

2002-03 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

MARCH 27, 2003

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 4
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES: No. 4
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 5
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 5**

The fourth meeting of the University Senate, Twin Cities Campus Assembly, and Faculty Senate for 2002-03 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, March 27, 2003, at 2:36 p.m., as a joint meeting of the three bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 117 voting faculty/academic professional members, 26 voting student members, 2 ex officio members, and 1 non-member. President Robert H. Bruininks presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Bruininks announced that today's musical prelude was performed by Mollie Markuson. The University Senate provided a round of applause. President Bruininks then said that the Faculty Consultative Committee elections end on March 18. The ballot is available online, and any faculty senator who has not yet voted is encouraged to do so. Lastly, a Faculty Senate meeting has been scheduled for May 22 to discuss possible budget implications.

2. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 20, 2003

Action

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/020220sen.html>

**CAROL WELLS, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

3. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Phillip P. Allen
Professor
Horticultural Science – Waseca
1922- 2002

Kinley Brauer
Professor
History
1935 – 2003

William S. Hays
Professor
Surgery
1964 – 2002

Ralph L. Hossfeld
Professor
Forest Resources
1914 – 2003

Andrew Hustrulid
Professor
Biosystems/Agricultural Engineering
1905 –2003

Ralph H. Hopp
Director
Wilson Library
1915 – 2003

Albert B. Matongo
Professor
Social Sciences – Morris
1957 – 2003

Paul E. Meehl
Professor
Psychology
1920 – 2003

Carol J. Pederson
Professor
Nursing
1939 – 2003

Charles J. Scott
Professor
Mechanical Engineering
1929 – 2003

STUDENTS

Brent Hendrickson
College of Liberal Arts

Christopher Jenkins
Carlson School of Management

Troy A. Sikkink
Medical School

Aaron I. Sinykin
College of Liberal Arts

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

University Senate

Constitutional Amendment (Vice Chair Eligibility)

Approved by the: University Senate October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

Constitutional Amendment (Electronic voting)

Approved by the: University Senate October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

Constitutional Amendment (Faculty voting on tenure and Judicial Committee matters)

Approved by the: University Senate October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

Faculty Senate

Resolution to Eliminate the Waiting Period for the Faculty Retirement Plan

Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 3, 2002

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING (Response due date January 3, 2003)**

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Academic Unit Governance Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 20, 2003

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING (Response due date May 20, 2003)**

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Constitutional Amendment (Vice Chair Eligibility)

Approved by the: TCCA October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

Constitutional Amendment (Electronic voting)

Approved by the: TCCA October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

5. CLERK OF THE SENATE/ASSEMBLY REPORT Nominating Committee Election Results Information for the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill vacancies on Nominating Committee, Professor W. Andrew Collins and Mr. Michael Darger were elected to three-year terms (July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2006).

**CAROL WELLS, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

6. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Statement on the Regents Search Information for the University Senate

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.

**DANIEL FEENEY, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**7. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
Student Protest Resolution
Information for the University Senate**

Student Protest Resolution

Whereas the University of Minnesota encourages students to become active participants in the democratic process, and

Whereas the University of Minnesota seeks to internationalize the curriculum and encourage students to become conscious actors in the world community, and

Whereas demonstrations and protests are a fundamental aspect of political involvement and expression in a democracy, and

Whereas some political issues are so significant that they supersede the content of a single lecture, discussion, or lab in importance in the student's life and learning

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.

Faculty Sponsors who brought the statement to the Committee on Social Concerns:

- Daniel Brewer, Associate Professor, French and Italian;
- Juliette Cherbuliez, Assistant Professor, French and Italian;
- Carol Chomsky, Professor, Law School;
- Lisa Disch, Associate Professor, Political Science;
- Katherine Fennelly, Professor, Humphrey Institute;
- David L. Fox, Geology and Geophysics;
- Woods Halley, Professor, Physics and Astronomy;
- Kristine F. Miller, Assistant Professor, Landscape Architecture;
- Mark Pedelty, Associate Professor, General College;
- Philip Regal, Professor, Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior;

- Wade Savage, Professor, Philosophy;
- Joe Schwartzberg, Professor Emeritus, Geography;
- George R. Spangler, Professor, Fisheries and Wildlife

Adopted unanimously by the Senate Committee on Social Concerns on March 3, 2003

**MARK PEDELTY, CHAIR
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE**

8. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Daniel Feeney, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), stated that much of the work of the committee has been consulting on budgetary issues. Only now is the committee considering specific numbers and budget balancing by targeted cuts versus tuition versus administrative structure changes. There is also a Budget Advisory Committee, with administrative and faculty appointments, that is shepherding this process.

