policy proposed three changes (underlined) to the grading policy:

"1. In those instances when a college or campus permits a student to repeat a course, (a) all grades for the course shall appear on the official transcript, (b) the course credits may not be counted more than once toward degree and program requirements, and (c) only the last enrollment for the course shall count in the student's grade point average. When a student repeats a course in which the initial grade was D+ or lower, the most recent grade and credits count in GPA calculation and degree progress. When a student repeats a course in which the initial grade was a C- or higher, only the initial grade and credits count in GPA calculation and degree progress. . . .

"8. A student shall have the right to petition the college scholastic committee or other appropriate body concerning any of the provisions of this policy. No student, however, may initiate an appeal of the grade earned in a course more than one calendar year after the grade was assigned.

"Instructors are permitted to hold graduate and undergraduate students who are in the same class to different standards of academic performance and accomplishment. The syllabus must make clear what the different standards will be for the different groups of students who may be enrolled in the class."

After considerable debate, the Senate approved the second and third and sent the first back for reconsideration.

The Senate approved a recommendation from and about the Committee on Educational Policy:  
"The committee shall have the authority to issue interpretations of Senate policies that it has previously introduced to the Senate and which the Senate and the administration have approved. Those interpretations shall be considered part of the policy once the interpretation has been reported for information at the next Senate meeting following committee approval of the interpretation and neither the Senate nor the president makes objection before or at that Senate meeting. The Senate may, by simple majority of those present and voting, vote not to approve the interpretation, in which case it is not part of the policy. If the president objects, the interpretation must be brought back at the following meeting for a vote by the Senate."

The Senate approved a bylaw change: "When provostries were established on the Twin Cities campus, Provostal Student Consultative Committees (PSCCs) were created to serve as an advisory body to each provost. During this period, the only committee that met on a regular basis was the Academic Health Center Provostal Consultative Committee (AHC SCC). With the change in administrative structure, provostries are no longer units on the Twin Cities campus. Therefore, two of the PSCCs have no direct administrator to report to. The Student Senate Consultative Committee, after consultation with the AHC SCC, voted to eliminate these two non-functioning committees, and leave intact the AHC SCC."

The Assembly Steering Committee proposed bylaw amendments: "These will give operational effect to the general principles that the Senate and Assembly adopted at the December 2, 1999, meeting.

"The existing mechanisms for oversight of the athletics departments were found wanting, both by the outside investigators into the recent scandal and by the Special Senate Committee on Academic Integrity (the Clayton Committee). . . .

"The proposed by-law amendments would abolish the existing Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. In its place two separate institutions would be created. One of these, the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics would have the duty of overseeing compliance with academic standing and academic integrity issues, as well as compliance issues. It would be composed exclusively of tenured faculty. We stress the need for faculty members to undertake this important task. The other committee, the Advisory Committee on Athletics, would advise the athletics departments on all other issues: equity, student welfare, financial and facilities matters. It would be composed of faculty, staff, students, and graduates of the University."

The proposed bylaw provisions took several pages of the Senate minutes and were approved 98-1.

The Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity reported for information progress on dealing with the general question of student academic integrity.

The Committee on Educational Policy proposed, and the Senate approved (after some debate) a policy on the Use of Class Notes for Commercial Purposes, which provided, inter alia, that "Students may not distribute class notes, handouts, or other instructor-provided materials for commercial purposes, through the Internet, or for any reason other than personal study among classmates enrolled in the course, without the express written consent of the instructor."

FCC chair Fred Morrison introduced a resolution adopted a week before by FCC: "The Faculty Consultative Committee abhors the recent attacks on plant research on the St. Paul campus of the University of Minnesota. These attacks undermine the basic mission of the University and are a threat to the free inquiry that must be the hallmark of an institution of higher learning and of a free society. These attacks have also, at other times and places, have placed the lives of people in the research facilities in danger, sometimes life-threatening danger. The attacks are, in both a philosophical and a physical sense, an assault on the precepts that guide the life of a university." The docket item cited the 4/7/99 resolution. The Senate endorsed the resolution.

April 20, 2000 University Senate (4) (all bodies)

Reported for information: "Be it resolved that the Senate Committee on Student Affairs and the Student Senate Consultative Committee fully support the concept of an initiative to institute an unlimited-ride bus pass available to all university students, faculty, and staff."

"Professor Morrison extended thanks to Professor Virginia Gray for two years of service as Clerk of the Senate and her guidance as Chair of the SCC/FCC during the tenure debates, since she is leaving the University at the end of the semester. The University Senate extended a round of applause."

The Health Plan Task Force "will be making a recommendation on whether the University should separate from the state in August and then consultation will be held with all employee groups and campuses before being brought back to the University Senate for action in the fall. If separation were to occur, the earliest date for implementation of the new system would be January of 2002."

The Senate approved without debate the Classroom Expectations Guidelines.

The Senate approved without debate a resolution on PeopleSoft: "Be it resolved, the University Senate requests the administration to make changing the PeopleSoft system a very high priority. The system must automatically prevent students from registering for courses which end and start too close together to permit students to arrive on time at their next class."

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Committee on Educational Policy (underlined language new): "A student may repeat a course once. When a student repeats a course, (a) all both grades for the course shall appear on the official transcript, (b) the course credits may not be counted more than once toward degree and program requirements, and (c) only the last enrollment for the course shall count in the student's grade point average."

The Senate approved a policy on the use of controlled substances.

The University Senate approved in principle a long report from the Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity that had a series of recommendations, including establishment of a Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity.

[1] Should a uniform University-wide policy be adopted? *Yes, with scope for unit variation in keeping with the spirit of the University policy and with the letter as appropriate.*

[2a] Should a uniform policy apply to undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, equally, or [2b] are there circumstances requiring special policies for some of these groups? *A uniform policy, expectation, and standard of justice should apply to all students, accommodating special circumstances and different levels as necessary and appropriate.*

[3] Should more explicit standards be adopted regarding plagiarism, use of materials obtained from other sources and services, such as the Internet, etc.? *Yes and no. The standards we recommend apply to any kind of cheating. To attempt to spell out the legion*



*possible ways of cheating by technological means, which come into being and mutate almost by the hour, would seem to be to court a costly cadre of sorcerer's apprentices to identify, sort, list, and count the proliferating methods as Norton does computer viruses. But we fully recognize the need to help students understand that plagiarism may include non-print sources.*

[4] How should these policies be communicated to students? *By all available and expedient means, from notice given in application materials through annual or semestral reminders made by e-mail to statements made on every syllabus, assignment, and examination.*

The Committee on Faculty Affairs provided a report and analysis for information and recommended that "Be it resolved: That the Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the children/dependents of all university employees having accrued 5 or more years of uninterrupted university service be granted a 50% tuition reduction upon being regularly admitted to an approved undergraduate program leading to a bachelor's degree, that the tuition reduction will be applied to half of the tuition for the first four years of a child/dependent's enrollment, during periods in which the child/dependent student is in good academic standing; and that the percentage of tuition reduced be increased by 10% for each additional year of uninterrupted service through year 10."

The Faculty Senate approved a set of administrative procedures for the Regents' policy on faculty emeriti.

In questions to the president:

"Q: Has anything been done to look into the long-term threat to the University from distance learning?"

"A: There has been discussion of this topic in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. There is disagreement among people since some see distance learning as a threat and others feel that the University is a residential college. At this time, the technology is ahead of the thinking so discussions should be held in governance on this topic. Applications have increased at the campuses so there is no immediate threat at the undergraduate level. Some professional degrees are being offered electronically to accommodate people who cannot move to attend classes and to reach remote areas."

September 28, 2000 Senate (1) (all 3 bodies)

FCC chair Fred Morrison reported that FCC and President Yudof were at odds over two provisions of amendments to the grievance policy and that FCC would appoint a subcommittee to work with the president.

The University Senate approved a bylaw change creating a new committee: "The Student Academic Integrity Committee is an advisory body to the Executive Vice President and Provost and to the administrative officers responsible for education, outreach, and sanctions related to issues of academic integrity." It was established in response to the recommendations of the Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity, appointed in response to an academic scandal in men's basketball.

President Yudof gave his State of the University address.

October 19, 2000 Faculty Senate

The Health Plan Task Force presented a report for information, with four recommendations: "The University should establish a standing Employee Benefits Advisory Committee to monitor the benefits packages available to employees and to advise the University administration. . . . The University administration should continue the recently initiated negotiations with the State Department of Employee (DOER) to acquire a management flexibility that has not been available through the state up to now. . . . At the same time, the University administration should continue to pursue an employee benefits purchasing program separate from that of the state. . . . The University should maintain a diverse and stable set of health plans to meet the needs of its diverse set of employees, retirees, and graduate assistants. . . . The University should offer to domestic partners the same benefits available to married employees." There was a long presentation and discussion.

A question was asked of the president: "Is a tuition benefit for children of faculty and staff still being considered?" President Yudof responded: "This issue makes sense, but until the University finds a way to fund salary increases and health benefits, it should be considered a dead issue."

November 16, 2000 University Senate (2)

The University Senate approved a new policy on educational materials and conflict of interest: "No member of the instructional staff of the University shall personally profit from the assignment of materials, or assignment of the venue of purchase of materials, to students in classes or any other instructional setting at the University without proper administrative approval."

The University Senate approved bylaw changes eliminating the Equal Opportunity for Women Committee and establishing the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee.

The president reported that "there has been much discussion lately regarding a new football stadium, but his position is that academic programs will come first. Any proposal is dependent upon independent financing from private sources or the state. There are three proposals regarding a stadium: remaining in the Metrodome, a joint-use stadium with the Minnesota Vikings, or a collegiate stadium. Any future planning would include feasibility studies on cost and location."

November 16, 2000 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved the recommendations of the Health Plan Task Force, including that "The University should establish a standing Benefits Advisory Committee to monitor the benefits packages available to employees and to advise the University administration. The committee

membership should include representatives of all affected groups. . . . [and] The University should offer to domestic partners the same benefits available to married employees."

The Senate approved "PRINCIPLES REGARDING INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL" recommended by FCC as well as the Committees on Educational Policy and on Faculty Affairs. It began:

"In order to provide a sound program of instruction for its students at all levels, undergraduate, graduate and professional, the University must rely on its regular faculty to take principal responsibility for developing and teaching courses carrying degree credit. Academic staff and adjunct faculty support this mission of the University through their important contributions in the fields of their special qualifications.

"The tenured and tenure-track professors are the regular faculty of the University. They participate in all three missions of the University: teaching, research, and service. The core instruction in every discipline should be provided primarily by these members of the faculty." There was additional text and discussion.

#### February 22, 2001 University Senate (3)

(nothing noteworthy)

#### February 22, 2001 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved a statement on faculty salaries that began: "The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning, after meeting in joint session on December 19, 2000, express their deep concerns about the disparity in faculty salaries between the University of Minnesota and its peer institutions and about the impact of this disparity on the quality of teaching and research at the University. We note with dismay that according to recent AAUP salary data, the University ranks 73<sup>rd</sup> in the nation, not only behind most of the top 30 research universities but also behind other colleges and universities whose research missions do not match Minnesota's in scale or scope. Their ability to pay higher salaries threatens our ability to remain a distinguished research university. In turn, this threat to the University of Minnesota is a threat to the continued economic well-being of the State of Minnesota. . . ."

#### April 19, 2001 University Senate (4)

The Senate approved an addition to the grading policy: "Enrollment for 15 credits in a semester would thus require approximately 45 hours of work per week, on average, over the course of the semester. All grades for academic work are based on the quality of the work submitted, not on hours of effort."

The Senate approved Intellectual Property Procedures that began with principles: "A member of the faculty, staff or student body of the University who creates protectible intellectual property or any other individual subject to the Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property* (the "Intellectual Property Policy ") (a "Creator" under the terms of the Intellectual Property Policy) that potentially may be owned by the University (or by the sponsor of the work leading to the

creation of the intellectual property) has the responsibility to promptly disclose, in writing, the existence of that intellectual property to the University through the office of Patents and Technology Marketing ("PTM"). . . ." There were multiple procedures, for different circumstances.

The Senate approved "University Network Management Guidelines": "Purpose: To preserve Internet access and campus network capacity for core mission applications. This guideline outlines how the Office for Information Technology will administratively manage the data network bandwidth and prevent any one application from monopolizing this limited and valuable resource." And more.

#### April 19, 2001 Faculty Senate

The administration responded to the statement on faculty salaries: "The Administration has publicly stated that University of Minnesota faculty salaries are not yet competitive. The administration continually voices public and private support for increased faculty salaries for the reasons stated in the resolution, among others. The President has clearly noted that it is a priority objective to increase faculty salaries on the Twin Cities campus at a rate above the level of inflation with decisions on use of funding related to salaried to be based on market and merit. This institutional commitment also extends to the coordinate campuses as appropriate. The Administration agrees that the Legislature and the Governor must be made aware that addressing the issue of competitive faculty salaried is of the utmost importance to the long-term economic health of the state."

The Senate approved a complicated revision to a complicated process of electing members to the Committee on Committees and the Faculty Consultative Committee.

FCC chair Fred Morrison reported on a statement from FCC about a new football stadium that had several points and began thus: "1. The Minnesota Vikings announced today a proposal for a joint Vikings-Gophers stadium on the University campus. Many Minnesotans, including many faculty members, would like the Vikings to stay in Minnesota. In considering its potential role in such a venture, the University should focus on its own primary mission—education."

"Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Health Benefits Advisory Committee (HBAC), said that the HBAC is proposing plans to introduce co-pays and possibly premiums for some coverages. This is in response to the projected 15 – 18% increase in health insurance costs. In response to the RFP, eight proposals were received, of which six dealt with the general health plans and two with specific aspects of it. A selection committee is reviewing these proposals and will issue a report to the Faculty Senate on May 31. The HBAC also continues to review the option of staying with the state if SEGIP can be modified comparable to the plans through the RFP."

#### May 31, 2001 University Senate (5)

(nothing noteworthy)

#### May 31, 2001 Faculty Senate

"Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Health Benefits Advisory Committee (HBAC), said that last fall the Health Plan Task Force brought a recommendation to the Senate for plan improvements. From these recommendations, a RFP was issued in February while the University continued to work with the state. A selection committee reviewed the proposals and has made the recommendations. . . . Various groups are advising the President on this issue, but the HBAC has voted to recommend separation from the state. The Regents will be making their decision next Friday." The recommendation generated considerable discussion.

#### September 20, 2001 University Senate (1)

The Senate approved "Principles Governing Private Support of Research" that began: "External support for faculty research and scholarship has become increasingly important in recent years, and will likely remain important for the foreseeable future. Faculty, departments and colleges should be encouraged to seek private support, as well as public support, for their research endeavors. Private support for research and scholarship at the University of Minnesota should be guided by" principles set out in the docket.

The Senate adopted this motion: " The Senate of the University of Minnesota extends its sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of the victims of the September 11 terrorist attacks. We condemn the perpetrators of these acts. Further, the Senate condemns any criminal acts or harassment committed against all ethnic, religious, or minority groups or individuals. Finally, the Senate also encourages the members of this academic community to turn our considerable talents to exploring the meanings of this experience and to working toward a more tolerant world in which such a tragedy is less likely."

#### September 20, 2001 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Committee on Faculty Affairs that "the University should extend Faculty Retirement Plan participation to all tenure-track faculty as of the date of hire."

The Senate approved another recommendation from the Committee on Faculty Affairs, that an interim faculty development policy be made permanent, on the basis of a recommendation from a subcommittee.

"Although the Committee on Faculty Affairs would prefer to fund sabbaticals more fully, this apparently is not possible at present.

"As a result, the subcommittee recommended that the interim policy be made permanent. . . . The policy has not changed but the availability of supplemental funds for sabbaticals has. In addition to the half salary available for sabbaticals, an individual going on leave--upon application and approval--may receive an additional 25% of salary up to \$20,000. Up to now, in some colleges faculty have not requested (used) all of the funds that are available for this purpose. The single term (presently semester, previously quarter) leave is not available at most other institutions and use of it has declined slightly since the change to semesters."

#### October 18, 2001 University Senate (2)

After items of routine business, President Yudof gave his State of the University address.

#### December 6, 2001 University Senate (3)

The Senate approved a policy providing that "each offering of a course is required to have a syllabus. Instructors are referred to the Classroom Expectations Guidelines for good practice on what should be included in a syllabus."

SCC chair Joe Massey, "said that in the spirit of consultation, SCC wanted to provide the senators with an opportunity to respond to the 13 credit minimum proposal to improve the graduation rate.

"Vice Provost Craig Swan noted that his interest in this topic stems from a commitment to student success and a strong belief that graduation rather than just attendance is a critical element of student success. . . . The system has not worked in the past so proposals will be brought the University Senate in the spring to improve the system and help students succeed."

In the president's report, "President Yudof said that he does not want to say much more about the graduation rate, but there is one statistic that is very telling. Only 50% of students graduate in six years, and of the remaining 50%, only one in ten will ever receive a degree from the University. This is a topic with which the faculty and students need to be engaged for the benefit of future students."

The president also reported that "he is working on the Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP) search committee. The committee will likely be larger than he first anticipated, roughly 15 to 18 individuals, with two students, one academic professional, one Civil Service member, a few deans, and a large number of faculty, close to the 50% which the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) recommended."

#### December 6, 2001 Faculty Senate

The Senate adopted without discussion a statement from FCC: "Decisions about the delivery of salary increases should be made in consultation with the Faculty Consultative Committee. In addition, the joint subcommittee on salaries should receive the necessary cooperation and support from the administration."

FCC brought to the Senate a statement on athletics:

"The rapid growth of commercial influences, particularly in high profile intercollegiate sports, and the increased tendency towards professional performance standards undermine the constructive roles of sports on campus. Universities and colleges increasingly find that the requirements of athletic competitiveness and the values of the entertainment industry strain their financial resources and divert student and public attention from their fundamental role as academic institutions. The high stakes drive for championship status can overwhelm the responsibility to prioritize the personal and academic development of college athletes and the integrity of the institution.

"The faculties of CIC institutions join with colleagues in the Pac-10 conference in urging the presidents, faculty athletics committees, and faculty conference representatives of Big-10 conference schools and of other institutions engaged in intercollegiate athletics, to join in a concerted commitment to bring these forces under control."

The statement included principles.

March 28, 2002 University and Faculty Senates (4)

The administration responded to the statement about consultation on faculty salaries: "The administration has reviewed this resolution and agrees with the Senate that the administration should continue its practice of consultation with the FCC and other committees and subcommittees on issues related to the delivery of salary increases."

The administration also responded to the statement on athletics: "The administration has reviewed this resolution and appreciates the sense of the Faculty Senate on this issue. The Vice President and Chief of Staff has presented a report on the current and future financial challenges facing the intercollegiate athletics department to the Board of Regents, and to several administrative, faculty, and student groups. . . . It is the University's philosophy that the success of an athletics program is measured by the value it adds to college athletes and to the campuses, not solely by championships. The administration continues to explore policy and practice options that would support this philosophy. . . . The administration will continue to consult and seek the views of faculty and input from faculty governance."

SCC chair Joe Massey reported, via copy of a letter to the president, that the Senate Research Committee had unanimously approved two requests for exemptions from the Regents' policy barring secrecy in research and that SCC had voted not to support the requests. "Given the unanimous vote at the Senate Research Committee in favor of granting these exceptions, and given the divided vote at the Senate Consultative Committee, it would appear that it would be appropriate for you to exercise your judgment without worrying that you are contradicting recommendations from the governance system." Later in the meeting, under New Business, the Senate took up the recommendations and reversed the SCC recommendations.

FCC and the Committee on Finance and Planning reported a statement they had each adopted unanimously the previous December that included this language, among other:

"Before we make specific responses to the substance of the report from Vice President Brown, we affirm that intercollegiate athletics can play a positive role at a university. The Committees also endorse a guiding principle that the University should meet, or exceed, the requirements of Title IX with respect to gender equity. Further, the Committees recognize and endorse the variety of benefits that athletics offer to the institution. The question for us is not about the legitimacy or appropriateness of intercollegiate athletics on campus; it is about the cost.

"The Committees are deeply disturbed by the financial situation of the Twin Cities intercollegiate athletics programs. An annual subsidy that has now become more than \$10 million from institutional operating funds is inappropriate and casts into stark relief the issue of institutional priorities. . . ."

"We conclude that we have no alternative to a recommendation that the University take action to scale back the use of institutional funds for intercollegiate athletics. . . . The University must do whatever is necessary, in the very near future, to reduce its present and projected financial commitment to athletics."

The Committee on Finance and Planning reported a "Statement on the adoption of a new Tuition-banding Model as a financial incentive for Improving Graduation Rates for Undergraduate Students": "The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) has read and discussed the document, *Improving our Graduation Rates: The Report of the Graduation and Retention Subcommittee of the Council of Undergraduate Deans* (August 13, 2001). The Committee concludes that the University must establish and communicate an explicit expectation that, upon admission, most students will be full-time students and will be expected to graduate within four-to-five years of matriculation. In reaching that conclusion, the SCFP strongly endorses the comments and recommendations prepared by the Council of Undergraduate Deans and sent to the President and Provost on January 22, 2002. . . ." It also concluded that "after review of three tuition-banding options (13 credits and above; 13-17 credits; and 12 credits and above) and a new tuition-discount option (75% discount for more than 12 credits) expresses its strong preference for the *13 credits and above band option*."

"The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning urges the central administration to move the data network to a common goods model of financial management in which the full recurring cost of the network is paid centrally."

The Committee on Student Affairs reported a resolution concerning the 13-credit rule: "Be it resolved, the University should make every effort to ensure clear communication to students, advisers, and other staff about the 13-credit minimum rule, the differences between full-time and part-time status, and the implications for being a full-time versus a part-time student; . . ." and made other points.

The Committee on Social Concerns reported for information a long report and statement it had adopted concerning the Mt. Graham observatory: "The conflict between the interests of research science and those of indigenous culture centering on the Mt. Graham project are perhaps irreconcilable. Central to the complication is that the opposing groups bring incompatibly different systems of politics, knowledge, belief and history to bear, and as a result, are incapable of either understanding or compromise. . . . We chose to outline the competing cases as clearly as possible and provide advice on a course of action. . . . That advice: for the University to join the Mt. Graham Observatory / Large Binocular Telescope places us in clear danger of allying ourselves against the interests and beliefs of native people. This strikes us as a choice with clear consequences in regard to the University's ethical reputation—should we join the MGIO/LBT project, we need to be prepared for considerable, strong and organized opposition and a great deal of media attention. . . ."

The Committee on Educational Policy recommended and the Senate approved a policy on mid-term alerts: "Instructors in all 1-XXX courses shall provide a mid-term alert for students who, on the basis of performance in the course through the sixth week of the semester, appear to be in



danger of receiving a grade of D, F, or N. Such notification to students will not be a part of their transcript."

The Senate approved a set of bylaw amendments establishing committee memberships for professional and administrative employees.

The Senate voted to grant to committees the authority to issue interpretations of policies they have previously brought to the Senate for action and that were adopted; it also granted FCC and SCC the authority to issue interpretations of any Senate policies.

The president's report: "President Yudof said that the University is facing a \$23.6 million budget rescission at a time when the University is doing more with less. . . . Some of the particulars of the new budget will include faculty raises at less than 6% this year. Tuition will increase more than the projected 13.8%, although this will be accompanied by a plan for tuition banding. . . . The University is keeping an eye on the stadium situation. This topic is not something the University is pushing, but its proposal and construction would have a significant impact on the campus. . . . President Yudof stated that athletics does have a problem because it requires a \$10 million per year investment from the University. Even with this investment, there is a looming deficit over the next five years. He is not opposed to public money supporting non-revenue sports but their subsidy must be weighed against the interests of the University as a whole. . . . Public education is not being supported nationally. He has theorized that a hybrid institution will be formed by systemic factors. . . . Tuition will continue to increase by double digits, although he hopes that he is wrong."

#### April 25, 2002 University and Faculty Senates (5)

The All-University Honors Committee reported for information its approach to posthumous awards: "The honorary degree and the Outstanding Achievement Award (OAA) shall be conferred on living individuals. To be considered posthumously the All-University Honors Committee must have received the nomination before the nominee's death.

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Senate Research Committee to grant an exemption from the policy barring secrecy in research.

"President Yudof said that merger of the two athletic departments has been approved and he feels that this is a positive step for the University. The one athletic department should be more successful in marketing, fundraising, and academic performance. He noted that this merger does not violate the principles of Title IX.

"Vice President Brown has projected a deficit of approximately \$21 million over the next five years. With the funding of three sports by the alumni for three years and the merging of the departments, the deficit will be reduced by \$8.5 million, although there is still more work to be done. While there is a short-term fix for three sports, another \$50 million needs to be raised to endow student athletic scholarships. . . ."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs brought this motion, which was approved: "The Faculty Senate requests the President to direct the Office of Human Resources, in concert with a subcommittee of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, to develop a strategy for gathering

systematic information from faculty who leave the University for other academic positions. An annual report of the findings from faculty who have left should be presented to the Committee on Faculty Affairs."

October 3, 2002 University and Faculty Senates (1)

The administration reported that it "strongly supports the spirit of this request [for exit interviews] and will direct Vice President Carol Carrier and Vice President/Vice Provost Robert Jones to work with the subcommittee to determine need and benefit, discuss options and strategies, and determine cost to benefit ratio for the proposed new Human Resources program."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs issued a warning: "A major issue has emerged. The Committee feels obligated to warn faculty about certain aspects of the privacy issue. There is a legal gap in privacy protection for faculty.

"In the view of the Committee, the Minnesota Data Practices Act . . . in essence removes many protections that faculty may believe apply to research data, and possibly personal communications.

"The act permits anyone to request any records that a faculty member has that are arguably relevant to any public or private interest. These records may be on paper or electronic, maintained in an office or home or on an office computer or even on an entirely private home computer. This includes email, no matter where it is physically or electronically located or how it was generated. There is no requirement that the information requested actually be proven important to the public. This is the legal gap. . . ."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs also brought a recommendation on the Faculty Retirement Plan, which the Faculty Senate approved: "New tenure track assistant professors must be employed for two years before they can join the Faculty Retirement Plan. . . . If new tenure track faculty received their retirement benefits for the first two years of their employment at the University, an analysis indicates their retirement income could be as much as 17% higher than under the present plan. . . . The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs had asked the administration to drop this two-year waiting period for new faculty. Unfortunately this has not, as yet, been approved. SCFA believes the waiting period puts the University at a disadvantage in recruiting. It also believes the difference between faculty and P&A appointments in terms of initiation of retirement plans is unfair and ill-advised.

"SCFA recommends to the Faculty Senate that it ask the administration and the deans to reconsider their position on this issue. In view of the importance of the first two years of contributions to the retirement plan, the Committee once again urges that the waiting period for Faculty Retirement Plan be eliminated for new tenure-track faculty."

Presidential search report: "Professor Sara Evans, a faculty member of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, said that she, along with Professors John Sullivan and Wilbert Ahern, are the faculty members on the committee. She stated that she cannot share much information since the nature of the process is for everything to be confidential to generate the best possible pool of candidates. . . . Professor Evans noted that one concern regarding the process is that there are only three faculty on the committee, and of these three, two are historians and two are from the College of Liberal Arts in the Twin Cities. There are no scientists or faculty from a professional

school. To be an effective faculty voice on this committee, the three committee members have been meeting with as many faculty leadership groups as possible."

Along with a long series of bylaw amendments, the Senate approved this one: "At present, the Civil Service Committee nominates to the President individuals to fill slots on Senate and Assembly committees allocated to civil service staff. The President and the Civil Service Committee have agreed that the Civil Service Committee should simply make the appointments, without presidential involvement in the process."

SCC presented a proposed constitutional amendment: "If a proposed constitutional amendment has received affirmative votes of 80% or more of those present and voting at a meeting of the Senate, but the number of votes cast is insufficient to adopt the amendment (either a two-thirds majority of all voting members at one meeting or a majority of all voting members at the second of two meetings), the amendment may be submitted electronically to all members of the Senate for a second vote. . . ." Part of the Comment was this: "There have been repeated occasions over the past several years when constitutional or bylaw amendments have received unanimous or near-unanimous support from the Senate or Assembly but which were nonetheless not adopted because the required absolute majority vote was not obtained simply because there were not enough people present at the meeting." The amendment failed because there were not enough people present to reach the required majorities. (It was approved on the second vote at the following meeting.)

Another constitutional amendment failed because of a lack of votes: "As part of a package of bylaw revisions establishing positions on some Senate and Assembly committees for academic professional members, the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Council on Academic Professionals and Administrators agreed that academic professional members of the Faculty Senate should not be voting on tenure or Judicial Committee matters, which are issues of concern exclusively to the faculty." (It was approved at the next meeting on the second vote.)

Robert Bruininks gave the president's State of the University address; it began thus: "It is an honor in my 35<sup>th</sup> year at the University of Minnesota, to serve as Interim President of this great institution."

#### October 31, 2002 University and Faculty Senates (2)

The Committee on Educational Policy proposed a change in the academic calendars for the Twin Cities campus: It "debated over several meetings about the calendar for the Twin Cities campus. As Senators who have served for a number of years will know, this has been a thorny issue ever since the change to semesters.

"The State Fair is an intractable factor in setting the calendar. . . .

"At the same time, the Committee was gravely concerned about the implications of scheduling a final examination period that does not end until December 22 or 23 in years when Labor Day (the last day of the State Fair) is late. The Committee was concerned that many instructors would choose not to have a final examination.

"As a result, the Committee has voted to approve, as standard practice, 70-day semesters in the fall and 74-day semesters in the spring. Although this may make for some awkwardness

when the same course is offered both semesters, it appears to be a compromise that we can live with. It does not completely obviate the problem of final examinations running late into December but it does mitigate it somewhat."

The University Senate approved.

The Committee on Educational Policy proposed a grading policy change: "If a student graduates with an I on the transcript, the I will remain permanently an I. A student may petition his or her college, within a year of graduation, to complete the work in the course and receive a grade. The degree GPA would be frozen upon graduation but the cumulative GPA would reflect the change in GPA if a student chooses to complete the work and change I to a grade within a year of graduation." The problem was the automatic conversion of an I to an F a year after graduation, thus changing the transcript. The Senate approved.

On recommendation from the Committee on Committees, SCC recommended a new section in the bylaws:

"10. Removal of Committee Chairs and Committee members

"a. Committee chairs (faculty, P&A, civil service, or alumni) may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Steering Committee. Committee chairs (students) may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the Student Steering Committee." There was also a provision for removing committee members and a rationale and reasons. No events at the time prompted the proposal.

The Senate approved. [As of the date of this abstract, the provisions have never been invoked.]

"Professor Daniel Feeney, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that the University will soon be facing a decision on this issue [a football stadium, with or without the Minnesota Vikings], and this is the first opportunity for senators to have any discussion. As of this date, several committees have sent a list of concerns to the administration and the Regents as to what can go wrong in this endeavor." There was lengthy discussion.

The Faculty Senate referred back to the Committee on Faculty Affairs a proposed policy on voting in promotion and tenure, intended as a clarification of the tenure policy.

#### December 5, 2002 Faculty Senate

In the report of the FCC vice chair, Judith Martin reported that "since the last meeting, FCC also received notice that Robert Bruininks was named the next president. FCC is pleased with this announcement."

The Senate had a lengthy debate about a proposed "academic unit governance" policy that vested final authority for certain matters in departments in the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

"Professor Richard Goldstein, Chair of the Retirement Subcommittee, said that the opportunity for a Post-Retirement Health Care Savings Plan (PRHCSP) comes from federal and state legislative changes. In Minnesota, state judges, state legislative employees, and school district employees have started PRHCSPs. The Subcommittee began a discussion a few months ago and now has a draft to be discussed." There was lengthy discussion.

### February 2, 2003 University and Faculty Senates (3)

The Senate approved unanimously a bylaw change in the Rules to permit committees to close their meetings (with a two-thirds vote of those present at the committee meeting) at any time. Previously meetings could only be closed "when personnel matters are discussed, when quasi-judicial functions are carried out, or when closed sessions are required to protect the right of individuals." The change also provided that "Only committee members and others designated by the chair may remain in the meeting once a motion to close the meeting has been adopted." The Comment observed that "In general, the Senate and Assembly and their committees should have open meetings. There are times, however, when committees cannot effectively serve a consultative purpose if there are others present. [Examples cited.] In these and many other situations, the committees have either had to contort their agendas to fit an item into one of the categories specified in the existing bylaw that permit closed meetings or they were unable to close their meeting--and thus committee members were unable to discuss in an organized fashion the issue before them. Often when closed meetings are not permitted, the chair and committee members are forced to communicate in other ways that do not facilitate full discussion." The change also required that "the topics discussed [in closed session] and any formal committee action must be reported in the Committee's minutes."

The Senate also re-established the Tenure Committee as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, changing its status from a subcommittee of the Committee on Faculty Affairs. "After evaluating the work of the Tenure Subcommittee in recent years, the Faculty Consultative Committee agrees that the Tenure Subcommittee should be made a regular standing committee of the Senate. This will make the appointment of members easier, through the Committee on Committees, and will provide the committee with the stature and status it should have as it deals with proposals to change the tenure code or other matters affecting faculty status."

One of the Faculty Legislative Liaisons reported: "Professor Fred Morrison, Faculty Legislative Liaison, stated that Governor's recommendation calls for a reduction of almost \$100 million a year in the state appropriation for the University. In perspective, this amount is equivalent to the state appropriation for CLA, IT, CBS, and Education combined or for the entire Academic Health Center. This is the size of the challenge that the University faces."

Following extended debate, the Senate approved 64-32 (5 abstentions) an Academic Unit Governance policy, the first point of which read as follows: "The regular faculty [As defined in the Board of Regents' policy 'Faculty Tenure'] are invested with academic freedom and are charged with responsibility in all aspects of the University's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service. They have been selected through rigorous search processes, are subject to substantive annual and tenure-related reviews, and have entered into long-term relationships with the University. For these reasons, the regular faculty hold ultimate authority for governance in tenure-granting units. This authority includes governance of the unit in research policy, curricular policy and degree requirements, and personnel allocation (the last in concert with the chair, head or dean)." [Footnotes omitted.] The Council of Academic Professionals supported the proposal, with reservations.

March 27, 2003 University and Faculty Senates (4)

FCC provided for information a statement it had adopted: "The Faculty Consultative Committee of the University of Minnesota Faculty Senate thanks the members of the Regent Candidate Advisory Council for their outstanding work in reviewing and interviewing candidates for the University of Minnesota Board of Regents. The Committee expresses its strong support for the work of the Council and the process that relies upon the Council to identify future Regents. The Committee commends the work of the Council to the Legislature."

The Social Concerns Committee reported a resolution it had adopted unanimously, with this conclusion following a series of "whereas" clauses: "Be it resolved that the faculty at University of Minnesota will not penalize students who miss classes, discussions, or labs as a result of participating in a potential, one day student protest on the first day of a United States invasion of Iraq, should the United States invade Iraq in 2003. Nor should those who choose to attend classes be in any way penalized for doing so."

The Committee on Educational Policy introduced a change to the semester-conversion standards, adding one word (underlined): "**SECTION 5A:** The hours of contact time for a course normally shall equal at least the number of credits for the course times the number of weeks the course is offered. In the majority of cases, this would mean the number of contact hours per week would equal the number of credits for the course, but the contact hours need not be spread out evenly by week." Following debate, the Senate approved the change 75-46.

The Senate approved changes to the Student Conduct Code, but not without debate about the language of the Code. Under New Business later in the meeting, a motion was approved: "To refer the approved Student Conduct Code language to a committee specified by the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) to propose revisions to the Code to address jurisdictional and free speech issues that have been raised." (At the following Senate meeting, SCC chair Dan Feeney reported that SCC "decided that the Code will be kept on its discussion list, but no action will be taken within the next few years."

The Assembly Steering Committee (Twin Cities SCC members) recommended a change in the process for approving policies governing Twin Cities intercollegiate athletics: "The Steering Committee recommends that the authority to approve the policies rest with it, with all adoptions and approvals reported thereafter to the Assembly for information, with the understanding that the Assembly could reverse the action of the Steering Committee. There are a substantial number of these policies, many of which involve details that are not of sufficient importance to bring to the Assembly every time there is a need for change or updating. The changes to these policies are made rather frequently so if they all needed to come to the Assembly for action they would take up a large part of each agenda." The motion failed for lack of a sufficient number of Assembly members present to vote.

An item in the president's report: "President Bruininks said that he would like to spend some time talking about the budget situation. He noted that while this is the biggest economic and budgetary challenge that the University has faced since the 1930s, the University needs to

remind people that this system has incredible strength in its programs and employees, as well as its economy.

The cut being proposed amounts to a 15 percent reduction in funding from the state, as well as additional costs the University has. In total, it amounts to a \$250 million decrease over the next two years. . . . For staff and faculty, a wage increase would likely increase the damage to the quality of life for all employees and students. While there will a wage freeze for this year, a two-year freeze would be devastating for the University and should be avoided."

The Faculty Senate declined to approve, 30-40, a Post-Retirement Health Care Savings Plan.

#### April 24, 2003 University and Faculty Senates (5)

SCC chair Dan Feeney reported that

"Professor Bill Tierney, an expert on governance, visited the University last fall. He evaluated the University's system, and commented that while this system is one of the strongest with respect to faculty and students, there are several groups that are unrepresented even though this structure is a University Senate. The groups he was referring to are non-faculty-like academic professionals and non-bargaining-unit civil service employees.

"He then asked senators to review a first draft for revising the Senate structure to be more inclusive. This proposal is being presented to all affected groups this spring for general comments and feedback."

"The Council of Undergraduate Deans recommended to the Committee on Educational Policy that the leave of absence policy be amended so that any time a student intends not to enroll for a semester he or she should obtain a leave of absence if he or she contemplates returning to the University later. The current policy allows students to leave ("stop out") for one semester and return without consequence the next semester. This change would require a student to obtain a leave of absence if leaving for even one semester. . . . A major reason for the change is to create the expectation that the University expects continuous registration, expects them to enroll for four years, graduate, and leave. By allowing students to 'drop in' and 'drop out' without talking to a college advisor, the University implicitly encourages students to prolong their undergraduate education." The Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate approved.

The Senate debated but finally approved a Twin Cities campus calendar for 2006-07; the debate was about the length of fall semester and whether or not a study day would be included.

The Senate approved series of bylaw amendments

"intended to align membership rules for the Senate/Assembly and their committees. At present the rules vary somewhat. These amendments basically provide that no central administrator or any dean may serve as a voting member of the Senate/Assembly or their committees. Assistant and associate deans with less than one-third-time appointments may serve as voting members/chairs of committees and as voting members of the Senate.

"It is the view of the Consultative Committee that any individual who holds a central administrative position (vice president, provost, etc.) will be dealing with issues that can come

before a committee and it is inappropriate that those with administrative responsibility also have voting rights on governance committees."

A constitutional amendment also required did not achieve the sufficient number of votes required. (But did so at the next meeting so was approved.)

The Senate approved a bylaw change to FCC membership so that the outgoing chair serves as an ex officio voting member even if his or her term on the committee would otherwise end, in order to ensure continuity.

"President Bruininks began by addressing the recent riots in Dinkytown and Stadium Village following the men's hockey victory. While the victory was a great cause for celebration, he was very upset when he heard news about the riots around campus. He noted that some of the rioters were not University students. For those who were students, they will receive fair treatment, but destructive behavior will not be tolerated and these students will no longer have a place at the University.

"President Bruininks felt that the statement from the Advisory Committee on Athletics was very articulate and to the point on this issue."