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) decided that Regents Professors, McKnight Professors, and members of the Academy of Distinguished Teachers were under-utilized groups. Members from these groups will be asked to serve on one of two task forces, Academic Freedom at a Land-Grant Institution and Instrumentalization.

The next FCC meeting will be a discussion dedicated to items that were raised during the Inauguration Panel discussion.

There are several ongoing initiatives. One is the Accountability Task Force, which should have results by mid-summer to early fall. Another item is the IRB process. A questionnaire is being sent to ask about the IRB services.

In closing, Professor Feeney noted that the Academic Unit Governance Policy was approved at the last meeting. Further discussions will take place with the Medical School, in the hope of producing revisions that are less damaging to clinicians scholars.

9. SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Standards for the Semester Conversion

Action by the University Senate

(15 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend Section 5A of the "Standards for the Semester Conversion" as follows (new language is underlined):

SECTION 4A: 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), averaged over the term, in order to complete the work of the course. 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. 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.

Instructional units should periodically review course syllabi to determine whether the course credit is appropriate.

All courses proposed for the semester calendar shall include a student workload statement demonstrating how the course conforms to this policy. College and campus curriculum committees and other approving bodies (e.g., the Council on Liberal Education) must consider the student workload statement in reaching a decision on whether to approve a proposed semester course, and should normally reject any course which does not meet, or significantly exceeds, the requirement of three hours of academic work per week for each course credit.

It is understood that professional norms and the nature of the activity may in some cases require more than three hours of work per week or 45 hours per semester per credit. Clinical experiences, some laboratory work, and some studio activities may be unable to adhere to this three-hour-per-credit standard; with college approval and with appropriate notification to the student of the amount of work expected for the course or educational experience (e.g., in class schedules, bulletins, or syllabi), demands on the student in excess of the 45 hours per semester credit are permissible.

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.

A contact hour is defined for these purposes as formal instruction by an individual appointed for that purpose by the department or faculty member, including faculty members, graduate teaching assistants, teaching specialists, or, in unusual instances, advanced undergraduates. This standard applies to all enrollment periods. The student workload statement (required in the preceding section) must justify fewer total contact hours than the number of credits for the course times the number of weeks the course is offered; contact hours of all types equal to or in excess of at least one hour per week per credit, on average, need not be justified. College and campus curriculum committees and other approving bodies (e.g., the Council on Liberal Education) must consider the contact hours in reaching a decision on whether to approve a proposed semester course; such bodies should normally reject course proposals which have fewer contact hours than the number of credits times the number of weeks the course is offered, barring significant evidence that reduced instructional contact hours are appropriate.

Explicitly exempted from this standard are research seminars, studio courses, clinical

experiences, correspondence courses and independent study, directed study or readings or field work, directed research, internships and practicums, honors thesis credits, and other experiences faculty offer to students outside the normal laboratory or classroom setting (many of which include activities beyond the physical boundaries of the campuses). Included in the standard are interactive video classes (which in practice should be no different from in-class instruction) and one-way transmission of instruction from the instructor to the students (it is assumed that other avenues of two-way interaction are used in this instance, such as email and the telephone).

COMMENT:

The Committee on Educational Policy was asked whether Section 5A should be repealed and Section 4A left as the controlling language for student academic workload. After extended discussion, the Committee concluded that 5A, if modified with the addition of one word so that it was not unnecessarily rigid, remained a useful rule governing the amount of contact time that should accompany a course. The Committee concluded it would be unwise to eliminate the rule because having it sets a standard to which the University should continue generally to adhere, eliminating it might allow slippage over the years, and because to do so could unnecessarily cause difficulties for the University at a time of significant budget difficulties.

The Committee thus recommends the Senate approve the one-word amendment.

The Senate Consultative Committee voted 6-5 in favor of the motion.

**MARTIN SAMPSON, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Martin Sampson, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that while there is much text in this motion, only one word is being added. Section 4 will remain unchanged since it ties class credits to student workload. Section 5 ties class credits to contact time between faculty and students, and this is where the change is being proposed.

SCEP considered removing Section 5, but instead decided to just polish the language by adding the word 'normally' instead of adding more exceptions to the list in the third paragraph.