"President Bruininks said that the University community will be asked to share this burden [of sharp cuts in state funding]. He is proposing no wage increases the first year as well as increases in the employee portion of health benefit expenses."

"Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC), said that three weeks ago the administration presented a proposal to cut \$19 million a year from the University's health benefit costs in a shift to more employee costs for this service. The average expense per employee would be roughly \$1000.

"Professor Morrison said this change means that office visits co-pays will double, pharmacy co-pays will increase by 50 percent, and premium costs will increase by \$500 to \$2500 depending on the type of coverage and the plan choice. While these are harsh increases, they are better than other employers who are cutting jobs or eliminating some types of coverage, such as dental."

#### October 2, 2003 University and Faculty Senates (1)

FCC reported a statement for information:

"The members of the Faculty Consultative Committee share the indignation expressed by our colleagues on the Advisory Committee on Athletics against the outrageous behavior on and off campus following the April 12<sup>th</sup> NCAA Gopher men's hockey team victory, and we agree with the sentiments and views expressed in the Advisory Committee's statement.

"The Faculty Consultative Committee has serious concerns about whether the University is able to prevent or prepare adequately for such disturbances. The Committee wishes to be assured that in the future more effective steps will be taken to protect students, faculty, and staff who may be working in campus buildings from harm or death as a result of arson or other violence, that the life and health of other individuals on or near the campus will not be at risk from such disturbances, and that University property is protected.



"The Committee also hopes that the consequences to students for participating in disturbances such as that of April 12 will be made clear and duly publicized. The administration must take decisive steps to warn students that they will be expelled from the University if convicted of participation in such disturbances."

President Bruininks gave his State of the University address.

October 30, 2003 University and Faculty Senates (2)

"President Bruininks announced that the Social Concerns Committee has asked that item 14 be changed from an action item to a 20 minute discussion item. The format for the discussion will be a five-minute presentation from the committee, a five-minute presentation from the Astronomy Department, and 10 minutes of general discussion." [Item 14 was a resolution on the telescope on Mt. Graham, in Arizona; it had a series of "whereas" clauses and a series of "be it resolved" clauses that began: "NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate Social Concerns Committee at the University of Minnesota hereby still strongly opposes any involvement by the University of Minnesota in the Mount Graham telescope project; . . ."] The Senate debated whether to permit the change from action to discussion, with FCC chair Judith Martin urging that it be a discussion item. The Senate approved the request. Later in the meeting, there was lengthy discussion and numerous representatives from the Astronomy department and the Apache Indians.

FCC reported a statement it had approved: "Statement on Centrally-Scheduled Classrooms[:] Capital improvements applicable to centrally-scheduled classrooms should NOT be the financial responsibility of the academic unit which houses the facility and should be exempt from the 1/6 cost-sharing principle which applies to other capital improvements that are not designated for HEAPR" [Higher Education Asset Preservation and Renewal, which appropriations are not subject to the requirement that the University pay one-third of the debt service]." Also approved by the Committee on Finance and Planning.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported a resolution opposing the establishment of additional-cost reserved contract parking spaces in certain ramps and garages.

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Social Concerns Committee that "the University Senate recommends that the University of Minnesota adopt a policy that all departments, computer labs and libraries on its campuses purchase paper that is a minimum of 30% pcw recycled paper."

The Senate also approved 82-61 a resolution indicating that "the University Senate recommends that every department, computer lab and library on its campuses purchase at least one duplex printer to be phased in as current printers are replaced."

A proposal for discussion to reorganize the Senate to include Professional and Administrative employees and Civil Service employees was presented. "Professor Dan Feeny, Chair of the Senate Reorganization Working Group [reported]. . . . This proposal started with a comment to the University Senate from Bill Tierney, a scholar of higher education governance, who visited

the University last year. His point was that the University has an active governance system but it only involves student and faculty, not staff. . . . A working group then developed a proposal that would have representatives from the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) and Civil Service Committee (CSC) added to the structure. In order to keep the size manageable, a decrease in faculty and student seats was also proposed.

"The proposal still leaves the Faculty Senate and Student Senate intact, as they currently exist, as well as CAPA and CSC. The proposal is that all four bodies intersect in the University Senate only. . . . The draft also proposes the elimination of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly as separate body since most of its business is redundant constitutional amendments to mirror changes in the University Senate. . . . From the numbers being proposed, the largest decrease would be in the faculty representatives, from roughly 175 to 125. Student representatives would decrease from 59 to 50. These decreases would allow for 25 seats to be allocated each to CAPA and CSC. All members of the University Senate would be elected.

"This plan is meant to give the University an opportunity to have an open discussion with all employment groups who are eligible to participate. It would also allow members from CAPA and CSC to participate in discussions without being yielded time by a senator."

The president reported that "When he was asked to take on this responsibility, he knew that it would be a difficult period, although he could not predict that it would be this tough. He did not expect the type of cut that it received, which was a 15 percent reduction in the University's base budget. This amount was unprecedented in the University's history, and might be the largest single cut to any institution in the country. . . . 33 percent of the cut came from reducing budgets, as well as targeted reductions in some areas. These reductions led to 500 layoffs across the system as well as a retrenchment of 150 open positions. An additional 17 percent was shouldered by faculty and staff, in the form of a wage freeze during the first year."

The president spoke about the striking civil service employees. Under New Business, a motion was made, with several "whereas" clauses and ending "Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate encourages and urges the administration to take a flexible, generous and humane approach to negotiating an early end to the strike, bearing in mind that the employees involved, many of whom have selflessly served the University for decades, are among our least generously compensated." The motion was not adopted for lack of a quorum and was referred to FCC.

#### February 12, 2004 Faculty Senate

The discussion of reorganization of the Senate continued. "Professor Dan Feeney said that the purpose of this proposal is to consider the concept of a more inclusive University Senate. . . . Discussions have been held prior to this meeting, and resistance has been expressed primarily in regards to the loss of faculty influence. He will try to allay this concern today. . . . He then said that the University is facing tough times, and it will be better to have an 'us' approach, rather than the current 'we' and 'they' approach. . . . One principle adhered to during this process is the clarification of individual group voices. There have been concerns raised as to the dilution of the faculty voice in the University Senate, but it can be seen that there is now a direct reporting line from the Faculty Senate to the President. The reporting lines for committees is also proposed to change to put them more in line with current practice. . . .

"Q: Under the proposed systems, there is the opportunity for faculty to stop a proposal or policy to allow for more review or consultation before it reaches the University Senate. What is the procedural impact of the reporting lines?

"A: Many faculty felt that there needed to be stronger faculty control over some items and issues, which accounts for the change in committee alignment and reporting lines. The proposal is not trying to block groups from participating in the decision-making process, but is to make sure that the faculty voice is heard on certain issues."

There was extended debate.

"The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is a faculty group with a steering committee of 12 members drawn from Division I universities across the country that is working to bring reforms to college athletics. The general direction and nature of the changes are outlined in the Framework statement" (which was included in the docket). The Advisory Committee on Athletics unanimously recommended to the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee (Twin Cities faculty senators) "that it join the COIA [Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics] and that it endorse in principle the Framework. "Joining" the COIA simply means that the Faculty Assembly has put its stamp of approval on the work of the COIA and that there will be a contact person, a faculty member, at the University to receive information about the work of the COIA." The Faculty Assembly approved joining.

February 26, 2004 University and Faculty Senates (3/4)

FCC chair Judith Martin reported a letter sent to the president: "I write on behalf of the Faculty Consultative Committee to transmit a report from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs concerning child care on campus. . . . Committee members felt strongly that this is an issue to which the University must pay more attention. We endorse the recommendations from SCFA concerning the need to identify funding that can help alleviate the shortage of high-quality child care for University faculty, staff, and students, as well as other initiatives the University might undertake in helping parents identify child-care options."

On the matter of the telescope on Mt. Graham, FCC chair Martin also reported that last "October, the Research Committee and the Social Concerns were asked by the Senate to confer and craft a joint resolution, and they began to meet. In January of this year, several senators from the Institute of Technology raised a constitutional question regarding discussions on this topic taking place in the Senate. She referred the question to the parliamentarian for a ruling.

"Professor Guy Charles, Senate parliamentarian, said that he was advised that there was a possibility that two Senate committees might be submitting contrary resolutions for Senate action with respect to the Mount Graham affair, and that each resolution might significantly impair the interests of a University unit, school, or department. If this action occurred, it would implicate Article VII, Section 2 of the Senate Constitution. This ruling was presented to the chair. If he adopts the ruling, it is appealable by the body. However, until such time as resolutions were presented to the Senate for action, this article is not implicated and both committees should continue to work towards a joint resolution.

"President Bruininks said that he would take the ruling under advisement and make a decision at the time that opposing resolutions are presented to the Senate."

Discussion of the reorganization of the Senate to include P&A and Civil Service staff continued.

FCC chair Judith Martin noted a proposed new Regents' policy on use of royalty income. "Professor Gary Balas, Chair of the Research Committee, said that a proposed policy was presented to the Regents at their last meeting to use royalty income to support non-profit corporations to help foster and promote University intellectual property. The Research Committee has not voted to endorse the policy because of the short time it has had to debate it, but it did vote in favor of the concept behind the policy to find other uses for royalty monies." Additional information was provided.

In his report to the Senate, President Bruininks noted: "Recently, legislation was introduced in the state to ban embryonic stem cell research at the University and withdraw state funding if such research continues. The University has proposed to do this research under existing federal legislation which permits funding from private sources under careful supervision. This issue deserves attention and the bill introduced is a threat to the academic freedom of the University. He has learned today that the bill was withdrawn from public discussion at this time."

#### April 29, 2004 University and Faculty Senates (4/5)

The Finance and Planning Committee reported for information a statement on technology transfer and commercialization of intellectual property.

It "supports technology transfer and the commercialization of University intellectual property as an integral and appropriate part of the University's mission. The Committee also supports the idea behind the proposed Board of Regents' policy allowing the expenditure of University funds in furtherance of that part of the mission.

"The Committee believes, however, that the current draft of the proposed policy requires careful revision, in part because it is focused too narrowly on only one model of supporting technology transfer, and offers to work with the administration to revise the policy and to promote this part of the University's mission."

SCC presented three motions:

**"MOTION 1:** That the structure of the University Senate should be changed to include representation from all academic professional and civil service staff.

**"MOTION 2:** To approve the revised Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules, thereby eliminating the Twin Cities Campus Assembly as a separate structure, and distributing authority for future revisions to the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules to the body or bodies listed after each article or section. The revised Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules will be mailed to all senators prior to the meeting.

**"MOTION 3:** That the structure of the University Senate should be changed to include 167 voting faculty, 60 voting students, 25 voting academic professionals, and 25 voting civil service members."

Motions 2 and 3 did not achieve sufficient votes to meet the required number and were submitted to electronic vote following the meeting. The constitutional amendments failed; the bylaw changes were adopted.

"President Bruininks testified that, in terms of stadiums, they are asking the state for the right to raise 60 percent of the cost of an on-campus stadium through non-state sources with the expectation that if the University succeeds, the state will make up the balance. This amounts to a state appropriation of about \$7 million. While this is not the most important priority but it is important item for the University to achieve as it is no longer a commuter campus and a stadium would strengthen the sense of community. However, he will not sacrifice the academic interests of the University." The president also spoke about the budget, which "will include salary and wages increases for faculty and staff, as well as a stiff tuition increase for students. He will continue to raise private dollars for scholarship funding. . . ."

#### September 30, 2004 University and Faculty Senates (1)

The Committee on Social Concerns reported a resolution: "The University of Minnesota encourage local, renewable energy projects on its campuses. Renewable energy includes: wind, solar, biomass, geothermal, hydrogen or future technology with a low impact on the environment. Local, renewable energy projects should provide students and faculty with the opportunity to research the technologies and benefits of local, renewable energy, and A percentage of electricity on all campuses be purchased through a wind energy program to support the development of Minnesota's wind resources and to reduce our purchase of non-renewable derived electricity, and

By January 1, 2014, at least twenty-five percent of the energy used at the University of Minnesota be derived from a local, renewable source or purchased from a wind energy program or other renewable energy sources."

"The Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) respectfully disagrees with the resolution concerning renewable energy adopted by the Senate Committee on Social Concerns.

"SCFP believes that the resolution has serious errors that undermine its purpose. We are concerned that current renewable energy projects may not be truly renewable at present, in that their consumption of fossil fuel used in production and transportation may actually exceed the energy delivered. SCFP also believes the resolution is ill-advised because it sets a date for University use of renewable energy at a stipulated level when the technology does not yet exist or is not economical to use."

The Social Concerns Committee also reported another resolution with a number of clauses, concluding: "Be It Resolved, that the University of Minnesota Senate Social Concerns Committee calls on the Board of Regents to enter into no further bond underwriting agreements with Lehman Brothers, Inc. until Lehman Brothers ends its financial backing of the private prison industry."

The Committee on Finance and Planning took issue with this resolution as well. "SCFP decided to take a position on this issue because it is directly tied to University finances. In particular, disrupting the University's relationship with its bond underwriter and starting a new relationship could cost the University a significant amount of money. Taking such action, in the Committee's opinion, was not justified by the case presented.

"To be specific, the resolution makes a compelling case that there are problems related to the level of incarceration in the U.S. It also makes a compelling case that there have been some

questionable practices in the private prison industry. While we accept that Lehman Brothers has profited from its work for the private prison industry, we do not see evidence of any particular egregious act committed by the firm. . . ."

FCC chair Marvin Marshak reported an FCC statement, "A Faculty View of the Role of the University of Minnesota in the State's Higher Education System" to the Citizens League, "a non-profit, non-partisan organization, [that] was asked by Governor Pawlenty in the spring of 2004 to prepare a report on higher education in Minnesota.

SCC brought back for another vote the constitutional amendments reorganizing the Senate. They failed to receive a sufficient number of votes to be adopted (but were approved in the electronic vote following the meeting, so were submitted to the Board of Regents for approval).

FCC chair Marshak said in his report that "President Bruininks has asked Provost Tom Sullivan to lead a University strategic-planning process to address the issues mentioned, as well as others. University governance representatives are actively involved in the process, and he issued an assurance from personal observation that Provost Sullivan is doing an outstanding job in leading this effort and that there is no preconceived outcome. He is much more worried about a handicap that past experience suggests, namely that the University of Minnesota is not particularly adroit at implementing strategic plans. . . . What is the role of the University Senate in all this planning? While consultation is a key process, he recommended that all senators read Section 7B of the Regents' Bylaws, which is appended to this report. The Regents delegate the responsibility for administering the University in parallel to the "President, the University Senate and the several faculties." Thus the Senate collectively and each person as individual members have a responsibility to assure the University's future. . . ."

The Grievance Advisory Committee recommended wholesale replacement of the grievance policy and process with a new conflict-resolution process. "Extensive interviews were conducted to clarify who was doing what and any problems with the current policy. General feedback from the interviews was that the present policy presents an adversarial model that creates a power imbalance and can lead to extreme costs in terms of dollars and attitude.

"As a result of these discussions, the GAC is recommending changes to the Grievance Policy. The main change is a terminology shift from grievance to conflict resolution, along with the inclusion of more informal procedures to deal with problems earlier on campus. The formal procedures will be maintained. Another change is the Grievance Office being named to the University Conflict Resolution Center. The changes to the Grievance Policy have also precipitated similar working changes in the Regents Policy entitled Grievance Process.

"These policies changes have been presented to the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Student Senate Consultative Committee, and the Regents for feedback."

The Senate approved.

#### December 2, 2004 University and Faculty Senates (2)

The Committee on Educational Policy reported that it "opposes any tuition policy change that includes differential undergraduate tuition rates for different programs or colleges on a given campus. The Committee endorses the current Board of Regents' policy."

The Senate had a discussion of strategic planning. "E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, also thanked Professors Carol Chomsky, Mary Jo Kane, and Marvin Marshak for moderating the three town hall meetings that have been held. Almost three dozen other presentations have also been held on this subject. Today's discussion will focus on the process and procedures, as well as outlining the basic principles on the web site, but which are constantly changing because of the dynamic process being used during this effort. He then presented the following information to the University Senate. . . ." One goal included "To be one of the top 3 public research universities in the world." The Senate had a lengthy discussion.

In the president's report: "The University will be playing football after 2011 and is looking after its own interests. The two professional teams will probably no longer be playing at the Metrodome after 2011, and he does not want the University to get caught without options available. The University has proposed raising most of the funding for a new stadium from private funds, with a modest state investment of \$7 million per year in bonds to pay off the project. . . ."

#### March 3, 2005 University and Faculty Senates (3)

The Senate approved a resolution from the Student Senate with "whereas" clauses and these concluding clauses: "RESOLVED That the Student Senate strongly encourages the faculty of the University of Minnesota to release student release sections. RESOLVED That deans, department heads, and department chairs should make the release of student release questions by their faculty a priority."

The Committee on Educational Policy reported interpretations of policy. About this language: "Academic dishonesty in any portion of the academic work for a course shall be grounds for awarding a grade of F or N for the entire course" the Committee concluded that "this provision allows instructors to award an F or an N to a student when academic dishonesty is discovered; it does not require an instructor to do so"; courses that carry no credit do not count in term or cumulative GPAs, and apropos of the policy on excused absences, "this policy does not extend to voting in local, state, or national elections."

The Faculty Senate approved a resolution from the Committee on Faculty Affairs that "again requests that the central administration immediately eliminate the waiting period for all faculty and P&A staff who would otherwise qualify for the Faculty Retirement Plan."

#### April 7, 2005 University and Faculty Senates (4)

After negotiation with FCC about certain provisions, the administration approved the Academic Unit Governance policy on March 22, 2005.

FCC chair Marshak reported that "pursuant to that grant of authority [to act on behalf of the Faculty Senate between meetings], the Faculty Consultative Committee voted that the University of Minnesota is in favor of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics academic integrity document."

Following lengthy debate, the University Senate approved a resolution from the Student Senate that concluded, after a long set of "whereas" clauses, " BE IT RESOLVED, the University Senate urges the University Administration to be straightforward, clear, compassionate, flexible, cautious and transparent when deciding the future of programs and to include public discussions of all parties involved in that decision including student government representation."

On recommendation of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Faculty Senate approved this motion: " The Faculty Senate requests the administration to establish the practice of conducting an exit interview with every tenured and tenure-track faculty member who leaves the University." The reason was that the paper surveys sent to departing faculty members were largely ignored, but the Committee maintained that the information would be valuable.

The Faculty Senate approved another resolution from the Committee on Faculty Affairs: " Be it resolved --that the Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the children/dependents of all University employees having accrued 5 or more years of uninterrupted University service be granted a 50% tuition reduction upon being regularly admitted to an approved undergraduate program leading to a bachelor's degree. . . ." The Committee commented: "This resolution was approved by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) and the Faculty Consultative Committee in 2000 and reported to the Faculty Senate for information at its April 20, 2000 meeting. No tuition benefit has been offered for dependents of University employees.

"The case for the benefit, if anything, is stronger today than it was five years ago. The competitive pressures on the University have increased and SCFA is aware of cases where departments have been unable to retain outstanding faculty members because the University did not offer a tuition benefit."

Both the University and Faculty Senates approved a new Rule for committee meetings: "A committee chair may exercise discretion to close all or part of a meeting to administrative ex officio members of the committee in order to permit candid discussion of matters that include, but are not limited to, personnel or administrative organization matters. The reason for the closed session should be included on the agenda for the meeting."

The University Senate had a lengthy discussion with Provost Sullivan about strategic positioning.

#### April 28, 2005 University and Faculty Senates (5)

The University Senate passed an 11-point resolution concerning strategic positioning that began:

"1. The University Senate strongly endorses the goal of systematically reviewing and improving the University and the necessity for strategic planning. The increasingly rapid change in the structure of knowledge and the pressures on the University arising from decreasing state funding and resulting increases in tuition all mandate an ongoing effort to ensure congruence between the University's structure and its goals.

"2. The University Senate calls on the President to increase University community participation as the strategic planning process continues. Whatever recommendations the



President and the Regents endorse, the implementation will only be effective with faculty leadership and participation as well as active involvement by staff members and students. Because of the importance of faculty in implementing academic change, a majority of each task force should be faculty members, and the task forces should be chaired or co-chaired by a faculty member."

The president stepped aside from the podium in order to listen to the discussion. The discussion went on at great length; the vote in favor was 120-3 with 6 abstentions.

The Student Senate reported for information to the University Senate a resolution it had adopted, which read in part: "Whereas The University of Wisconsin has been required to involve students in pertinent policy discussions by Wisconsin Statute 36.09(5), which states: 'The students...shall be active participants in the immediate governance of and policy development for [the University of Wisconsin]. As such students shall have primary responsibility for the formulation and review of policies concerning students life, services and interests.'; and . . . Resolved That the Student Senate recommends to the President of the University of Minnesota and the University of Minnesota Board of Regents that the University of Minnesota Board of Regents adopts a Regents Policy codifying the spirit of Wisconsin Statute 36.09(5)."

The University Senate adopted a resolution from the Senate Library Committee, following an explanation:

"We endorse the following urgent resolutions:

Library collections are fundamental to the University's stated strategic goal of excellence. **Increase the budget for collections and resources** in order to reverse the dramatic slip in rankings and to restore lost ground.

Collections require access. **Expand computer capabilities** to provide access to resources, including electronic publications, which are an increasingly critical component of learning and research.

Knowledgeable, professional librarians ensure that the libraries' resources have the greatest possible impact in the academic programs. **Provide equitable compensation** to recruit and retain librarians."

The Social Concerns Committee introduced a resolution on academic freedom that the Senate approved. It was "extremely concerned about recent well-publicized events concerning academic freedom that threaten faculty, including academic administration, with loss of position or tenure for making unpopular comments about sensitive issues of national importance. The role of the University is to provide a venue for the exchange and transmission of ideas. . . . Recent events, such as public opinion makers calling for legislation to limit academic freedom, or the dismissal of faculty or academic administrators for making unpopular observations or defending those who make such observations, may illustrate a weakening of the trust between faculty and institutions of higher learning. This seems to be particularly true in the politically delicate national atmosphere of post-9/11. . . . The Social Concerns Committee therefore urges the University Senate and the President on behalf of the Regents to formally reaffirm the support of academic freedom and to condemn the silencing of diverse opinions and views on nationally sensitive issues."

The Student Senate recommended a new set of student-release questions for the student ratings form; the University Senate, after debate, referred them to the Committee on Educational Policy for final approval.

#### September 29, 2005 University Senate (1)

The response of the administration to several items adopted at earlier meetings was reported:  
Resolution on Strategic Planning: "I appreciate your input and participation in the strategic planning process and the depth and breadth of your thoughtful resolution. I have taken into account the ideas contained in the resolution as the implementation phase is being planned, and will continue to work in partnership with both faculty and student leaders on strategic positioning implementation."

Resolution on Library Funding: " I wholeheartedly agree that the library is a critical resource for the University and we are moving forward to increase our investment in this area. Specifically, we allocated significant new money for FY06 and we intend to allocate more in FY07. . . ." For

Resolution on Academic Freedom: "I continue to support the principles of the academic freedom resolution, and in fact appointed an academic freedom task force that produced a very strong paper in support of academic freedom. . . ."

Resolution on the Faculty Waiting Period: "The president charged the vice president for human resources over the summer to outline the costs involved in different options for eliminating or reducing the time associated with the waiting period for the FRP. . . ."

Resolution on Exit Interviews for Faculty: "I support the principle of this resolution, and by way of this memorandum am charging Vice President Carol Carrier to partner with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs to develop the most appropriate implementation strategy or strategies.

Resolution on Tuition Benefits: "I support competitive benefits for University employees, but first have a responsibility to examine the financial implications of implementation. By way of this memorandum, I am charging Vice Presidents Carol Carrier, Richard Pfitzenreuter, and others they deem necessary to develop a cost-benefit analysis of the proposal for my review."

The Committee on Information Technologies reported a resolution for information: "We commend the colleges for the careful way in which they have handled technology fees, including the regular determination of priorities, setting of fees, and appropriate expenditures. We note the careful inclusion of students in planning and decision-making and urge that feedback about the outcome of technology fees be assured."

The Finance and Planning Committee reported for information a resolution: It "is pleased with the Phase Two plans for the financial system replacement project, but is extremely concerned that a lack of unit-level participants threatens to undermine the quality of a system that is key to our research mission and operations. . . . Accordingly, we strongly urge the President to act quickly to encourage greater unit-level participation, through whatever appropriate means necessary."

#### September 29, 2005 Faculty Senate

On recommendation of the Committee on Educational Policy, the Faculty Senate approved a change in the grading policy: "The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) has been informed by the Registrar that students who have graduated wish to repeat a course that they took prior to graduation and have the second grade count in their degree GPA. It has been long-standing policy that once a student graduates, his or her transcript is 'frozen' for that degree or program and no further changes will be made." The policy change affirmed the freeze.

On recommendation of the Committee on Educational Policy, the Faculty Senate approved another change in the grading policy; this language was deleted "[In any class, instructors have the right to set the level of performance required for an S at any level. They may not set it at less than a C-.]" This language was added: "The performance required for an S shall be the same as that required for a C-." The Committee reported learning that "a student complained because he enrolled for a course and would have received a C+ if he had enrolled for the course on the A-F grading system; since he had enrolled on the S-N system, however, and the instructor set the level for an S equal to a B-, the student received an N."

"The Senate Research Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the revised Regents' policy governing secrecy in research [which was included in the docket]. There are no significant policy changes; this is largely a matter of re-formatting to align the policy with other regental policies. . . . The procedures that were part of the former policy, however, have been changed in the proposed administrative policy. In the current policy, requests for exceptions from the policy barring secrecy in research were first sent to the Senate Research Committee, then to the University Senate for a final recommendation to the President. The President made the decision whether or not to grant an exception. In the administrative policy, requests for exceptions go to the subcommittee on openness in research (which has been established by the Senate Research Committee). The subcommittee makes a recommendation to the Senate Research Committee, which in turn makes a recommendation to the Vice President for Research. The Vice President makes the final decision." The Faculty Senate approved.

Under New Business, the Committee on Educational Policy recommended a new policy on academic probation, noting that "the existing policy allows a student to seesaw between being on probation one semester and off the next semester repeatedly during their academic career. The change being proposed would force a student who is on probation to either get off for both their semester and cumulative GPAs or would remove them from the University." The Faculty Senate approved.

#### December 1, 2005 University Senate (2)

The Committee on Educational Policy reported for information that it "has reviewed material provided by Vice Provost Swan with regard to courses with a high percentage of A's. There are clearly some situations where a high proportion of A's would not be unusual, e.g., smaller classes with a large proportion of high ability students. While there are no simple numeric limits that the Committee would want to impose, a high proportion of A's in large classes for which there is little reason to expect that enrollment would be selective does raise questions about the appropriateness of the use of the A-F grading scale. . . . The Committee asks the Provost's Office

to share this statement with colleges, to have follow up conversations with colleges on specific courses, and to report back to SCEP by the end of the spring semester."

The Committee on Finance and Planning reported for information a statement it had adopted: "If the University aspires to be among the top three public research universities in the world, the aspiration must include salaries commensurate with that aspiration." The comment noted that "The Provost asked the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning to identify, in the context of the University's strategic positioning process, an appropriate goal for faculty salaries. . . . At present (fall, 2004) the University ranks 5<sup>th</sup> among Big Ten public institutions in average salary for faculty at all ranks. Among the top 20 public institutions by academic rank (AAU), it ranks 17<sup>th</sup>. The AAU has 59 members, which include the top 30 research universities (public and private); in that group, Minnesota ranks 39<sup>th</sup>. . . ."

The Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators reported for information (and also later in the docket for action) a resolution. Following statements about strategic position, "CAPA recommends the University empower the Office of Human Resources to be proactive in implementing and monitoring extraordinary measures to ensure employees remain at the University." The University Senate approved.

#### December 1, 2005 Faculty Senate

The Committees on Educational Policy and Faculty Affairs presented for information and disagreed about a proposed policy on the evaluation of teaching; the disagreement was over the disposition of written comments from students. They posed two alternatives: "ALTERNATIVE ONE: --All written comments on student evaluation forms shall be provided only to the instructor, after data processing by the designated unit on the campus. . . . ALTERNATIVE TWO: --The disposition of written comments on student evaluation forms shall be decided by each college or campus." On a straw vote, after long debate, the Faculty Senate favored alternative one.

The Faculty Senate approved a new policy: "Every instructor at the University of Minnesota has the authority to restrict or prohibit the use of personal electronic devices in his or her classroom, lab, or any other instructional setting. It is expected that faculty will make reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities in working with the Office for Disabilities Services." Statements were presented to the Faculty Senate: Graduate students supported it; the Student Senate opposed it on a divided vote.

#### March 2, 2006 University Senate (3)

"The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) voted to request that the administration change the information in class lists provided to instructors. The grading system for which a student has enrolled in a course will no longer be included. The instructor will give all students a letter (A-F) grade; for those students who are enrolled S/N, the computer will automatically convert the letter grade to an S (if it is C- or above) or N (if D+ or below). . . . The Committee does not believe this requires a change in the grading policy."

### March 2, 2006 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Educational Policy presented for further discussion a revised policy on the student evaluation of instruction. "The draft Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction presented today includes the language from alternative one, presented at the December 1, 2005, Faculty Senate meeting. This alternative states that the disposition of written comments shall be decided by each college or campus."

University Senate: The president presented his State of the University address.

### April 6, 2006 University Senate (4)

The Disabilities Issues Committee presented a statement for information.

"The members of the Disabilities Issues Committee along with representatives from the Disabled Student Cultural Center are concerned that the views regarding people with disabilities as expressed by Peter Singer, a guest lecturer to the University campus on March 23, 2006, create a hostile environment for people with disabilities. . . . While we believe his views to be exclusionary, bigoted, and threatening, we welcome the opportunity to engage in a discussion about the vital role of all members of our community.

"Our larger concern is that the University of Minnesota does not have a Disability Studies Program that directly supports faculty research in this field or provides students with an opportunity for learning about this important subject. . . ."

FCC chair Jean Bauer reported that on "March 27 a special FCC meeting was called to discuss the UMore Park stadium proposal with President Bruininks, Vice President Richard Pfitzenreuter, and Director Charles Muscoplat. There was unanimous consent from members present for the following statement to represent the sense of the meeting:

The FCC welcomes the new proposal for exchanging part of UMore Park in return for support for the football stadium. . . ."

The Social Concerns Committee introduced a two-part resolution that the University Senate approved:

"The Social Concerns Committee requests that the Board of Regents replace their policy outlining the investment responsibilities of the Social Concerns Committee in favor of one delegating these responsibilities to the President of the University.

"The University Senate requests that the President prepare an administrative policy documenting how the social impacts of the University's investment responsibilities will be addressed. . . ."

The Social Concerns Committee also recommended "that the President establish, as an administrative policy, a written Code of Conduct for University vendors, incorporating priorities identified in the University's existing Trademark Licensee Code of Conduct and existing relevant Board of Regents policies. This Code of Conduct should be drafted in consultation with the Social Concerns Committee and other appropriate Senate committees." It reported that "Although the University of Minnesota has adopted a code of conduct for licensees of University goods and apparel that identifies ethical priorities . . . it does not currently have a parallel code of

conduct for University vendors. Specifying University values in such a policy would allow the University to influence vendors and act as a positive force for change in their corporate ethics." The University Senate approved the recommendation.

The president reported on legislative and other matters; his closing remarks were these:

"Additionally, the University has a supplemental request to cover Rochester expansion. . .

"There are two other issues before the legislature. The first is a \$300 million, 10-year biomedical sciences plan which includes upgrading laboratories and facilities, and building a few new buildings. . . .

"Lastly is the University's stadium proposal. . . . He noted that the current proposal includes providing UMore Park land to the state in return for increased funding. He stated that UMore Park is environmentally sensitive land that was always intended to be dedicated to public use. . . .

"He stated that the last stadium amendment in the House Ways and Means Committee was meant to preclude the University from doing any embryonic stem cell research that was not from federally-approved lines. This amendment was defeated, but the University must constantly guard and defend ideals of academic freedom."

#### April 6, 2006 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate did not approve a constitutional amendment (because of an insufficient number present) that provided (underlined language is new):

c. For the purposes of this constitution, the bylaws, and the rules, faculty shall include professors, associate professors, assistant professors, research associates, instructors, and research fellows on full-time appointments holding a regular appointment as defined in the Regents' Policy "Faculty Tenure." Faculty shall also include clinical faculty on full-time term appointments as defined in the Regents' Policy "Faculty Tenure." (The amendment was subsequently approved in an electronic vote.)

The Faculty Senate also approved (by subsequent electronic vote) a bylaws amendment: "\_c. No unit may be allocated more than 20 percent of the total Faculty Senate seats available."

#### May 4, 2006 University Senate (5)

The Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators "recommends that the vacation policy for P&A employees with 12-month appointments at 67% time or greater be changed to the following:

- Employees will accrue 24 days a year at the rate of 2 days/month.
- The maximum accrual will be 48 days. . . ."

#### May 4, 2006 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Educational Policy brought back the proposed new policy on student evaluation of instruction; the Faculty Senate approved it.

"Professor Richard McCormick, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that this item has been presented to the Faculty Senate three times this year for information and discussion. The policy itself reconciles two separate policies on evaluation from the early 1990s.

"In December, the discussion focused on the distribution of written comments and the majority of senators felt that the decision should be made at the unit or department level, as is currently the practice. Therefore no change was made to the policy. . . ."

September 28, 2006 University Senate (1)

It was reported, apropos of the waiting period:

"The administration fully endorses the resolution for members of the University's faculty. Enforcing a faculty retirement waiting period for incoming faculty clearly has had, and would continue to have, a negative effect on our ability to recruit top-notch faculty. It also provides an unequal retirement benefit among faculty at the University of Minnesota. The administration will seek the required approval from the Board of Regents.

"With respect to waiving the waiting period for professional and administrative (P&A) employees at the University, The President has asked Carol Carrier, Vice President for Human Resources, to conduct a market analysis to compare this benefit with similar classes of employees at other universities. . . ."

It was also reported, apropos of the tuition benefit for dependents of employees: "At this point in time, the arguments in favor of this particular benefit are not persuasive as it would impact slightly less than 2% of the University's employee population in any given year, representing a markedly unequal benefit for a very small percentage of employees. . . ."

FCC chair Carol Chomsky reported that FCC had approved changes in the outside consulting policy on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

The University Senate approved 177-0 a change in the bylaws of SCC, with this new language: "Notwithstanding any other provisions in these Bylaws or the Senate Rules, the Senate Consultative Committee shall have final authority over the docket of the University Senate meetings." And with this explanation: "Inasmuch as SCC is the executive committee of the University Senate, responsible for the conduct and flow of business to the University Senate, it is logical that SCC should have responsibility for the docket. If items can appear on the docket without review and approval by SCC, there is risk that items will appear prematurely, that politically or otherwise sensitive items will appear inappropriately, or that items that are not germane to the business of the Senate will be on the docket."

The Committee on Finance and Planning recommended approval of a motion dealing with the Request for Proposals for a new food and beverage vendor: "Based on what we have learned, the Committee recommends that the University place attention in the RFP and contract process on the desire of many in the University community for healthier foods. We note that this concern may be implied within the goals to improve performance and operational efficiencies, and while we noted that University wellness/nutrition representatives are identified as stakeholders, we recommend more explicit acknowledgment of this concern in the process. . . ."

### September 28, 2006 Faculty Senate

Because of a lack of sufficient number of senators present, the Faculty Senate did not approve a bylaw amendment concerning committee membership: "An individual serving as a voting member of a Faculty Senate committee who is appointed to a position which would bar them from service as a voting member on the committee shall resign from that committee. If the individual is appointed only to an interim or acting position, the chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee may, with the consent of the Faculty Consultative Committee, waive the requirement that the individual resign from the committee." (It was approved at the next meeting.)

Also because of a lack of sufficient number of senators present, the Faculty Senate did not approve a bylaw amendment: "Notwithstanding any other provisions in these Bylaws or the Senate Rules, the Faculty Consultative Committee shall have final authority over the docket of the Faculty Senate meetings." The amendment was not subsequently put up for electronic vote or presented at a later meeting [as of December, 2012].

### November 30, 2006 University Senate (2)

The University Senate approved a bylaw change providing that student terms on Senate committees would be two years, not one.

The University Senate affirmed the practice of granting to SCC the authority to approve changes to policies governing athletics and reporting them to the Senate for information; the Senate could change an SCC decision.

The Committee on Faculty Affairs proposed a statement on tuition benefits that began: "The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs is disappointed and puzzled by the President's reaction to the recommendation from the Faculty Senate that the University offer a tuition benefit to the dependents of University employees." It listed reasons for supporting the idea and concluded: "As we did last year, we again strongly recommend: -- that the children/dependents of all full-time University employees (as defined by the University) having accrued 5 or more years of uninterrupted University service be granted a 50% tuition reduction upon being regularly admitted to an approved undergraduate program leading to a bachelor's degree; . . ." The Senate approved.

The president spoke with the Senate about the Rochester campus and UMore Park, among other things. He said that Rochester would not be a coordinate campus, like Morris, for governance purposes, at least not at that point.

### November 30, 2006 Faculty Senate

The meeting was devoted primarily to a long discussion of proposed changes to the tenure policy:

**"7.11 General Criteria.** What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each candidate has



established and is likely to continue to add to a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both. . . .

**"9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor.** The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, . . .

**"7.12 Departmental Statement (fn 1).** Each department or equivalent academic unit must have a document that specifies the indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the threshold criteria of subsection 7.11 ("General Criteria" for the awarding of indefinite tenure). . . ."

April 5, 2007 University Senate (3)

It was reported, in response to the statement about the food and beverage RFP: The "director of the University Wellness Program, is now a member of the 2008 Food & Beverage Executive Steering Committee. In addition, a Wellness and Nutrition Work Group has been formed to provide advice regarding the Food & Beverage RFP. . . ."

It was also reported, apropos of tuition benefits, the President "asked to meet with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) on February 27, 2007. He and the Committee had a very good discussion and the committee presented a number of persuasive arguments in support of the tuition benefit proposal. . . . The President has since met with Carol Carrier, Vice President for Human Resources, and asked her to explore the costs and benefits of alternative proposals that could in part support SCFA's recommendation, and to consult with relevant employee groups in looking at these various alternatives. He expects to make a final decision in this matter in early fall, 2007."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported that it had endorsed two new Board of Regents' policies, one on Employee Compensation and Recognition and one on Employee Performance Evaluation and Development.

FCC reported for information a statement it had prepared in response to a request from the Faculty Senate at its previous meeting; the statement began: "The Faculty Senate expresses its deep concern about the Governor's recent decision not to request funding for general faculty and staff compensation or for enhancing undergraduate and graduate education in the FY 2008 and FY2009 budgets. At stake is the quality of Minnesota's only research university, which educates tomorrow's leaders, attracts hundreds of millions of dollars of research funding, engages in research that spawns important innovations both for the state's economy and the improvement of human lives, and provides a vast array of service within the state. The Governor's budget choices are short-sighted. . . ."

"This year, the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) requested the Social Concerns Committee take up the issue of whether the University should divest its Sudanese holdings due to the stormy political climate in Sudan. Several other institutions such as Yale, Harvard, Dartmouth, Stanford, University of California, Brown, Amherst, and Samford, to name a few, have already taken action. The Social Concerns Committee spent four months hearing

testimony, collecting information and carefully weighing the issues around divestment from Sudan and came to the conclusion that it was the right position to take." The University Senate approved the resolution that had been presented.