A senator expressed his opposition to this amendment since a one word change can have enormous impact on this policy. The language was originally written to try and transform a chaotic relationship between credit hours and contact hours. While many things of educational value can take place outside of the classroom, this language leaves a loophole for great variance in contact hours between colleges and departments. Until someone can assess the value of what is taking place outside of the classroom and can monitor these activities, the University Senate should not approve this policy change.

Professor Sampson stated that SCEP is sympathetic to the problem that existed before semester conversion, but this Section already allows for fewer contact hours in given circumstances.

A senator then said that it is wrong to focus efforts on contact hours, since the focus is being placed on teaching rather than learning. An average amount also does not work since teaching takes place with the class as a whole and not individually for each student. That said, the senator is in support of the motion since the amendment makes it more accommodating.

Professor Dan Feeney, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that SCC did not discuss eliminating Section 5, but centered on the one word addition. The concern was this amendment would dilute the relationship between credit hours and contact hours. The decision rests between flexibility in an area where there has been abuse in the past or rigidity in this area.

Another senator then said SCEP was unanimous in its decision on this amendment. One issue that strongly influenced the vote was the increased use of instructional technology and its challenge of learning tied to seat time. More disciplines expect students and faculty to be engaged in learning outside of the classroom. This amendment allows for this type of flexibility.

A senator then expressed concern about this amendment since the addition is incredibly vague. He was worried about the amount of teaching time that might be received if this amendment is approved. Students want to be in class to learn from faculty and hear their analysis and thoughts on the course topics. While there are some classes that just need to provide students with basic guidance, such as a major paper class, most classes should be meeting according to the number of credits. Exemptions to this section should continue to be listed, and limited to those, in the section.

Professor Sampson stated that in SCEP's view, 'normally' referred to the status quo. If there is a situation where contact hours have been drastically cut, SCEP will get involved in the circumstances for this decrease.

Another senator said that exemptions in this policy are current course options that have been subjected to critical analysis and SCEP has determined that it is appropriate to have learning take place outside of the classroom in these courses. If the amendment is approved, it allows departments and colleges to circumvent this critical analysis.

With no further discussion a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 75 in favor and 46 opposed.

APPROVED

**10. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Student Conduct Code
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve amendments to the Student Conduct. A paper copy of the changes is available in the Senate Office.

DISCUSSION:

Professor Dan Feeney, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), stated that the major impetus behind this policy revision was to bring it into compliance for format with other Regents policies. Other changes were also made to modernize the language use and incorporate technology. Parts of the policy were also rearranged. The most controversial issue during the revision process was the question of jurisdiction. Discussions were held on this topic, and it was decided that jurisdiction would not be changed in this draft.

Ryan Osero, Student Senate Chair, noted that the Student Senate, earlier today, unanimously approved this policy. The approval was with the understanding that jurisdiction would be defined as University-owned property, issues related to the classroom environment, or when officially representing the University. Since jurisdiction was not re-defined in this revision, the 30 years of precedent would continue to define jurisdiction.

A senator then noted that while these changes represent improvements, this is still a bad policy. These revisions should be supported, but more work should be done to revise the policy. The main reason for more revisions is that this policy attempts to mix legalese with vagueness. The policy tries to state that issues will be dealt with in a sensible and rational way as they arise, but then itemizes each issue.

The senator noted that there are several inconsistencies within the policy. First, the policy states that it is critical to the University that people are open to change. Does this mean that if people are on the mall saying no to war that they better be willing to open themselves up to war or they are not part of an academic community?

Second, the policy talks about issues of breach of peace without documenting in the text that it is scoped to breach of peace within the campus and the area that is appropriate. Does this mean that a student wandering off to Washington D.C. and participating in what may be an appropriate and educational, but non-peaceful, protest is only by understanding and not by the letter of this policy, protected from University action?

Third, the policy notes that students are expected to support the law rather than obey the law, even while they may be working to undermine it and have it overturned. The policy says twice, “supportive of democratic and lawful procedures” and talks about supporting the applicable laws of the state and national government. Even if this old text was edited, it was left in a way that is weak.

Fourth, the policy addresses students obtaining tests without authorization. Does this mean that students cannot keep files of old exams not being given this semester, and share these among students? Are they subject to prosecution?

Fifth, the policy addresses disturbing studying wherever it happens. Does this mean that if students are tossing a ball around on the mall and someone says that it disturbs them, are they in violation?