#### April 5, 2007 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Educational Policy recommended a change in the grading policy, providing that "for undergraduate students, a C- grade shall be equal to an S grade." It explained: "Since the change [to stipulating an S = a C-] was approved, SCEP has heard from many sources that it is inappropriate to require that an S be granted for C- work to post-baccalaureate students. The language proposed makes it clear that the policy applies to undergraduate students. . . ."

With no debate, the Faculty Senate approved a series of amendments to the tenure policy relating to the Judicial Committee and other sections.

The University Senate reconvened and the president gave his State of the University address.

#### May 3, 2007 University Senate (4)

The Social Concerns Committee introduced a resolution that the University Senate approved without debate:

"The University Senate requests that the University of Minnesota join with other universities and human rights organizations to respond to the concerns of foreign-born students, faculty, and visiting scholars, regarding the Military Commissions Act.

"Congress is now considering legislation to revise the Military Commissions Act and to restore the due process right of habeas corpus to detainees being held by the United States, and to make it clear that the federal government must comply with the Geneva Conventions. . . ."

The Senate Library Committee "has reviewed the CIC Provosts' statement on Publishing Agreements and supports the principles it incorporates. The statement encourages authors to be thoughtful in selecting publishing outlets, recognizing potential restrictions that may fetter access to scholarship. The model publishing addendum and information about publisher policies will be made available by the University Libraries to assist authors in those choices. The Committee recommends that the Senate support the CIC Provosts' statement." The Senate did so.

The Committee on Educational Policy introduced for discussion to the Twin Cities Delegation of the University Senate proposed student learning outcomes that would be proposed for action to the Faculty Senate: "At the time of receiving a bachelor's degree, students:

- Can identify, define, and solve problems
- Can locate and critically evaluate information
- Have mastered a body of knowledge and a mode of inquiry
- Understands diverse philosophies and cultures within and across societies
- Can communicate effectively
- Understand the role of creativity, innovation, discovery, and expression across disciplines
- Have acquired skills for effective citizenship and life-long learning."

The Committee on Educational Policy introduced for action at the Twin Cities Delegation a set of student development outcomes:

*"Responsibility and Accountability* by making appropriate decisions on behavior and accepting the consequences of their actions.

*Independence and Interdependence* by knowing when to collaborate or seek help and when to act on their own

*Goal Orientation* by managing their energy and attention to achieve specific outcomes

*Self-Awareness* by knowing their personal strengths and talents and acknowledging their shortcomings

*Resilience* by recovering and learning from setbacks or disappointments

*Appreciation of Differences* by recognizing the value of interacting with individuals with backgrounds and/or perspectives different from their own

*Tolerance of Ambiguity* by demonstrating the ability to perform in complicated environments where clear cut answers or standard operating procedures are absent."

The Delegation approved the outcomes.

The University Senate approved under New Business a resolution: "The University Senate supports the passage and enactment of the Minnesota Dream Act." The comment: "The Minnesota Dream Act would help open the doors to higher education for more resident students of color. Under the current system, undocumented Minnesota students are hindered from enrolling in post-secondary institutions because they must pay out-of-state tuition, even though many of these young people have lived nearly their entire lives in the state. . . ."

#### May 3, 2007 Faculty Senate

FCC recommended and the Faculty Senate approved (by subsequent electronic vote) a constitutional amendment to make "contract/term faculty with three years of service at the University eligible for Faculty Senate election and service. The amendment also modifies the definition of eligible P&A staff to conform with current understandings and practice. Academic professionals (but not professional administrators) who have faculty-like responsibilities in teaching or research (or both) will be eligible for they are in a continuous appointment track (this is a small category) or if they have completed five years of service at the University."

FCC proposed and the Faculty Senate approved a change in the membership language for FCC, providing that only tenured and tenure-track faculty members would be eligible for membership. "While the Senate is representative of all faculty and faculty-like individuals, the FCC is the Executive Committee for the Senate and appropriately represents the ultimate responsibility of the tenured and tenure-track faculty for governance as established in the 2005 Academic Unit Governance policy."

Following long debate, the Twin Cities Delegation of the Faculty Senate adopted for the Twin Cities campus the student learning outcomes discussed at the earlier meeting of the University Senate.

The Faculty Senate adopted under New Business a statement on child care that included this language: "In December, 2003, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs received from one of

its subcommittees a report on child care at the University (especially the Twin Cities). The gist of that report was that the University should increase the availability of on-campus child care for faculty, staff, and students. . . . Professor Judith Martin, then chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, transmitted the subcommittee report to the President in February, 2004, and urged that the University 'identify funding to help alleviate the shortage of high-quality child care for University faculty, staff, and students. . . . The problem is not a lack of child-care facilities. The problem is a lack of high-quality child-care facilities. We do not believe the University has made any progress on increasing child-care facilities on the Twin Cities campus. We believe that it should do so very soon if it is to achieve the goal of becoming a top-three public research university."

#### October 4, 2007 University Senate (1)

It was reported: "While it is unfortunate that the Minnesota Dream Act was dropped from the higher education bill this spring, the University continues to identify and promote other opportunities to help open the doors to higher education for all eligible Minnesota high school students."

It was also reported, apropos of child care: "I have asked Vice President for Human Resources Carol Carrier in consultation with faculty and staff leaders to review all employee benefits as a whole to ensure that the University is as responsive as possible to the changing needs of its employees."

The Student Academic Integrity Committee reported a "recommendation to the Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity (OSCAI) on a structure for communication with instructors and program administrators about instances of academic dishonesty by Twin Cities undergraduates. It is hoped that by taking advantage of the existing structure of the academic programs it will be possible to remove some of the barriers to instructor reporting that may exist with the current method. . . ."

The Committee on Information Technologies reported a resolution; it "requests that the final proposal for any new student technology fees structure be brought before SCIT prior to going forward for Board of Regents approval. The committee wishes to applaud the colleges for their existing work to create procedures and feedback mechanisms for the current college-based student technology fees structures. They have carefully worked to create cost-neutral plans with clear involvement of students both in the setting of fees and in reporting results and gathering feedback for future planning. However, the current system has become unnecessarily complicated and dysfunctional. . . ."

#### October 4, 2007 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate approved a policy on course numbering.

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee presented for information and discussion a 23-page document: "Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty."

FCC chair Gary Balas presented for discussion a draft Board of Regents' policy on copyright. There was considerable discussion.

#### November 29, 2007 University Senate (2)

The Committee on Faculty Affairs recommended a resolution calling for increased support for University retirees. The University Senate approved it.

The University Senate approved a change in the appointment process for members of the Advisory Committee on Athletics; it recommended "that the process for appointing the members of the Advisory Committee on Athletics (ACA) be placed in the hands of the Committee on Committees. SCC was given responsibility for appointing the members in the wake of the most recent Twin Cities campus basketball scandal, when it was thought important that the executive committee of the University Senate keep a watchful eye on the relationship between the athletic program and the academic programs in which student-athletes are enrolled. While SCC continues to believe that ACA plays an important role on the campus, SCC finds it is not the best group to make such appointments. . . ."

#### November 29, 2007 Faculty Senate

"The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) is recommending that the process for appointing the members of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA) be placed in the hands of the Committee on Committees. FCC was given responsibility for appointing the members in the wake of the most recent Twin Cities campus basketball scandal, when it was thought important that the executive committee of the Faculty Senate keep a watchful eye on the relationship between the athletic program and the academic programs in which student-athletes are enrolled. While FCC continues to believe that FAOCIA plays an important role on the campus, FCC finds it is not the best group to make such appointments." The Faculty Senate approved.

The Committees on Educational Policy and on Faculty Affairs, with FCC endorsement, brought a revised policy on evaluation of teaching, including new questions. They "appointed an ad hoc committee to analyze the current SET form in light of research on teaching and principles of good practice on evaluation. . . . Over a five month period, the committee a) examined the structure of well-established rating forms, b) constructed criteria to guide the development of a new form, c) identified core items appropriate for diverse courses, d) deliberated on an appropriate measurement scale. . . . The research-based rating form comprises a wide set of constructs known to influence effective teaching and learning. . . . The term 'rating' is substituted for 'evaluation' at appropriate places in the revised policy. All other elements of the policy approved earlier by the Faculty Senate remain intact." The Faculty Senate approved.

The Faculty Senate discussed a revised Regents' copyright policy.

Professor Leslie Schiff reported for the Council on Liberal Education (CLE) a proposed revision of the liberal-education requirements for discussion. "CLE, which is composed of 21

individuals, was able to unanimously agree on only one point – that they support the value of liberal education for the University. During the analysis, CLE found no compelling reason to conclude that the current design of the requirements is flawed or out of line with what other institutions are doing. . . ."

March 6, 2008 University Senate (3)

(no noteworthy business)

The president gave the State of the University address.

April 3, 2008 University Senate (4)

FCC reported for information: "The Faculty Consultative Committee suggests to the Provost that the standing Copyright Subcommittee it approved on March 6, 2008, be incorporated into the administrative policy implementing the Regents' policy Copyright. FCC believes the subcommittee could serve as a mechanism to help resolve copyright disputes that may arise."

FCC reported a second statement for information: "The Faculty Consultative Committee recommends to the President and senior vice presidents that a representative group of the Twin Cities deans (and coordinate campus chancellors, as appropriate) either (1) be involved directly and integrally in the current mechanisms used to determine rates for the cost pools, or (2) be constituted as a separate body to review recommendations on cost pool charges and provide advice to the President on them. In either case, the review and consultation should take place before any decisions have been made about cost-pool charges or rates."

The Social Concerns Committee introduced a resolution; following "whereas" clauses: "RESOLVED that the University of Minnesota require in all food service contracts it signs into with food service providers that all coffee sold on its campuses (Twin Cities, Morris, Duluth and Crookston) must be 100% Fair Trade Certified including all coffee retail locations, catering operations, and residence halls; and be it further RESOLVED that whenever possible, this coffee be Organic, Shade Grown, and purchased from a local roaster." The Senate approved.

The Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee recommended a resolution for action: "The University Senate requests that the administration provide a mechanism to remedy the income differences between similarly-situated heterosexual and gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees caused by state and federal tax codes as they affect the provision of medical and dental benefits for spouses/partners." The Senate approved.

"President Bruininks talked about academic freedom and its fundamental value to the University. This body has spoken over the decades in support of academic freedom. He has been asked questions about controversies in the papers, the most recent of which involved research on biofuels production and its impact on the use of land.

"Last year, the Theatre Department voted to perform a Dario Fo play, "The Pope and the Witch," which triggered a flood of letters to campus. The year before, 27 House members signed onto a

bill to essentially take away every dollar of state support to the University if it chose to conduct stem-cell research. He wants to assure the University community that the Regents do not waiver in supporting the rights of University faculty. . . ."

#### April 3, 2008 Faculty Senate

The Finance and Planning Committee introduced a four-part resolution that the Senate adopted:

1. The Vice President for Research should be an integral part of the process by which decisions are made to allocate resources to all aspects of the University mission.
2. There be changes to the way that cost-pool rates are set and reviewed. Specifically, (a) establish college revenue budgets before setting cost-pool unit expense budgets and link them, so that if college revenues decline, cost-pool charges also decline, . . .
3. A system of incentives be established for cost management and colleges guaranteed that they will retain for a period of time the savings they generate. . . .
4. A faculty committee be created to formulate basic rules that simplify interdisciplinary research. . . .

The Research Committee, Information Technologies Committee, and Faculty Affairs Committee introduced a resolution that the Senate adopted: "The University of Minnesota should adopt an integrated software system that serves as a comprehensive repository of University faculty and staff activity and expertise. This system should include the features of an expertise database while supporting annual activity reporting, the promotion and tenure process, and other relevant reporting functions. . . ."

The Research Committee proposed and the Senate adopted a companion resolution: "Any new expertise database should include the capacity to be mined for information for the purposes of creating grant management documents across the University."

The Twin Cities Delegation of the Faculty Senate approved new liberal-education requirements for the Twin Cities campus.

The Senate discussed a health-care savings plan.

The Committee on Educational Policy initiated a discussion of a complete revision of educational policies.

"Professor Cathrine Wambach, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that a subcommittee of SCEP and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has been reviewing the 30 current educational policies with a goal of reorganization and better access to the information. The plan is to bring a series of documents that contain the policy language from multiple sources combined in new policies.

"The intent was just to reorganize current language, but the subcommittee found that some policies needed to be edited or deleted if obsolete. The plan is that the different policy groupings will be brought for comment over several meetings, and then for approval as an entire set next spring."

#### May 1, 2008 University Senate (5)

FCC brought for discussion "Significant Changes to Administrative Procedure on *Academic Misconduct*." FCC indicated there were no changes in substance; there was no debate.

The Senate discussed proposed revisions to the policy on Patents and Commercialization of Intellectual Property.

The Senate discussed proposed revisions to the policy on Openness in Research.

President Bruininks reported that "after almost four years of hard work, the biomedical science initiative was approved, which amounts to a \$300 million long-term capital investment in four new buildings. The University will be responsible for 25 percent of the total, with the remainder covered by the state."

A recurring item in the president's report was light-rail transit through the campus.

#### May 1, 2008 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved a resolution: "The Faculty Senate recommends to the President that the University adopt a Health Care Savings Plan for the faculty that uses the 0.5% of the 2.5% faculty contribution to the Faculty Retirement Plan. If there are questions about the details of the plan, the administration will consult with the appropriate Faculty Senate committees and the Faculty Senate."

The Committee on Educational Policy brought a long list of proposed revisions to educational policies for further discussion.

The Faculty Senate approved a motion: "The student release questions, as part of the policy and protocol on the student rating and peer evaluation of instruction form, require the joint approval of the Student Senate and Faculty Senate."

#### October 2, 2008 University Senate (1)

It was reported, apropos the resolution on retirees: "The President wholeheartedly supports additional improvements to the coordination and facilitation of retiree service in campus activities, particularly teaching, mentoring, advising, and serving on critical University committees. Consequently, the University is referring this resolution to" three vice presidents.

It was reported, apropos fair-trade coffee: "The University supports offering fair trade coffee to campus customers where reasonable, including University residential, retail, and catering operations. . . . The possibility of offering fair trade coffee exclusively is now automatically a part of the evaluation process when the University considers a new retail location on campus. . . ."

It was reported, apropos same-sex domestic partner benefits: "Given the budget challenges facing the University and the estimated \$300,000 annual cost to implement this additional



benefit, the University cannot approve the resolution to offset imputed income tax related to same-sex domestic partner benefits at this time."

It was reported, apropos the budget model: "The University appreciates the thoughtful analysis of the internal budget model implementation and recommendations for improvement. Consequently, the University is referring the resolution to the Senior Vice Presidents and the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for consideration. . . ."

It was reported, apropos a faculty-expertise database: "The University would clearly benefit from a system to identify, store, and track faculty and staff activity and expertise. In fact, this item currently appears on the University's 6-Year IT Plan and is currently in the planning and development stage. . . ."

SCC reported changes to the Administrative Procedure for the Academic Misconduct policy that the Senate approved.

The president reported on the Enterprise Financial System (EFS) implementation. "He has been receiving a few complaints, and is taking them seriously. These types of systems are hard to implement in a highly decentralized and distributed environment. This system is a mature product used mainly in the private sector where there is much more centralization in accounting. He stated that the University did not fully anticipate all the problems in this implementation and the ways in which financial information is fed into the system, such as through 16-18 legacy systems. He is meeting with senior officers on this topic and has asked for weekly updates. . . ."

The Senate approved changes to the Copyright Ownership policy.

#### October 2, 2008 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate discussed the report of FCC's metrics and measurement subcommittee:

"In 2006, the Metrics and Measurements Task Force produced a report that involved 20 performance measures identified through the strategic positioning process. When the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) reviewed this report, it was concerned that the scholarly and creative work of the faculty was not being appropriately addressed. FCC also felt that measurement draws attention, and this was needed for faculty work, and that it could begin a discourse to help the broader community understand that what faculty are doing is valuable.

"Of the 20 measures proposed, six deal with research and discovery, six deal with teaching and learning, three deal with public engagement, and five deal with resources and infrastructure.

"The Subcommittee decided to focus on the six measures of research and discovery – national academy memberships, significant faculty awards, the number of post-doctoral appointees, total federal research expenditures, diversity, and faculty satisfaction. . . ."

The Faculty Senate voted unanimously to amend the bylaws of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee to add two P&A staff members (who could not vote on matters related to tenure).

The Committee on Educational Policy and Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee brought a proposed amendment to the policy on student ratings of teaching (the underlined language): "The disposition of written comments on student-rating forms shall be decided by each college or campus. In units where all written comments on students' evaluations are routinely sent to the chair and/or to reviewing-bodies and included in the file, the instructor concerned has the right to ask the chair or a designated senior faculty member to withhold from the file inappropriate comments he or she views as likely to be prejudicial. This provision is intended to cover racist, sexist, homophobic, and other inappropriate personal comments, and is not intended to exclude from the file negative comments directly related to the course. . . . AF&T concurs with the concern expressed by SCFA about the potential impact of inappropriate negative comments on evaluation of instructors for promotion, tenure, and merit. After reviewing the comments provided to SCFA by Professor Marti Gonzales on the social-psychological research that demonstrates the disproportionate effect of a small number of negative comments, AF&T recommends the changes indicated above, noting that this policy does not include the excision of negative comments directed to the content or pedagogy of a course."

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee brought a resolution for discussion, prompted by the collapse of the 35W bridge: "The Faculty Senate and the President affirm their mutual understanding that, in cases of unpreventable major adversity affecting faculty members, whether due to accident, the weather, building collapse, or any other external cause, the administration will immediately do all in its power to enable faculty members affected to resume their professional activities as soon as possible; and will ensure that they will not be held responsible for professional performance to the extent that their professional activities are disrupted through no fault of their own."

#### December 4, 2008 Faculty Senate

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee reported a resolution it had adopted: "The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure cannot endorse the personnel plan proposed by the senior administrators at the University of Minnesota, Rochester. The Committee believes that the proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty is too low to provide the kind of liberal-arts education that merits awarding a University of Minnesota baccalaureate degree to the students who will matriculate at this campus."

FCC reported a statement on the budget: "If the University is faced with a situation that requires budget cuts, the Faculty Consultative Committee strongly urges that any percentage cuts in academic budgets be matched by comparable cuts in the non-academic units."

FCC also reported that it "voted to approve the proposed bylaws for the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, of which the Faculty Senate is a member."

FCC reported that it "recommends that the President adopt at least on a trial basis the proposal of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs Subcommittee on Faculty Ombuds Services, made on September 8, 2008, to establish a Faculty Ombuds Service for the Twin Cities campus."

The Faculty Senate approved a modification to the evaluation of instruction policy, discussed at the previous meeting: "In units where all written comments on students' evaluations are routinely sent to the chair and/or to reviewing-bodies and included in the file, unfairly prejudicial comments should be withheld from the file upon request of the instructor concerned. The decision whether particular comments are unfairly prejudicial should be made by the chair, a senior faculty member designated through a process determined by the department, or a standing or ad-hoc committee. This provision is intended to cover scurrilous, racist, sexist, homophobic, and other personal comments, and is not intended to exclude from the file negative comments directly related to the course."

The Senate approved the resolution on University responsibility to researchers, discussed at the previous meeting.

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee brought for discussion a statement that began "The Members of the Faculty Senate of the University of Minnesota write to express their grave concern at the change in Department of Home Security policy that enables Customs and Border Patrol Agents to seize and copy electronic and printed materials at will, without even "suspicion of illegal activity" ("probable cause"), by which their efforts were limited until July 2008. . . ."

The Faculty Senate discussed several educational policies brought for review by the Committee on Educational Policy.

The president reported on a "\$4.8 billion shortfall, which is slightly more than the \$4.5 billion shortfall that the state had six years ago. While the University will not know the extent of the problem until the February forecast is issued, a proportionate reduction of 14 percent would be \$700 million per year in the biennium. However, when the state needs to cut budgets, higher education usually gets a higher-than-proportionate cut. This is one of the reasons that the University needs to slow down on hiring, why capital projects have been delayed, and executive salaries have been frozen."

#### February 5, 2009 University Senate (2)

The Committee on Information Technologies reported a resolution it had adopted: "The Senate Committee on Information Technologies (SCIT) would like to indicate its support for the Office of Information Technology compact statement as presented to SCIT during the November 4, 2008 meeting. These goals serve as a catalyst and mechanism for leveraging technology to advance and support education, innovative research, and public engagement while continuing to be one of the best information technology support organizations in higher education. . . ."

SCC chair Emily Hoover "said an administrative committee was formed to discuss and propose an option for a Twin Cities campus outdoor smoking policy. This committee met last semester and received input from various faculty, student, and staff organizations. They would now like to gather input from the senators.

A senator presented the following statement that was approved by the Student Senate with 31 votes in favor and 4 opposed, "**The Twin Cities Student Delegation does not support a campus-wide smoking ban.** While we are concerned about the health impact that smokers have

on themselves and others, we support other alternatives such as smoking zones, or designated smoking areas. . . ."

"President Bruininks addressed several distressing issues with the University's budget. The first is the Governor's recommendation to cut \$75.5 million per year from the base budget, coupled with a \$40 million reduction in the past few months. . . . While the deficit amounts to 2.2 percent of the total state budget, the University's reduction is in excess of 8 percent, a four-fold increase over the state average. The University is trying to determine how it responds in a way that is civil, respectful, firm, and assertive in light of a recommendation that indicates that the Governor does not regard higher education as critical to the state's economy. . . ."

The president was asked "How were faculty involved in the decision to combine the Medical School dean with the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences?" He indicated that "Consultation did take place with the Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee before a decision was made. Going forward, faculty will be involved in defining qualities for this position and in the evolution of this leadership model before there is a search. . . ."

#### February 5, 2009 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate approved a message to the Minnesota Congressional Delegation that began: "The Members of the Faculty Senate of the University of Minnesota write to express their grave concern at the change in Department of Homeland Security policy that enables Customs and Border Patrol Agents to seize and copy electronic and printed materials at will, without even 'suspicion of illegal activity' ('probable cause'), by which their efforts were limited until July 2008."

The Faculty Senate continued its discussion of revisions to educational policies.

#### March 5, 2009 University Senate (3)

It was reported, apropos of University responsibility to researchers: "The President supports the underlying principle of this policy statement, and is asking Vice President for Human Resources Carol Carrier to consider ways to incorporate the principle in the current comprehensive review process of administrative policies."

The Student Academic Integrity Committee reported for information: "The purpose of this document is to provide a recommendation to the Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity (OSCAI) on a structure for communication with instructors and program administrators about instances of scholastic dishonesty by students in the Graduate School (but not professional students) on the Twin Cities campus. . . ." It introduced a parallel document for "academic activities that are not related to a specific course on the Twin Cities campus. These activities include exams (written preliminary, etc.), theses and other academic work that is connected to their program, but not a specific course."

SCC/FCC chair Emily Hoover reported that "today's remarks would incorporate both committees and focus on the process for restructuring graduate education. If senators take away

one message from this report, let it be that shared governance works when everyone when everyone works with it.

"Since the Provost's memo on February 9, she has received over 1000 emails from faculty, staff, and students about the restructuring and has spent much time in the last few weeks in meetings or on the phone on this topic. The University community has expressed a high level of concern, anger, and angst about how the decision was made, and although people were divided on whether it was a good decision, it caused controversy. . . . As representatives of the faculty to the administration, FCC members have openly and vigorously voiced concerns about the process. . . ."

Under New Business, a motion was made: " The University Senate does not approved of the abolition and reorganization of the Graduate School as it has been proposed. While streamlining, budget cuts, and reorganization might be needed, the Graduate School should be preserved." The vote was 70-63, a majority in favor but an insufficient number of votes to suspend the rules to take it up at the meeting, so it was referred to SCC.

#### March 5, 2009 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate declined to vote in favor of creating health care savings plans endorsed by the Committees on Faculty Affairs and Finance and Planning.

The University Senate reconvened and the president gave his State of the University address.

In response to a question, the president said that he "knows that there is angst about how the Graduate School plans were announced, but he acknowledged that this could have been handled better and engaged more people in the process. He is listening to these concerns, and notes that work will be done together to implement changes and ideas. There will not be a diminishment in shared governance, but at the end of the day, some of the decisions need to be made."

#### April 2, 2009 Faculty Senate

The Senate Research Committee brought a long statement for information:

"First and foremost, the SRC hopes the administration will reconsider its efforts to close the Graduate School.

"At the very least, the SRC believes that closure of the Graduate School, and delegation of its responsibilities to other University units, would be unwise until critical issues, as described below, are resolved by faculty, through their governance system, working with the administration. . . ."

FCC chair Emily Hoover reported "that FCC has continued its discussion on the topic of graduate education with individuals and groups across the University. She thanked Dean Crouch's task force for its forums to collect feedback. The task force report will be brought to the April 30 Faculty Senate meeting for discussion. She asked senators to talk with their colleagues to get rich feedback on the report.

"FCC also continues to consult with the President and Provost to convey the sentiment of the University community on graduate education and other topics of importance to faculty.

Some of the conversations have been confidential, but many have been in the FCC minutes. She encouraged senators to read these minutes. . . . This continued consultation has resulted in a broader charge to the task force chaired by Dean Crouch."

The Faculty Senate voted to approve the overhaul and revision of all the educational policies.

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee proposed an amendment to the Regents' policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility; it "is designed to protect faculty and staff members who participate in the governance system and who may express views critical of institutional proposals or actions. . . . The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure has taken note of what it considers to be an ominous development in case law in the United States and recommends an amendment to the Regents policy, Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The Committee wishes to make it clear that the amendment it has proposed is intended to preserve the status quo, in response to a trend in federal court cases that may restrict the subjects of discourse in the University. . . ." The concern arose because of the U. S. Supreme Court decision in *Garcetti et al. v. Ceballos* (2006). The Faculty Senate approved.

Two motions were introduced by individual senators for discussion: One, "WHEREAS: The University of Minnesota's Policy on Reorganization requires that the Senate "be involved in any organizational or structural decision affecting an academic unit" (Preamble) . . . . WHEREAS: The proposal announced by the Provost to abolish the Graduate School was taken without any consultation or involvement of the University Senate, or any part or committee thereof, in violation of University policy; BE IT RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of the University of Minnesota rejects the proposal to dissolve the Graduate School as illegitimate and demands that any proposal to dissolve or otherwise to restructure the Graduate School be subject to the University of Minnesota Policy on Reorganization." Two, "WHEREAS: The restructuring of graduate education as announced in this proposal is fundamentally flawed, notably in the following respects. . . . BE IT RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of the University of Minnesota rejects the proposal to dissolve the Graduate School as ill-considered, and requests that, should the President wish to pursue the matter, he submit his proposal for review by the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, and their appropriate committees, in accord with University policy." The motions elicited long discussion.

The president addressed the concerns expressed about the Graduate School in his comments.

#### April 30, 2009 University Senate (4)

SCC brought for discussion the draft report of the "Committee on Graduate Education [,which] was given its initial charge by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan on February 20, 2009. Originally, the charge was to make recommendations for implementing the plan for restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education at the University of Minnesota that had been announced to the University community on February 9. At the outset the committee was referred to as the Implementation Team, but this name was eventually changed to Committee on Graduate Education — hereafter simply 'the committee' — to reflect an evolving revision of the original charge, including the option of recommending a streamlined version of the current Graduate School instead of a new Office of Graduate

Education, as called for in the February 9 restructuring plan." Vice Chair Carol Chomsky then read a statement from President Bruininks. "First, the President wanted to express his appreciation for the discussion and debate about the graduate school resolutions at the last Faculty Senate meeting. . . . The University is very interested in hearing the reaction of its faculty, staff, and students to the Committee recommendations over this public comment period. The University will also be engaging in additional consultation with key governance groups, such as the Faculty Consultative Committee, Twin Cities Deans, and graduate students, to discuss the Committee recommendations prior to making any final decisions. . . . President Bruininks understands that restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education is a somewhat challenging task for a University that has functioned under the same Graduate School model for many years. He wants to assure senators and the University community of his personal commitment to retaining key elements of the Graduate School structure that have been effective to date. . . ." The draft report received lengthy debate.

Two individual senators brought back one of the two motions from the previous meeting for action (the other was moot):

"WHEREAS: The University of Minnesota's Policy on Reorganization requires that the Senate "be involved in any organizational or structural decision affecting an academic unit" (Preamble). . . .

"WHEREAS: The Provost's plan to abolish the Graduate School, as publicly announced by the Provost in his e-mail of Feb. 9, 2009 to the University faculty, was adopted without any prior consultation or involvement of the University Senate, or any part or committee thereof, in violation of University policy. . . .

"WHEREAS: The formal charge to the "Implementation Committee" (now "Committee on Graduate Education") did not encompass review of the merits of the underlying decision to abolish the Graduate School, having instead been limited to consideration of how the Provost's decision to abolish the Graduate School was to be implemented;

BE IT RESOLVED: That the University Senate of the University of Minnesota rejects the Provost's decision to dissolve the Graduate School as illegitimate and demands that any proposal to dissolve or otherwise to restructure the Graduate School hereafter comply with the University of Minnesota Policy on Reorganization."

The motion provoked long debate. The language of the resolution was amended on the floor during debate [the language reproduced above is not the amended version] and the motion was approved 135-17 with 9 abstentions.

"Professor Kathryn Hanna, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committees (SCFA), stated that a few years ago the faculty had a discussion about faculty compensation and the fact that the current policy was silent for faculty who hold endowed chairs and other similar positions. SCFA felt that this should be addressed in the policy. A subcommittee was formed to revise the policy. The primary change was to add language that included endowed and honorary faculty titles and annual reviews of these positions. Language was also added that units should have goals and expectations of endowed chairs and professorships."

December 3, 2009 University Senate (1)

FCC chair Marti Gonzales reported that in the face of a potential flu pandemic, FCC had approved on behalf of the Faculty Senate an amendment to the policy on excused absences: "In the event that the University declares a pandemic emergency (e.g., flu), the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost or designee may waive the requirement that students are required to have documentation from a physician for illness."

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure reported a statement it had adopted on Academic Freedom and the Institutional Review Board: The committee "advises the Institutional Review Board (IRB) that it is not an infringement of academic freedom for the IRB to place restrictions on faculty members who permit or encourage inappropriate research by students using human subjects. Rather, faculty members who advise students have a responsibility to offer rigorous training and oversight consistent with IRB expectations when students are conducting research with human subjects.

"The Committee takes the position that the safety of the human subjects, and the safety of the students conducting the research, is paramount, and that the IRB does not infringe academic freedom when it acts to protect human health and well-being."

The Senate held a discussion on the financial future of the University.

#### December 3, 2009 Faculty Senate

The Senate approved an amendment to the policy on class scheduling from the Committee on Educational Policy: "5. Classes may not be held on official University holidays except with the approval of the appropriate dean." The committee reported that it had been "informed that an instructor insisted that his class meet on the Fourth of July." Exceptions were allowed, subject to approval by the dean.

The Senate also approved an amendment to the grading policy brought by the Committee on Educational Policy: "b. If the instructor determines that a grade of F or N for the course should be awarded to a student because of scholastic dishonesty, the student cannot withdraw to avoid the F or N. If the student withdrew from the course before the scholastic dishonesty was discovered or before the instructor has concluded that there was scholastic dishonesty, and the instructor (or the appropriate hearing body if the student requests a hearing) determines that the student should receive the F or the N, the student will be re-registered for the course and the F or N grade will be entered on the transcript."

The Senate also approved extending the policy on makeup work for legitimate absences to cover final examinations.

#### March 4, 2010 University Senate (2)

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure brought three items to the Faculty Senate for information, one a rearrangement of words in the Regents' policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility that had a significant implication for its meaning.

(1) "The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) has taken note of recent events involving the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) response to



College of Education and Human Development's (CEHD) faculty members' work in developing a proposal for the Bush Foundation to redesign the teacher-education curriculum.

"The Committee takes no position on the merits of the ideas expressed in the task force notes that have been the focus of the events, but it vigorously reaffirms the right of faculty and staff to speak freely on matters related to their professional responsibilities and to the governance of the University. Academic freedom protects faculty and staff who express their best professional views; it is the essence of the creative process."

(2) The committee "met with Vice Provost Arlene Carney on Friday, February 5, to discuss matters related to tenured and probationary faculty appointments and the budget decisions that will need to be made in the near future. Three sections of the tenure code bear directly on the discussions. Vice Provost Carney was emphatic in telling the Committee that the University would follow the requirements of the tenure code, which are transparent and ironclad."

(3) The committee wrote to Provost Sullivan: "Professor Tom Clayton . . . has recognized that there is a phrase in the statement that needs to be moved within the [Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy], in order to clearly state the intent of the policy. The current wording is:

"Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the University."

Professor Clayton has pointed out that as written, the phrase "without institutional discipline or restraint" syntactically applies only to "to speak or write. . . ." The committee recommended this substitution:

"Academic freedom is the freedom without institutional discipline or restraint to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the University."

The Faculty Senate approved the change at the September 30, 2010 meeting.

The Committee on Finance and Planning reported for information several observations it had made about the budget, conveyed in a memo to the president.

"1. It is apparent that we are in a severe and worsening fiscal crisis. Something has to be done. We are not sure everyone believes this yet or understands the likely impact.

"2. The proposals are based on additional "across the board" cuts and is for only one year, FY 11. This is the usual response to a fiscal crisis. A bold, transparent strategic plan, which provides a vision and informs decisions, is not apparent. . . .

"3. Major elements in the draft budget proposal move many budget decisions from the schools and colleges back to central administration. This reverses the goals of the budget model over the last several years and takes responsibility away from the schools and colleges, once again encouraging dependency on central administration. . . ."

FCC had endorsed the memo.

The Senate Consultative Committee sponsored a budget discussion at the Senate; the president began:

"Issues of the University's budget are first and foremost and occupying time for all administrators of state-funded agencies in light of the economic recession. Currently the University is dealing with the cumulative impact of three separate decisions – the first budget

reduction, a \$50 million unallotment, and another \$36 million unallotment – which amount to a \$226 million state budget challenge in the next fiscal year. This is in addition to stagnant allocations to the University for the last 30 years once they are adjusted for inflation. This is the second time in this decade that the University has taken significant cuts. This is not business as usual but it is referred to as the 'new normal.' It is something that will be difficult to cope with and address in the next few years. . . .

"The compensation plan includes a two percent pay increase in July 2010, with a deferred increase to faculty and academic professionals until January 2011, a three-day unpaid furlough for all employees between Christmas and New Years in December 2010, three additional unpaid furlough days for administrators, and up to a total of 10 unpaid, voluntary furlough days for all employees. This plan is a modest shared sacrifice for everyone while preserving the workforce."

FCC chair Marti Hope Gonzales "said that the committee has decided to convene the Faculty Senate on March 25 to take a vote on reductions in faculty compensation, as required by the tenure code. All senators will be welcome but only faculty senators will vote." The compensation proposal elicited long discussion.

#### March 4, 2010 Faculty Senate

FCC chair Marti Gonzales commented on the budget and reported that "representatives from FCC have also met with Board of Regents Chair Allen and Regent Simmons to discuss the search for the next President. FCC indicated that it hopes for and expects meaningful faculty representation on the search-advisory committee. . . ."

The Committee on Educational Policy offered a clarifying amendment to the Policy on Expected Student Academic Work per Credit: "One credit equals 42-45 hours of work over the course of the semester (1 credit x 3 hours of work per week x 14/15 weeks in a semester = 42-45 hours of academic work). . . . All online courses and all short courses (whether offered during fall or spring semester, the May session, January, summer session, or any other time) must have the same expectation of academic work per credit, 42-45 hours." The committee commented: "a credit is a credit is a credit and every credit should carry approximately the same expectation of academic work."

#### March 25, 2010 Faculty Senate

The tenure policy provided:

**"4.5 Reduction Or Postponement Of Compensation.** If the University or a collegiate unit is faced with financial stringency that does not amount to a fiscal emergency, the president may propose a temporary reduction or postponement in compensation to be allocated to faculty in accordance with a mathematical formula or similar device. If approved by the Faculty Senate or the appropriate collegiate assembly, respectively, and the Board of Regents, the recurring salary of all faculty members in the University or in the designated collegiate units shall be reduced temporarily in accordance with the formula or device."

The president proposed: "As a result of financial stringency facing the University, and in accordance with Section 4.5 of the policy Faculty Tenure, I transmit to the Faculty Senate and seek Senate approval of a proposal to reduce the salary paid to each faculty member 1.15% for academic year 2010-2011."

FCC presented a motion (which it had adopted unanimously) for debate: " In accordance with Section 4.5 of the Regents policy *Faculty Tenure*, the Faculty Senate approves the President's proposal for a 1.15% reduction in salary for all faculty for the 2010-2011 academic year. The authority granted by approval of the proposal extends only to the identified 1.15% reduction for 2010-2011." This motion provoked long debate.

Substitute motion 1 was presented by two senators; following "whereas" clauses, "BE IT RESOLVED: That, prior to asking the Faculty Senate to vote on its proposal to reduce faculty compensation, the administration provide to the faculty and the public a detailed account of all current and projected University expenditures and savings, justifying each item and amount in terms of its relationship to the University's primary missions of education and research;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate requests an independent audit of the finances of the University, including specifically an independent itemized analysis of the expenses of administrative overhead, with a view to identifying areas where additional economies might be realized with minimal impact on the University's primary missions of education and research." After debate, the motion was tabled until the May 6 Faculty Senate meeting.

Substitute motion 2 was presented by three senators; following "whereas" clauses, "BE IT RESOLVED: That in place of its proposal to reduce salaries of all employees of every category and salary level, the administration develop and present to the Faculty Senate an alternative plan that calls for temporary salary reductions on a sliding scale, with no reduction for salaries below a certain threshold, in order to achieve the same savings." After additional long debate, the Faculty Senate voted against substituting motion 2 for the FCC motion.

The Faculty Senate then voted 130 in favor and 26 opposed to the FCC motion. (All other items of business were postponed.)

### May 6, 2010 University Senate (3)

The Committee on Educational Policy reported a statement for information: "The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee encourages the University's academic community to be aware of the increasing availability, affordability and technical capability of person-based mobile computing devices and begin now to consider how to support and incorporate these devices into student learning strategies and learning spaces. . . ."

The Committee on Finance and Planning reported for information a statement on risk: The committee

"has consulted numerous times in recent years both with administrators responsible for risk management and with those responsible for financial management. . . . A common theme in most of the conversations is that the University has been in a risk-averse mode. We are now concerned that this risk-averse stance has been too severe for too long, and as a result is creating unwarranted administrative burdens on colleges, departments, faculty, and staff--a particularly serious problem during this time of reduced funding.

The Committee has discussed the University's appetite for risk and endorses a movement to increase the institution's tolerance for risk in appropriate areas, including, for example, human resources, research, student, financial, and other enterprise systems, and capital planning. . . ."

The "Committee on Finance and Planning received from [the] Vice President for University Services . . . a set of questions related to space use and cost planning. The Committee is very aware of environmental and financial reasons to optimize space utilization on campus. In this time of fiscal constraints, it is critical for the University community to make efficient use of our resources. The Committee strongly supports these efforts and recommends to the University/Faculty Senate that it adopt the following principles." Five principles were set out. The Senate approved the principles without debate.

The Senate discussed for information a new policy: "The University reserves the right to modify the appointment terms of Academic Professional and Academic Administrative (P&A) employees in order to address financial stringency. Specifically, the University may: 1) reduce P&A salaries or percentages of appointment during the term of an employee's appointment; 2) impose unpaid furloughs or other mandatory unpaid absences; 3) postpone compensation; or 4) take other actions as determined by the University in its sole discretion. All P&A appointments are made subject to this right, effective June 1, 2010."