Sixth, the policy talks about falsification but does not go far enough. There is nothing in the policy that makes it a violation of University rules to falsify letters of recommendation in an application before being admitted to the University, although this is within the jurisdiction of the University. The policy also makes persistent and repeated violations a violation on its own, which seems to be a case of double jeopardy. Most of the penalties cannot be applied to organizations though the policy claims that it is about organizations. You cannot withhold the diploma of an organization. It does not say whether the officers of the organization are responsible.

The senator then proposed that a solution may be to separate the document into at least two parts. The heart of the policy, which would be good, is really a community code of conduct, which does not apply differently to students, faculty, or staff, and which does not allow anyone to be prevented from learning. If there was such a policy, it might be possible to make it broad in terms that could be agreed upon. The few student-specific items could then be contained in a separate policy. While the senator does not oppose approval of the policy, he does oppose not making further revisions.

Another senator agreed with the previous speaker, and noted that the rights to free speech need to be supported. When this issue was addressed at the Student Senate meeting, the response received was that the Constitution trumps anything within this policy. At the moment, this answer is fine, but the issue should not be dropped. The University should be in compliance with a person's constitutional right to speak. Regarding jurisdiction, the definition provided is not in the policy, but is interpreted through precedent. The senator would feel more comfortable if the jurisdiction language was specifically listed within the policy.

The senator then made a motion to suspend the rules to consider an amendment to the original motion. The motion to suspend the rules was seconded and a vote was taken. The motion was not approved with 52 in favor and 61 opposed.

A senator then said that they are opposed to the policy since the item descriptions are unclear. If these descriptions are approved for the students, they would likely also be approved for faculty and staff. One issue in this policy relates to weapons on campus. Many faculty and staff hunt in the morning, come to campus, and park in a University facility with their gun locked in a case in the trunk. Other faculty carry pocket knives. Under this policy, these cases would be in violation.

Professor John S. Anderson, Chair of the Student Conduct Code Review Committee, stated that it is difficult to incorporate every possible situation in one document. The policy language was made less specific to be able to cover all possible situations in as few pages as possible.

A senator then offered a friendly amendment to Section III, (1), to reorder the wording to read "...or to obtain grades, honors, awards, or professional endorsements dishonestly;..."

This change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

With no further discussion a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

MOTION A
UNIVERSITY SENATE/TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY
CONSTITUTION, BYLAWS, AND RULES AMENDMENTS
Action by All Bodies

COMMENT:

Agenda Items 11. through 12. are offered as a one motion to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator.

As an amendment to the Assembly Bylaws, a motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Assembly (100) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Assembly present and voting at each of two meetings.

11. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Intercollegiate Athletics
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 6 the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws, as follows (new language is underlined):

6. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

...

The Regents Policy declares that all aspects of the programs will be administered by central administration, the athletic directors, and the coaches, with direct oversight and involvement by the faculty representatives through an Assembly committee. (Sec. III, subd. 10, para. 2), but also provides that a committee of this Assembly is responsible for the formulation of all policy on intercollegiate athletics within the policies provided by the Board. (Sec. III, subd. 13.) All policies formulated by the committees established by this bylaw will be reported to the Assembly Steering Committee for action and to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly for information after the Assembly Steering Committee has acted. The Assembly has the authority to reverse or change a decision by the Steering Committee.

...

COMMENT:

Before the establishment of the two existing committees that deal with intercollegiate athletics, the bylaw governing the athletic committee provided that all policy approvals and policy changes

were to be brought from the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics to the Assembly Steering Committee. When the new bylaws were adopted, there was no language establishing how policies were to be approved or changed.

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. Such a process would also slow down the approval.

**DANIEL FEENEY, CHAIR
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE**

**12. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Committee on Committees
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly**

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 2 the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws, as follows (new language is underlined):

2. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Senate Committee on Committees

The Senate Committee on Committees appoints members of certain committees of the Senate and advises the Senate Consultative Committee on the committee structure of the Senate. The faculty/academic professional representatives shall serve as the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees and the student representatives shall serve as the Student Senate Committee on Committees.

Membership

The Senate Committee on Committees shall be composed of at least 13 and no more than 15 elected tenured or tenure-track faculty members, at least 2 and no more than 4 elected academic professional members, 6 elected undergraduate students, and one elected graduate/professional student.

COMMENT:

As the Nominating Committee was identifying candidates for the Faculty Committee on Committees, it concluded it would be able to bring more breadth to the membership if it had

somewhat more flexibility in appointing faculty from various colleges and disciplines. It thus proposes that it be given the authority to nominate individuals for between 13 and 15 slots. By the same token, it wished to have somewhat more flexibility in identifying candidates for the P&A positions.