#### May 6, 2010 Faculty Senate

FCC chair Marti Gonzales reported that the "FCC leadership met with Bill Funk regarding the presidential search, the vision for the process, and the need for a faculty voice in the process."

FCC proposed three complicated bylaw amendments; the Comment explained: "(1) would eliminate the Nominating Committee and replace it with a Nominating Subcommittee of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). (2) would establish the election process for Twin Cities members of the FCC. (3) would charge the Faculty Committee on Committees with replacing its own members.

"The idea of having an elected Nominating Committee identifying candidates for the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) (and Faculty Committee on Committees) is a good one in theory but one that has not worked in practice. The current system has been dysfunctional for several years. . . ." The Faculty Senate approved the change.

The Faculty Senate discussed a proposed policy that "clarifies what activities are allowable while paid on sponsored projects during the summer months, and sets forth a mechanism to document (for auditors or funding agencies) that faculty understand their obligations in the event that they elect to work full-time on sponsored projects rather than taking time off (vacation). The policy also describes when it is permissible to create competitive grant proposals on time not paid for by the University."

Following the debate over substitute motion 2 at the March 25 Faculty Senate meeting, the Committee on Faculty Affairs presented for discussion a motion on salary reductions: "If temporary reductions in employee compensation, whether by means of furloughs or otherwise, should in the future be deemed necessary in order to balance the University's budget, SCFA recommends that such reductions be calculated on a substantially more progressive scale than that which was adopted for the reductions in FY 2011. The committee feels that lower paid employees should be assessed the least or none at all. Conversely, higher and the highest paid employees should be assessed according to a sliding scale that is more equitably proportional to

their level of compensation. Additionally, if temporary reductions in compensation should be considered for adoption in future years, the committee urges that alternative models incorporating greater and lesser degrees of progressivity be discussed with appropriate Senate, Faculty, CAPA, Civil Service, and bargaining unit committees sufficiently early to enable substantive participation in the planning and decisional processes." The Faculty Senate discussed the resolution at some length but took no action.

#### September 30, 2010 University Senate (1)

The Committee on Finance and Planning reported plans: "At its 4/20/10 meeting, [it] heard from three faculty members about their concerns regarding the size of University administration in these times of economic constraints. The Committee decided it would give their proposal serious consideration and respond to it. Although the message was sweeping, SCFP believes it contained elements that could lead to a more informed committee as well as to a more informed University community. . . . This proposal would require SCFP to embark on a more systematic and thorough review of the patterns of institutional spending for administrative functions, a review that SCFP hopes will receive the endorsement of the central officers. . . ."

The Committee on Educational Policy reported a statement it had issued: "The Senate Committee on Educational Policy encourages the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education to work with the colleges, departments, and the Council on Liberal Education to identify ways to reduce the number of excess credits students take to complete an undergraduate degree (that is, credits that exceed the University's stated requirement of 120 credits for a degree)."

SCC reported on a consultation matrix: "developed by subcommittees of the Faculty Consultative Committee and consulted with the leaders of the Student Senate, CAPA, and the Civil Service Committee, identifies which groups will consult on which policies when amendments or reviews of current policy are being considered. When a new policy is proposed, the Senate Consultative Committee decides what the consultation process should be."

"Gavin Watt, Chair of the Benefits Advisory Committee, walked senators through a presentation on the Effects of Health Reform on UPlan. . . ."

SCC brought for action an administrative policy, Conflict of Interest.

"In November 2009, a draft policy was disseminated to all faculty, P&A staff, and graduate students. The policy was posted on the Policy Library website for six weeks. During the posting period, more than 150 comments were received. . . . Many comments voiced concern that the policy was too restrictive if it was to have University-wide application.

"A consultation process was developed to obtain further feedback and recommendations. The policy was consulted with the President's Policy Committee (PPC), the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), the Senate Research Committee (SRC), . . .

"The University revised its approach and in April of 2010 completed a second draft that was risk-based in its approach. That draft was consulted with [many groups]. . . ."

"Professor Michael Oakes, former Vice Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), reminded senators that the Regents Conflict of Interest Policy was approved in March 2010. That policy stated guiding principles. Today the motion presented is for the administrative policy. A strong conflict-of-interest policy maintains and cultivates a stronger reputation for the University. The public is aware of the reported transgressions so the policy is in everyone's self-interest. . . .

"The administration listened carefully and made dramatic and useful changes. This policy has been thoroughly vetted. . . .

The proposed policy is comprehensive and risk-based. There are two groups – low-risk and high-risk. While the policy covers both groups, the high-risk group will have extra attention devoted to them. People in the low-risk group doing non-human-subjects research or exempt human subjects research will remain in the low-risk group."

The Senate voted in favor of the policy, after considerable debate, 120-49.

"President Bruininks then publicly apologized to the senators for the awkwardness in the way that the University managed the film, 'Troubled Waters,' and the questions that it raised regarding the University's commitment to academic freedom. . . .

"President Bruininks believes that this situation could have been handled differently and communicated more effectively. He is not blaming anyone else because as chief executive of the University, the final authority rests with him. At no point was there a question about the importance of the issues raised in this film. . . .

"A senator commended President Bruininks for his defense of academic freedom. It has been reported that the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, Research Committee, and the Faculty Consultative Committee will be looking into how the release of the film was precipitately cancelled on the grounds that it had not undergone adequate scientific review, and when finding these grounds baseless the administration released the film after all. Academic freedom is not the only principle at stake here. It is ancillary to an important part of the University's mission, which is to communicate the results of inquiry to the public.

#### September 30, 2010 Faculty Senate

FCC chair Kathryn VandenBosch reported, inter alia, "FCC also met last week with Provost Sullivan for a discussion devoted to the embargo of the Bell Museum film "Troubled Waters". During this meeting FCC learned about the decision by the President and Provost to lift the embargo and allow the film to be shown. The co-chairs of the Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) Committee joined this discussion. Everyone agreed about the importance of academic freedom. The Provost then suggested working with the AF&T Committee to discuss related, general issues that are less clear-cut and need more attention, including academic freedom in outreach activities involving contract work. . . ."

FCC brought for action the Regents' policy on Commercialization of Intellectual Property Rights. "This policy governs patents and the ownership, commercialization, and dissemination of intellectual property rights in technology created at the University of Minnesota. . . ."

FCC vice chair Christopher Cramer "said that the Office for Technology Commercialization, which exists to help faculty commercialize the products of their research,

has been funded from one source, Ziagen. In 2010 this drug provided \$13 million to the office. As the current licensing will end in 2013, a different income stream was needed. Currently there is an equal one-third licensing income split between inventor, department or college, and the Vice President for Research. The proposal would take 15 percent at the start for the Office for Technology Commercialization and then split the remaining 85 percent equally among the same three areas. . . ." The Faculty Senate approved the policy.

#### December 2, 2010 University Senate (2)

At the September 15, 2010, Advisory Committee on Athletics (ACA) meeting a motion was approved to allow the University of Minnesota sports teams to compete against the University of North Dakota sports teams during the 2010-11 season. The motion was approved because the NCAA lifted its ban on the University of North Dakota due to its commitment to change the Fighting Sioux nickname and logo.

The Senate approved creation of the Faculty and Staff delegation to vote on matters affecting only the staff, such as health benefits.

The Senate discussed a revision to the Policy on Reorganization. "At the time of the proposal to reorganize the Graduate School, there were questions about appropriate consultation pursuant to this policy. When looking at the policy, it was determined that the policy was written without thinking through the nature of all units at the University and the Graduate School fell through the cracks of the current policy. . . . The proposed policy sets up a procedure for promoting and ensuring that there will be consultation on these types of changes. The language is flexible and allows the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) or its chair to work with central administration to determine which Senate committees should be involved. The policy also continues to provide that for major changes within academic units, consultation within those units should take place, although it is not the role of the University Senate to mandate how this should take place. . . ."

The Benefits Advisory Committee posed questions for discussion. "Early next year the committee will be considering the plans for 2012 and beyond. Here are some of the issues that will need to be resolved. The Committee would appreciate any comments that members of the Senate or other University employees may have.

1. If the University is unable fully to cover increasing health care costs in 2012, how should we respond:
  - (a) with across-the-board increases in the employee share of the premium cost:
  - (b) with substantially higher co-pays or co-insurance.
2. If we impose higher employee premiums, should we cap the amount that an employee must pay for coverage as a percentage of salary, in order to avoid substantial federal financial penalties that would be imposed on the University beginning in 2014?
3. Should we substantially reduce the premiums or co-pays for employees who either (a) have satisfactory biometrics, or (b) are making real progress in improving their biometric results through health improvement activities?
4. Should we offer, as an option, a network that consists only of providers who provide above-average quality of care at below average costs? Such a network might not be available in all locations."

There was considerable debate.

#### December 2, 2010 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate, after debate, approved a new Policy on Appointments to Graduate Examining Committees.

FCC chair Kathryn VandenBosch "said that Provost Sullivan was invited to an FCC meeting to discuss and ask questions about 'Troubled Waters.' At this meeting he voiced his support for academic freedom and the decision to release the film as originally scheduled. FCC has continued to have discussions on this topic with President Bruininks and has identified questions for further study by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee in conjunction with the Provost."

The Senate approved a resolution from the Classroom Advisory Committee: "For the Twin Cities campus, the administration will report to the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (1) on the proposals for classroom number, capacity and pedagogical accommodations including technical capabilities for every planned new building or major renovation, and (2) the impact of these proposals on the central classroom inventory."

The Senate approved an amendment to the Board of Regents' policy Code of Conduct to bring it into alignment with the policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and "amends the academic-responsibility language of the Code of Conduct so that no faculty or staff member is held accountable for stating 'the truth.' 'The truth' is a matter of contention in many disciplines, and the nature of debate in virtually all fields is about what 'the truth' is. In some fields, there may be multiple truths. It is reasonable to hold people accountable for seeking truth but not for not speaking 'the truth.'"

#### February 24, 2011 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure reported a statement for information:

"The Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure has been made aware that the University may consider changes to the contributions to the Faculty Retirement Plan. One question that has arisen is whether such a change would require a vote of the Faculty Senate under the provisions of sections 4 or 11 of the tenure policy.

"We conclude that if any proposed change is prospective only, with no changes to the salary and fringe benefits of currently-employed faculty members, then the tenure policy is not implicated and no vote is required. If, however, changes may be made to the contributions to the Faculty Retirement Plan for currently-employed faculty members, the Committee will revisit the matter."

The Committee on Educational Policy reported that the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure recommended to [it] that the list of policies that syllabi notify students about be expanded by one item to include a statement on academic freedom. Both committees believe that recent controversies about academic freedom have highlighted the need for students to understand how central the concept is to the University." The Faculty Senate approved.



The Committee on Educational Policy proposed a change in the policy on class scheduling: "The proposed changes include requiring colleges to distribute classes evenly throughout the day (non-compliant classes must change their class-meeting times), allowing colleges to schedule a maximum of 50% of course sections on a Tuesday-Thursday pattern, and requiring colleges to distribute enrollment (as well as classes) throughout the day and throughout the week" and other changes. The Faculty Senate approved.

The Senate voted in favor of a resolution on participation in governance from three committees: "CAPA, CSC and the Faculty Senate urge faculty and administrators actively to encourage and support reasonable levels of such activities by their staff members. Support for participation in governance activities includes allowing staff to take time from their responsibilities to attend meetings and serve on committees free of concern that such activities will have an adverse impact on their annual performance reviews. Further, we strongly recommend that faculty members and administrators responsible for annual performance reviews take steps to ensure such activities are included in those reviews so that staff willingness to serve in support of the University's governance and mission is noted."

The Senate voted to approve a series of changes in the tenure policy. "Professor Chomsky said that over one year ago, she and Professor Tom Clayton were asked to work with Vice Provost Arlene Carney to bring clarity to some aspects of the tenure code in tenure procedures in units and to avoid having problems brought to the Senate Judicial Committee. These amendments were worked on and then brought to FCC and the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AF&T) twice in the last few months."

" Substantive Clarifications

1. Extensions of probationary period for new parents, for caregivers, and for personal medical reasons are made more consistent and clear; the two-year cap on extension for caregiving responsibilities is increased to three years and noted as applicable to all three reasons for extension (Section 5.5).
2. Amount of time credited to probationary service is clarified (Section 5.3, 3.2).
3. The use of probationary instructor appointments is clarified (Section 6.22).
4. The use of three-year probationary appointments for associate professors and professors is clarified (Section 6.21).
5. These modifications clarify the relationship between granting of tenure to and promotion of assistant professors, and makes the language consistent with the procedures already in use (Section 6.3)."

And a few more.

March 3, 2011 University Senate (3)

The Senate approved a resolution from the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee: "The University Senate recommends to the President that the University revise its policy regarding the Twin Cities and Rochester campus' academic employees' personal holiday so that the personal holiday may be used at any time during the year."

The president gave his State of the University address.

### March 31, 2011 University Senate (4)

The Senate approved a statement from the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee on equity in budget cuts: "Should it be necessary to implement salary reductions for University employees in the future, the University Senate requests that the administration seriously consider a progressive scale based on principles of protecting living wages and social justice."

- 1) The Senate approved a statement from the Finance and Planning Committee: "The University Senate:
- 2) Endorses the principles that space should be:
  - Sustainable: The University should not have more space than it can afford to operate, maintain, and support.
  - Aligned: The University should provide the correct type, quality, and quantity of space required for programs (academic, administrative, and athletic) to function effectively.
  - Managed: The University should provide tools and incentives for maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of its space resources."

There were additional elements.

The Senate did not have sufficient votes to approve constitutional amendments recognizing the transition of the Civil Service Committee to the Civil Service Senate, but they were subsequently approved by electronic vote.

A recurring theme in the president's report: "President Bruininks said that this has been a challenging legislative session. There are 61 new legislators, a change in the majority in the House and Senate, and a new Governor, as well as a large budget deficit. He is deeply worried about the current trends. State support is currently 20 percent of the University's budget. The House and Senate recommendations would take University funding back to 1998 levels."

### March 31, 2011 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate approved recommendations for policy from the Committee on Educational Policy:

"Students will be awarded credits based on nationally-recognized examinations (Advanced Placement (AP) program, the International Baccalaureate (IB) program, and the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)) when they meet the minimum standards for awarding credit. Academic unit authorities on each campus establish the minimum standards for awarding credits. Academic units are not required to offer credits for nationally-recognized examinations."

"Academic departments have the discretion to offer any currently-enrolled undergraduate degree-seeking student an exam to either demonstrate proficiency or earn course credit. Departments may establish eligibility criteria for an exam for proficiency or credit. The format of these exams is at the department's discretion (e.g., final examination, oral tests, written papers or projects)."

The Senate received a report for discussion: "The Ad Hoc Summer Semester Committee was

established and charged by the University of Minnesota Faculty Consultative Committee to assess whether or not serious consideration of a full, regular third (summer) semester added to the University's Twin Cities Campus calendar is warranted. . . . This report is not a detailed analysis of how a full summer semester would be implemented; we did not consider that to be our role. Nor do we address the potential for a full summer semester at the coordinate campuses. However, the report does raise the many issues, concerns, and opportunities that a full summer semester would present." The report elicited discussion.

#### April 14, 2011 University Senate (5)

Following brief debate, the University Senate approved a new administrative policy Individual Conflicts of Interest: Standards that Govern Those Involved in Clinical Health Care. FCC vice chair Christopher Cramer "reminded senators that this is the last piece of the conflict-of-interest policy revisions that began over two years ago. An initial policy was created to address conflict-of-interest across the entire University. While consulting that policy, it became clear that just one policy would not be workable and the issues stemming from clinical health care were separated into a separate policy. This is what is for action today. This policy is more stringent and based on a perception of greater risk. . . ."

The Senate held a discussion of the budget. The president began.

"The University faces deep proposed cuts from both the House and Senate bills that would reduce funding to the 1998 level. To put this in perspective, next year's freshmen would have been starting kindergarten the last time University funding was this low. He also believes that most cuts will hit in the first year of the biennium. . . ."

"The Senate bill is the most adverse as it requires a \$71 million per year reduction for a total of \$142 in the biennium. \$71 million of this would be a continuous decrease. This amount would be in addition to an \$85 million reduction in the last biennium."

The Senate discussed benefits changes. FCC chair Kathryn VandenBosch reported "that this year FCC has had frequent discussions with President Bruininks and other senior administrators about various strategies that might be used to meet the anticipated budget challenges in the coming biennium. . . . Last week, representatives from the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) came to FCC to discuss feedback on proposed benefit changes which would shift some of the costs for health care from the University to employees. . . . The Administrative Working Group (AWG), the body which has oversight for the responsibility of the UPlan, has brought several proposals to the BAC this year with the goal of saving \$12 million per year starting in the next biennium. This amounts to five percent of the University's cost for health benefits. . . ." There was lengthy discussion and resolution from the Faculty Affairs Committee was adopted: " That HealthPartners negotiate in good faith to make its clinics available through Medica at the best possible price, keeping in mind the long term devotion of many University members to their HealthPartners clinics. . . ."

The Senate received a presentation on, and discussed at some length, light-rail transit.

#### April 14, 2011 Faculty Senate

Professor Kathryn VandenBosch, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that this is another budget-related discussion that will impact employees. At the FCC meeting on April 7, Jackie Singer and Vice President Carol Carrier were invited to discuss changes to the faculty retirement plan for new employees. . . . Since 1992 the University has contributed 13 percent of a faculty and academic professional member's salary to the retirement plan, along with 2.5 percent from the employee for a total contribution of 15.5 percent. A number of proposals were considered for current employees but as they were discarded, they will not be discussed today. The preferred proposal would decrease the University contribution for new employees to 10 percent. This will produce a total savings of \$3 million per year in the first year and this amount will grow as there is turnover. . . . Professor Dan Feeney, Chair of the Retirement Subcommittee, stated that his subcommittee is not advocating for this decrease. . . . The Retirement Subcommittee did not want to see the overall contribution for academic personnel drop from the current level, which would impact the replacement ratio. His subcommittee then passed a resolution, which was distributed for today's meeting, stating that the overall contribution level should remain at 15.5 percent for new employees, thereby increasing the employee contribution to 5.5 percent."

May 5, 2011 University Senate (6)

The Senate approved a motion from the Committees on Equity, Access, and Diversity, Student Affairs, and Social Concerns: "The University Senate supports the Academic Civility Work Group, which envisions 'a university culture that fosters academic excellence and promotes civil and respectful relationships through effective prevention of, and response to hostile, offensive, or intimidating behavior. . . .' The University Senate encourages the continued growth of a respectful culture for graduate and professional students by addressing University faculty and staff attitudes and behaviors in a systemic way through the following actions: . . ."

The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee and the Educational Policy Committee brought a resolution on classroom funding, the last paragraph of which was also endorsed by the Committee on Finance and Planning: "Classroom facilities and technologies require periodic maintenance and replacement, and identification of and planning for lifecycle costs is a fiscally prudent approach to management of classroom facilities and technology infrastructure. . . . The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) recommends a minimum level of recurring funding at 50% of lifecycle requirement to maintain the basic-level of maintenance and renewal of classroom infrastructure. CAS furthermore recommends restoring funding to 80% of need by the 2014-15 biennium, in order to provide a quality standard for classroom facilities, technology and support that is appropriate for a major, nationally ranked university." The Senate approved the statement.

In his report, "President Bruininks started by noting that as this was his last report to the Senate, he wanted to take the opportunity to state what a rare privilege it was to preside over this body. When reflecting over his last nine years as president, he has had some of his finest moments with the Senate as it courageously addresses long-range challenges at the University. . . ."

SCC chair Kathryn VandenBosch read a statement: "The Senate Consultative Committee, on behalf of the University Senate, expresses its deep appreciation to Robert Bruininks for his nine

years of leadership as President of the University, which include his service as Chair of this body. We commend his 43 years of service to the University: as a faculty member, as department chair, as dean of the College of Education, as Provost, and, most recently, as President. We thank him for his unswerving dedication to advancing the teaching, research, and public engagement missions of the University. We welcome him back to the faculty as a colleague whose energy and commitment we will continue to value as the University moves forward under the leadership of the next administration. The University Senate then gave a standing ovation to President Bruininks."