This recommendation does not impinge on the student membership of the committee because the two groups only rarely meet together--and when they have recently, there has been no disagreement on issues. The Nominating Committee would not, in any event, be opposed to a similar expansion of the student membership, if the students wished. For now, however, the Nominating Committee would like the option of flexibility as it considers members for 2003-04.

**CHARLES CAMPBELL, CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was not approved with only 97 in favor, none opposed, and one abstention.

NOT APPROVED

END OF MOTION A

13. 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. The way the reduction works, is that if the University can cut more in the first year, then the University will be in better shape for the second year. This state cut would amount to a 10 percent decrease in the workforce or a 30 percent tuition increase.

In going forward, a framework for discussions was needed. This framework, along with framing values and principles, was presented to the Regents to help with the decision-making. He also told the Regents that a cut of this size will require shared sacrifices, as well as decisions to stop doing some things that are currently done or doing more with less.

At the same time, he was clear with respect to the students that tuition and fees will increase over the next biennium, but he opposed mid-year tuition increases as a fix to the rescission. He has stated that it should be possible to keep the tuition increase at the level that the governor has recommended, but the University is not bound by this recommendation.

He stated that reductions will also need to be made in administrative and operating costs. These reductions will take a longer time to implement since it forces the University to look at how it spends and manages all its resources. He would prefer some of these initiatives rather than employee layoffs and decreased graduate student support.

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. A long wage freeze sends the message that this is not a place to work, the University loses competitiveness in attracting new faculty, and current faculty leave for other jobs. He would like to propose other alternatives to simply eliminating positions, such as shared health care costs.

President Bruininks said that there are several strategies for balancing the budget. The University will target elimination/consolidation of programs, enhancing revenues through increased pricing, and increases in tuition. The budget presented to the Regents will also include an investment component and will maintain the status of academic programs. Before any plans are finalized, consultation will take place so that all strategies are implemented respectfully.

He then thanked the faculty and students for their efforts and rallies at the capital. These efforts made people listen to the University's concerns. The grassroots support has also been impressive this year. The simple message at the capitol has been to protect the University for future generations and to allow the University the maximum degree of flexibility in dealing with these issues. The University will survive these difficult challenges, but it must commit itself to maintaining a strong sense of community during this process.

In closing, he said that he enjoyed Founder's Week and the wonderful events that accompanied it.

14. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: While all colleges can appreciate that sacrifices needed to be shared equally, there is currently a nursing shortage in the state. In response to the legislature last year, the college increased its enrollment to address the shortage. How can colleges equally share the burden when the workforce demands for colleges are very different?

A: In the first phase of the budget crisis, the University received a rescission. The decision was made to share this equally among the colleges and administrative units so that every unit was paying attention and so that budgets could be rebased. Along with the amount of the cut, instructions were provided to protect students by finding the funds through administrative cuts. In the second phase, a different plan will be used to find cost reductions without tapping academic budgets. Some units will also be looked at differently.

Q: If the University decreases its workforce, will it also decrease the number of buildings and land that it owns as well? Can the University afford the debt?

A: While there has been coverage lately of the University's attempts to purchase land, this is the

first step in a condemnation procedure and does not affect the current budget. It is good policy to try and purchase land that the University knows that it will need in the future, especially on this campus. The University cannot afford to keep building and acquiring more debt. The current strategy will focus more on remodeling current facilities, making more effective use of space, improving infrastructure in buildings, and more private funding for building projects. The Twin Cities campus has the oldest public buildings in the state, and they deserve attention and preservation. The University also needs to inventory its property to see if they can be made more productive.

Q: What is the University opinion on the high tuition/high aid model being presented to the legislature?

A: There are two proposals. One tries to adjust the current state aid program for inflationary increases. The governor proposed taking \$30 million each from the University and MnSCU for this proposal. While this is not helpful for the University, no objection was raised since it is an attempt to invest more in state grants. The other proposal is from the Minnesota Private College Council (MPCC) would take \$100 million each from the University and MnSCU to be used in a voucher-driven approach to funding public higher education. While the current program provides 53 percent of the benefit to roughly one-third of the private college students, University students receive only 18 percent of the benefit. The proposal is a bad idea. In 1945, 50 percent of students attended private institutions and 50 percent attended public institutions. Since World War II, 15 million more students attend post-secondary institutions. The majority of this growth and access has taken place through public institutions. At the University, 40 percent of students are graduate and professional students, but they are not eligible for state grant funds and would be further hurt by the MPCC proposal. The research infrastructure would also be devastated by this reduction.

15. REPORT OF THE FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS

Discussion by the Faculty Senate

Professor Fred Morrison, a Faculty Legislative Liaison, said that over the next few weeks open forums will be held by the legislators in their districts. All faculty should attend these for a and speak in favor of higher education funding. Also, faculty should keep contacting their legislators by phone, email, and paper. Lastly, budget targets will be set by April 2 with budgets finalized by May 19.

16. RETIREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Post-Retirement Health Care Savings Plan

Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following plan:

The merits of a post-retirement health care savings plan (PRHCSP) are evident. A key concern to present (and certainly future) retirees is the cost of health care, which now comes from their

post-tax dollars. This is often a rude awakening for faculty entering retirement, as during employment the University not only covers the major portion of the cost, but most additional costs come from an employee's pre-tax dollars.

A PRHCSP has the advantages that each of our present 401a, 403b and 457 plans have; all University and employee contributions come from pre-tax dollars and earnings on the balance invested are not subject to income taxes. The contributions can be invested in one or more funds chosen by the employee from a select group of investment options. A PRHCSP has another very important advantage; upon retirement or termination of employment from the University, withdrawals to pay for health insurance premiums and other appropriate health care costs are not considered to be taxable income. Thus, the PRHCSP avoids taxation on contributions as they go in, on accumulated investment earnings, and on tax post-employment distributions when used for health care.

We believe there is no question that the University should embrace this plan. However, there are questions about the amounts to go into the savings plan and the source of these funds. The rules of the program say that each individual in a given "class" must put in the same amount (\$ or % of salary). This "class" cannot be directly defined by age. However, those nearing retirement would probably want to (and certainly should) put in more than younger faculty as they have fewer years to put in funds or have the earnings accrue.

Recommendations:

- 1) For Faculty Members* the "class" is defined as the number of years employed at the University.
- 2) Plan contributions will be collected and invested by Minnesota Life Insurance Company.
- 3) Claim payouts will be managed by the University's Employee Benefits Department.
- 4) Plan implementation will ideally be by July 1, 2003 but no later than January 1, 2004.
- 5) All Faculty Members would have a basic contribution each year to the PRHCSP of one and a half percent (1 1/2%) of salary. This would, for now, come from the 13% contribution of the University to each individual's Faculty Retirement Plan (FRP).
- 6) All Faculty Members who in fall 2003 have served seven years or more would contribute an additional amount as a catch-up provision. Additional contributions from those starting their eighth (8th) or later year in fall 2003 should be in steps of 0.2% per service year up to those in their 25th year of employment at the University when it would reach 3.6%. This additional 3.6% contribution, over and above the one and a half percent new contribution from the University, would be the same for all eligible employees with 24 or more years of service in Fall 2003. For a given individual these contributions would be frozen at the percentage dependent on their service at the U up to fall 2003. It should be clear that the contributions to the new fund would be mandatory; each member of each specific class (years of service with our definition) must contribute in the same manner. The recommended input by faculty members with different

degrees of service should be reexamined at least once every three years.

7) The additional money, 0.2% to 3.6% of salary, would also come from the university's present 13% contribution to the basic (401a) plan, reducing the input to that plan by the amount going into the PRHCSP. This is not a reduction to the individual's total retirement funds; rather a transfer to a more tax advantaged plan (PRHCSP). If the individual wishes to make up for the smaller amount going to the 401a plan, additional funds could be contributed to either of the Optional Retirement plans (403b or 457) up to the maximum permitted.

The rationale for these contributions is to provide a reasonable sum of money at the time of an individual's retirement. Though people now very close to retirement can never completely catch up to accumulate enough money to pay for a significant fraction of their health care premiums, these additional steps will help and would perhaps be sufficient for those who still have a fair amount of time left before retirement. The goal is to have the accumulated savings in this plan reach something in the order of magnitude of an individual's last year's salary within +/-25%, though this is unrealistic for those with less than 10 to 15 years to retirement. Even one year's salary would probably not provide (based on an annuity analysis) all of the funds for health care insurance, but could provide a significant fraction.

8) We also believe that those in Phased Retirement should be in a separate faculty class. For this class we propose a significant increase in the individual's input (essentially taken from the University's contribution to the basic Faculty Retirement Plan) to the PRHCSP, tentatively 10% of salary. This would greatly help those now approaching retirement through the Phased Retirement Plan. This contribution would be reviewed periodically when the entire plan is reviewed and may eventually be phased out.