#### May 5, 2011 Faculty Senate

The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee reported a statement for information to the Faculty Senate: It "has taken note of the proposed reduction in the length of notice for non-renewal for Academic Professional and Administrative (P&A) employees. The current policy calls for a notice period of 12 months for employees with 11+ years of consecutive service, 6 months for those with 6-10 years of service, 3 months for those with 2-5 years, and 1 month for those with one year of service. The proposed policy calls for 6 months notice for those with 6+ years of consecutive service. . . . We are very concerned about the implications of these proposed changes for the academic freedom of P&A staff. The Board of Regents' policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility guarantees academic freedom to all members of the University community. We have discussed a number of times, however, the practical limit of this guarantee on staff members (and contract faculty members) who have annually-renewable appointments: Those whose continued employment at the University depends on the approbation of their superiors on a year-to-year basis could be at risk if, in fully exercising their academic freedom, they put themselves at odds with their superior. To shorten the notice period for P&A staff, and to reduce it to two weeks for part-time P&A staff, in our judgment, puts them at even greater risk."

Another resolution on the same topic was reported: "The Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) requests that the Office of Human Resources retain the 12-month notification period for all currently employed P&A staff. Revised notice periods, as currently proposed, should apply only to new P&A hires."

"In September 2010, a University vice president determined that a film, "Troubled Waters," (TW) that had been produced in the College of Food, Agriculture, Natural Resource Sciences as a sponsored project, was not appropriate for public release. Considerable controversy and discussion followed. In November 2010, the University's Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) asked the Academic Freedom and Tenure committee (AF&T) to respond to six inquiries regarding how the TW experience should be considered in light of our understanding of Academic Freedom and Responsibility at the University of Minnesota. This report is submitted in response to FCC's request." There was little discussion.

The Senate approved a change to the policy on teaching awards to extend eligibility to qualified P&A staff.

The Committee on Educational Policy proposed increasing the high-school preparation standards in mathematics from three years to four. It "has considered several times in recent years the idea that the mathematics requirement should be increased. It declined to make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate until the Provost's office had a plan to ensure that students would have the option of the fourth year available. Vice Provost McMaster has provided the Committee with such a plan, so it now recommends adoption of the new requirement." The Senate approved.

The Senate approved with little debate new graduate-education policies: Policy on Credit Requirements for Master's and Doctoral Degrees, Policy on Leave of Absence and Reinstatement from a Leave: Graduate Students, Policy on Application of Graduate Credits to Degree Requirements, and Policy on Appointments as Director of Graduate Studies. The comment for each policy was the same: "This policy has been reviewed several times by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Faculty Consultative Committee; both committees recommend the Faculty Senate adopt it."

#### October 6, 2011 University Senate (1)

It was reported, apropos equity in budget cuts: "In the face of necessary budget reductions, this administration will seriously consider all options available to ensure that impacts of budget cuts are handled humanely and without significant impact on any one group."

It was reported: The president indicated that "I appreciate and share the concerns of the SCFA with respect to the importance of maintaining access to the HealthPartners Clinics for our faculty and staff. Both HealthPartners and Medica received copies of your memo, and understand the importance of affordable access to HealthPartners clinics for University participants. . . ."

It was reported, with respect to funding for classrooms: The president indicated that "I appreciate the concerns expressed in the statement regarding classroom infrastructure and technology and the intent of the recommendation. Given the current financial uncertainties, however, I cannot endorse so specific a resolution."

SCC proposed and the Senate approved (unanimously without discussion) getting rid of trivial business; it granted to SCC authority to "correct grammatical and punctuation errors and to approve other non-substantive technical amendments in existing administrative policies previously approved by the University Senate and in University Senate documents (including the constitution, bylaws, and rules); such actions will be reported to the University Senate at its next meeting and the University Senate may then overrule the Senate Consultative Committee." The Faculty Senate did the same for FCC the same day.

The Senate approved a Resolution on Consultation Prior to Reorganization:

"The structure and organization of the University's academic units and central administration have a profound effect on faculty, staff, and students, and decisions about modifying those structures will benefit from the knowledge and experience of those affected. This resolution therefore identifies appropriate governance committees to be consulted before any major reorganization decision is made. To be effective, such consultation must occur early in the consideration of any such changes.

"For reorganizations in central administration, the consultation should be with appropriate University Senate committees. . . .

"This resolution replaces the 1999 Policy on Reorganization adopted by the University Senate, which itself replaced several existing policies dating from 1956 through 1971. The intent is to remove ambiguities in the 1999 policy and convert it to a resolution, to be agreed on by the President and the Senate."

"President Kaler said that it was a pleasure to be here and to chair his first Senate meeting. . . . He closed with a few themes that senators will hear throughout the year. The first is excellence. There is a need to look carefully at what the University does, move the things done well to excellence and look hard at things not done well, for any reason, and decide to step back and refocus resources on things that can be done more effectively and will have a larger impact. There will be a hard look at the business side, with staff and faculty buy-in, and, on the academic side, it is a faculty responsibility to look at the programs in an unemotional way and evaluate critically their quality. These are not easy conversations but will lead to improvements across the entire University. Access is critically important. Costs need to be controlled to mitigate the need for future tuition increases. . . ."

#### October 6, 2011 Faculty Senate

It was reported: The president indicated that "I appreciate the dedication and commitment that our faculty and staff demonstrate through their active participation in governance and wholly support their participation in these activities. I will ask Vice President Kathryn Brown to encourage all managers and supervisors to consider and recognize that participation in governance committees and activities is included in annual reviews of performance.

FCC reported that it had approved a policy change, in the policy on Adding, Changing, or Discontinuing Academic Plans, on behalf of the Faculty Senate: "Departments, colleges, and campuses have the authority to establish, change, and discontinue academic plans and sub-plans that may appear on official University transcripts, subject to the final authority of the Board of Regents. . . ."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported for information a statement: It "discussed a number of proposed changes to the University policy regarding non-renewal of P&A staff. SCFA supports many of the proposed changes, including the 'clarification that non-renewal is to be based on a reason, . . . ' There is one proposed change, however, that SCFA does not support. It is the proposal to shorten the period of notice of non-renewal in the case of long-time employees (10 completed years of service) from one year to six months. It does not appear to the Committee that shortening the notice period for long-time P&A employees would result in any significant benefit to the institution. . . ."

The Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) reported an item for discussion, a Report on Vice Presidential Units at the University of Minnesota. ". . . questions regarding the size and scope of administration are widely discussed. A natural corollary to this question about administration is the associated cost. . . . The SCFP recognized it was relatively uninformed about the size and scope of many administrative activities and felt that presentations from the

vice presidents would be helpful in its understanding and fulfilling its job of advising the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Faculty and University Senates and administration. To accomplish this, the SCFP met with heads of eight vice presidential units. . . . A number of observations, conclusions and suggestions arose from these discussions. This report does not focus on any specific unit because each is distinct in its mission and scope of activities. Nonetheless, there are generalizations that can be made and should be considered by President Kaler. . . . The following observations and suggestions should be considered in the context of strengthening the education, research, and service missions of the institution. . . ."

FCC initiated a discussion of gender equity in faculty salaries, noting first a message from Provost Sullivan: "I received today a report from an independent consultant regarding a statistical analysis of faculty salaries by gender on the Twin Cities campus. The report is the result of a process begun by the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC), which presented to me in May 2010 an analysis that indicated the existence of a gap between male and female faculty salaries on the Twin Cities campus. . . ." There was considerable discussion.

The Faculty Senate by unanimous consent adopted two motions, one from Finance and Planning and this one from FCC: "We join our colleagues on the Committee on Finance and Planning in expressing our deep sadness at the death of Professor Judith Martin. As former member and chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee, and in her many other roles in and outside of governance, she contributed enormously to the well-being of faculty, staff, and students at the University."

#### December 1, 2011 University Senate (2)

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure reported for information a statement it had adopted for parents: "Academic freedom is the cornerstone of a university. At the University of Minnesota, as elsewhere, it means the freedom to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write on matters of public concern.

"Academic freedom includes the freedom to discuss all matters relevant to a course and may include presentation and/or discussion of diverse viewpoints on controversial matters. Students are responsible for learning the content of any course in which they enroll, and the learning process may include discussion about and reflection on varying points of view. . . ."

On recommendation of SCC, the Senate approved without debate changes to the Outside Consulting and Other Professional Commitments policy. "Assistant Vice President Sharon Reich Paulson from the Provost's Office said that changes to this policy came about during the regular process of review for all University policies. No substantive changes were made. The goal was to make this policy consistent with the format of other University policies, to make it clearer and to clarify questions, and to make sure that wording was consistent with the new Conflict of Interest policy."

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure presented for discussion a White Paper on academic freedom. " In 2011 the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure discussions addressed current thought about these aspects of University work. These discussions, which came about because of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the case of



*Garcetti v. Ceballos* and because of the controversy surrounding the release of the film *Troubled Waters*, led to the preparation of this White Paper. These discussions are contained in the minutes of the committee and the Senate for 2009-11." There was considerable debate and concerns expressed; a motion to suspend the rules (requiring a 2/3 vote) and delay presentation to the Regents only failed by 6 votes (114-60).

#### December 1, 2011 Faculty Senate

The Research Committee reported for information a letter it had sent to the Office of Human Research Protections: "As the official response from the University of Minnesota points out (question 59), adopting HIPAA-like standards for all types of research will constitute a substantial new burden to researchers and will impede our work, contrary to the purpose of this review of the Common Rule. . . . One of the proposals in the ANPRM is to make the consent document specify what kind of research could be done in the future with biospecimens collected for purposes other than research, even if de-identified (question 14). Requiring that level of detail in any consent document will impose important limits on the research that could be done with that sample without adding any protection for the subject. . . ."

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure reported on revised Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, which "are adopted by approval of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (see *Faculty Tenure* subsections 7.4, 7.61, and 16.3). They become effective after they are reported to the Faculty Senate and the Board of Regents for information. . . ." A summary of the proposed changes was presented.

The Council on Liberal Education recommended a change in the liberal education requirements and concluded: "The Council believes that reducing the required number of theme courses from five to four has several benefits. It gives students more flexibility in meeting their liberal education requirements, it facilitates program planning, and it decreases the likelihood of delaying graduation. It does these things while still paying significantly more attention to thematic issues and ways of thinking than was the case under the old LE requirements. . . ." The Senate approved without debate.

The Senate discussed graduate education metrics, drawn from the report *Mission and Scope: A Vision for Enrollment Management* at the University of Minnesota. Former FCC chair Kathryn VandenBosch, "along with [former FCC vice chair] John Sullivan, served for 18 months as members, along with administrators, faculty, staff, and students, of the enrollment management committee appointed by the Provost, a group that became known as the Size, Scope, and Mission committee. . . . She and Professor Sullivan served on the graduate and professional subcommittee. . . . The subcommittee then made the following four recommendations. First that the Graduate School establish an all-University committee of top researchers to evaluate graduate training and scholarship. Second that it use diversified metrics to assess programs and categorize them as outstanding, strong, good, or needs reassessment based on quality. This categorization is already done by the Graduate School but it should be more transparent going forward. Third that it provide supplemental funding to programs categorized as outstanding. Finally, the Graduate School should take action on under-performing programs. The metrics can

be used to identify shortcomings, reorganize, or close programs. . . ." There was lengthy discussion.

### March 1, 2012 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure reported a resolution that had been endorsed by FCC: "The Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee expresses its deep appreciation to Tom Sullivan for his seven years of leadership as Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost at the University of Minnesota. We commend his consistent efforts to strengthen academic freedom at the University, his tireless support of faculty governance, and his constant efforts to strengthen the academic base that sustains the tenure policy as a cornerstone of the University. . . ."

The Research Committee reported a statement it had adopted on the Value and Measurement of Scholarship at the University of Minnesota Whether or Not Externally Funded. Following opening language, the statement declared that "The productivity of all faculty members at the University has value, whether externally funded or not. . . . But equating innovations with sponsored funding is misguided; it is not money alone but ideas that expand the boundaries of both the arts and sciences. This rapid advancement of the enterprise has also been driven by scholars with little more than access to a good library and pen and pencil. Those in the humanities and arts operate with little financial support yet their scholarly work—symphonies, books, performances, and exhibits, to name a few—has a dramatic impact on our students, our communities, and culture as a whole. . . ."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported for information approval of a policy change with respect to emeriti faculty, with this new language: "(b) The president, following notice to the faculty member and an opportunity to be heard on the issue, may withhold or withdraw the emeritus title in circumstances: (1) where a faculty member has retired during suspension or termination proceedings initiated under Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; or (2) where evidence presented to the president demonstrates that the faculty member has engaged in conduct that violates the standards of Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*."

The Faculty Senate added the campus at Rochester as a voting unit of the senate.

The Senate approved new policies on graduate education, Readmission and Changes to Master's or Doctoral Degree Objectives, Post-baccalaureate Certificate Plans Approved by the Board of Regents, and Admission for Master's and Doctoral Degrees.

### March 1, 2012 University Senate (3)

It was reported, apropos of personal floating holidays, "After careful consideration of the senate resolution, I am pleased to approve this request. . . ."

SCC reported for information a statement it had adopted unanimously on salaries:

"The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) commends the thoughtful discussions in the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) and the Senate Committee on Finance and

Planning (SCFP) pertaining to salary instructions to units for the next fiscal year.

Cogent arguments were made with respect to the importance of a salary increase system that is based on merit, but also advancing the notion that merit can encompass everyday contributions, sustained loyally in the face of diminishing resources, increased workloads, and salary freezes.

"Considering the various options discussed by the committees, SCC recommends to the administration that a tangible proportion of recurring funds for salary increases be distributed in a progressive fashion (e.g., as a constant dollar amount for low-income employees that decreases ultimately to zero with increasing salary), with the remainder being dedicated to pay increases based solely on merit criteria. Such an approach addresses the disproportionate impact that recent increases in employee-paid health insurance costs had on the lowest paid members of the University workforce, while preserving an emphasis on merit-based compensation for those at the other end of the earnings spectrum. . . ."

The Committee on Faculty Affairs reported a statement it had issued on salaries: It "recommends to the President of the University of Minnesota that any salary increase that is earmarked for faculty and P&A employees to take effect in FY2013 be divided into two components as follows: 50% in an across-the-board allotment of equal percentage to all, and 50% to be distributed on the basis of normal merit reviews. . . ."

The Committee on Finance and Planning reported a statement it had issued on salaries:

1. Salary increases should be based on merit;
2. Merit should be understood to include general support of the unit as well as outstanding performance; and
3. The period for calculating merit should be four years, back to the time of the last significant salary increase."

The Library Committee reported for information a letter it had sent:

"Dear Members of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee:

"The undersigned organizations and institutions write to express our strong concerns with H.R. 3699, the Research Works Act, which has been referred to your Committee. This bill would impede public access to valuable research results from work funded by federal agencies. . . ."

The president gave his State of the University address.

#### April 5, 2012 University Senate (4)

The Senate Library Committee reported for information: "The Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA) of 2012 (S. 2096/H.R. 4004) was introduced to the House and the Senate on February 9, 2012 with robust bipartisan sponsorship. FRPAA would require that any federal agencies with annual extramural research budgets greater than \$100 million provide public access to the published results of funded research within six months after publication. The University of Minnesota Senate Library Committee members write in support of FRPAA; we believe increasing access to research stimulates progress and innovation within the academic enterprise, in industry, and in broader social contexts. . . ."

#### April 5, 2012 Faculty Senate

The Committee on Educational Policy proposed and the Senate approved changes suggested: "Currently if an undergraduate student has not declared a major or been admitted to a program by the time he or she has completed 60 credits, colleges will place a hold on the student's record that stops the student from being able to register for courses. For some colleges, the 60-credit mark is too late in the student's career; many of our undergraduate students reach the 60+ mark after spring semester of their sophomore year. Colleges have requested the flexibility to apply the "major declaration hold" to student records earlier in the credit total, when programmatically warranted. This would force students who may be off track (either through course choices or GPA) for their desired major to meet with an adviser to discuss alternative plans."

The Senate approved a change to the administrative policy on High School Preparation Requirements for Undergraduates and Admissions for Undergraduates: "If a student has been admitted with a missing HS prep, do not require the student to satisfy it as a requirement for graduation. HS preps will continue to be tracked and noted on a student's record by Admissions. The 'missing HS preps' service indicators will still be visible to advisers, to help inform the advising considerations for each student."

The Faculty Senate approved with little debate new policies on graduate education: Master's Degree: Performance Standards and Progress, Master's Degree: Completion, Doctoral Degree: Performance Standards and Progress, and Doctoral Degree: Completion.

#### May 3, 2012 University Senate (5)

"The Senate Library Committee proposes that University of Minnesota establish an institutional fund to underwrite University of Minnesota authors' costs in making their published works openly accessible. The fund would be supported by both the Office of the Vice President for Research and the University Libraries, and would be overseen by a review panel comprised of sponsors and faculty, with a role of reviewing eligibility (not content). The fund would cover all scholars on all campuses. . . ."

"The Senate Consultative Committee found that it was too complicated to ask central officers to consider which of a multitude of committees they should involve in searches. This revision [of the protocol on searches] provides that the chair of SCC will receive all requests for participation in searches and will consult with the different senate constituent groups with each search. This change is intended to simplify and streamline the process of consultation on and participation in searches." The Senate approved.

The Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee proposed that the "University Senate supports the Equity Access and Diversity Committee's (EAD) proposal to establish a Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Community Service Pledge Drive to honor the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr." The Senate approved.

SCC proposed a resolution: "The University Senate of the University of Minnesota, composed of faculty, staff, and student representatives, opposes the amendment to the State of Minnesota's

constitution to 'provide that only a union of one man and one woman shall be valid or recognized as a marriage in Minnesota.'" After short debate, the Senate approved.

The Senate approved a resolution from the Classroom Advisory Committee: "The Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) supports the Office of Classroom Management and its planning for lifecycle maintenance and renewal. CAS recommends no further cuts to the classroom lifecycle funds to maintain the basic-level of maintenance and renewal of classroom infrastructure. CAS furthermore recommends restoring funding to the FY08 levels by the 2016-17 biennium, in order to provide a quality standard for classroom facilities, technology and support that is appropriate for a major, nationally ranked university. . . ."

FCC chair Chris Cramer "said that each year at the last Senate meeting, grading data provided in the docket are presented for the prior academic year. They are often in a still smaller font than that used here and, with nary a ripple, the stone of the grade distributions sinks into the pond of disinterest, and the Faculty Senate goes on to the next agenda item. For a change, he would like to engage senators in a somewhat more thoughtful discussion of the topic.

"In particular, he stated his own alarm and dismay at the degree to which grade compression has infected some of the colleges. He noted that while this phenomenon is sometimes called grade inflation, that ignores the fact that an A grade has nowhere to which to inflate, no more exciting letter having yet been invented."

The Faculty Senate discussed grading.

The Women's Faculty Cabinet and Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee reported: "In light of recent reports on salary equity (conducted by the WFC and external consultant Dr. Murray Clayton) that found unexplained gender gaps in faculty salaries, the WFC and EAD considered a variety of possible University responses. In part 1, we identify key principles for a thorough response that aims to address current inequities and minimize future concerns. Parts 2-4 offer more detailed recommendations for monitoring salary equity by gender, identifying possible salary adjustments for faculty, providing training to department chairs/heads and deans. . . ."

The Faculty Senate approved revisions to the policy on University-Administered Graduate Student Fellowships and Traineeships. "The basic goals of the policy are 1) to provide information to units about basic rules and alert students and units of the rules, 2) to remind everyone that selection is through an equitable, transparent, and justifiable process without any micro-level rules being included in the policy, and 3) to clarify the difference between fellowships and traineeships and other forms of monetary compensation for graduate students which reflect employment."