9) For faculty in either a Phased Retirement or a Terminal Leave program, there should be a change in how the University pays the additional health care coverage after leaving the University (two or more years depending on eligibility for Medicare benefits). At the time a faculty member ends regular employment at the University, a sum equal to the University cost of faculty health care (either single or family coverage) for the total time involved should be placed in the individual's PRHCSP fund. This would not represent a change in the present University rule, which provides health care benefits for retirees during the phased retirement period.

Summary:

A recurring annual contribution of one and a half percent (1 1/2%) of salary would be made by all participants in the FRP. For the present that would come from the 13% University contribution to each individual's FRP. An additional contribution by each individual who has been here for seven years (i.e. in the eighth year of service) would be 0.2% of salary. For those who have been here longer this would rise by 0.2% for every year of service until the 25th year of service (after 24 years) when the individual's contribution would be 3.6%. This (3.6%) would be the same for those with still longer service. Thus the maximum input to an individual's PRHCSP would be 5.1% of salary. The additional money, 0.2% to 3.6% of salary would also come from the university's present 13% contribution to the basic (401a) plan. Those in phased retirement would make still larger contributions. Those leaving the University through Phased

Retirement or Terminal Leave would receive whatever funds due for future health care as a lump sum into their PRHCSP account.

* The actual definition of a "Faculty Member" in the Faculty Retirement Plan is rather lengthy, but is essentially: "any employee of the University who holds an appointment of at least 67% time for a duration of at least nine months and holds one of the following titles (if an employee holds more than one appointment, the first title of appointment will govern): a) Faculty (94xx classes); b) Administrative staff members with personnel classifications 9301-9399; c) Professional staff members with personnel classifications 9701 through 9799; and d) University of Minnesota Extension Service (MES) academic staff with personnel classifications 9621 through 9640 who are not eligible for a federal appointment. A "T" temporary appointment does not affect an employee's status in one of the above-described categories. "Faculty Member," however, shall not include the following: 1) Faculty members with Visiting, Adjunct, or Clinical prefixes; 2) Staff members filling administrative or professional positions on an acting basis; 3) Research Specialists (9755); 4) Clinical Preceptors (9756); and 5) Industrial Fellows (9757)."

There are exclusions from the PRHCSP: "An employee shall be ineligible for future contributions to the PRHCSP if the MSRS determines that the employee falls within any one of the following categories: a) The employee is a foreign national and plans to return to the country in which he or she is a citizen upon termination of public employment. b) The employee will receive employer-paid post retirement health care coverage through his/her public employer, or through a spouse's employer. The insurance must provide full-coverage for the employee's lifetime. c) The employee will receive post retirement health care coverage from the military."

COMMENT:

Note, because of the difficult financial circumstances for the University this year, we have modified our previous plan which was submitted 13 December 2002. In that plan, we had proposed one-and-a-half percent of salary would be contributed by the University to the Post-Retirement Health Care Saving Plan (PRHCSP). Now the expectation is a zero salary increase, and yet we believe that this program should be initiated now. Thus, we propose that for the present, the base one-and-a-half percent of the salary going into PRHCSP for all faculty would come out of the University's present contribution to the retirement plan (13% of salary). Aside from this, the plan would be the same as recommended previously, including the increased contributions for those who had been at the University seven years or more and the increased contribution for those in phase-retirement.

There are two very strong caveats that we would like to add. First, we are going under the assumption that there will be no additional funds for any University group this year for PRHCSP. If this is not the case, then we would expect that similar funds would go into PRHCSP for faculty, rather than having all of the money coming out of the faculty members' present retirement plan contributions.

Second, we ask that in the future, when the University again reaches a point that there are reasonable new funds, that the one-and-a-half percent taken out of the basic faculty retirement

plan would be put back in, returning the University's FRP contribution to 13% of salary. The University FRP has been an excellent one. We greatly regret the need to reduce the basic plan by this change yet we think overall it is a good idea. However in the future, we are very desirous of seeing the plan return to its present level of contributions.

This plan was approved by the :

- Retirement Subcommittee on Monday, March 10, 2003,
- Faculty Affairs Committee on Tuesday, March 11, 2003,
- Faculty Consultative Committee on Thursday, March 14, 2003.

**RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, CHAIR
RETIREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE**

**JOHN FOSSUM, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard Goldstein, Chair of the Retirement Subcommittee, presented the Post-Retirement Health Care Savings plan (PRHCSP) for approval, stating that the biggest expense once faculty retire is health care insurance and other health related costs. These expenses are then paid from post-tax dollars which means a biggest hit to savings. The PRHCSP provides a savings fund for all post-retirement benefits in a pre-tax fund, the earnings are tax-free, and the disbursement is tax-free, as long as it is used for health care expenditures.

The law requires that everyone in a given classification have the same amount of input, although the classification can not be based on age. The closest classification then became years of service. The calculation used for the PRHCSP was to provide everyone roughly their 12 month salary at the time of retirement. This amounted to 1.5 percent for all faculty, increasing by steps until a maximum of 5.1 percent is reached. The gradual increase is to take into account that this is a new plan. Once instituted for a number of years, the formula will simply be 1.5 percent for the length of tenure.

Since this was presented in December, several changes have been made. At that time, the proposal was that the basic 1.5 percent would come from the University's salary funds. Since there will not be an increase this year, instead of postponing the program, the proposal is now to take 1.5 percent from the basic faculty retirement plan, thereby reducing that contribution from 13 percent to 11.5 percent. This is not a loss in retirement funding, but is a shift between plans. Other changes include that the plan be administered by Minnesota Life and that disbursement be handled by Employee Benefits.

Q: What would happen to unspent funds at the time of death?

A: Any unspent funds could be spent tax-free on health care expenses by the spouse and any dependents. If the employee, spouse, and dependents are deceased, it then reverts to the beneficiaries, is taxable, and can only be spent on health care expenses. If there are no living beneficiaries, then complications arise.

Q: Can the definition of service be changed so that only years as a faculty member count in the classification?

A: From talks with the Office of the General Counsel, service has been defined as any years working nine months and at least 67 percent time. Therefore, years as a civil service or academic professional employee would count, but time spent as a student would not.

A senator commented that while he can see that the proposal is not a cut in benefits but a shift between plans, he does not support retirement funds being touched for two reasons. One is that the 13 percent is a powerful recruiting tool in times when salaries are not being increased. Second, he does not like the precedent that retirement funds can be spent on something that the faculty really value but the University cannot afford. He would propose delaying implementation until next year when salary increase dollars may be available to fund the proposal.

Professor Goldstein agreed with the comments and stated that the proposal asks that the 1.5 percent be reinstated once funds are available.

Another senator felt that it would be a mistake to take funds from the retirement account for this purpose, since it then opens the door to future initiatives when there is a budget crisis. The senator also stated that the tax advantages are being oversold since during the first few years of retirement, deductions can still be itemized.

Professor Goldstein said that health care can only be deducted if the payments are grouped, which is usually feasible only for the first two years.

Randy Croce, Chair of the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA), said that CAPA approved this plan last Friday after considerable debate, mainly so that academic professionals would continue to have the same retirement plan as the faculty. The University would also be saved money if it did not have to administer two separate plans. CAPA did have several concerns. One related to people who have been at the University for many years. Since their payment percentage is increased at the later years of service, a fairly large percentage of retirement funds would be committed to a restricted fund. A second concern is that remaining funds that are not left to a spouse or dependent are taxable, which would be the case for domestic partners. Lastly, CAPA members were concerned with the quick pace that the plan took, especially in light of the pressing budget decisions.

Professor Goldstein responded that the purpose of the increased payments is to guarantee that their will be an equal percentage in both plans at the time of retirement, not that there will be more funds in the PRHCSP versus the basic retirement plan.

A senator then said that they support a plan of this kind since it provides everyone with pre-tax funds to pay for health care. An early proposal however, stated that the funds could be used for non-health care expenses if taxes were paid and that there was a broader distribution base. The current proposal now states that fund can only be used for health care costs and distribution is limited. While the senator is still in favor of the proposal, since it is only a recommendation, in

light of the new information, the senator has reservations about the amount that is being proposed in the plan. The senator urged the administration to review the percentage proposed in light of the new tax ruling.

Q: On what types of services can these funds be spent?

A: The funds could be used for any formal insurance plan premiums, long-term care insurance premiums, and any other health care deductions that can be used on income tax or from a flexible spending account. Health care restrictions are governed by the IRS, not the University.

Q: Is it possible to administer an optional program?

A: An optional program is outside the bounds of the law.

A senator then commented that while the University has been proactive in offering same-sex domestic partner benefits, this plan would be less valuable to these people and therefore should be considered carefully.

Another senator said that this is a long-term decision and they are concerned that the definition of health care will change dramatically in the next 10 years. The senator was also skeptical that if faculty vote to use 1.5 percent from retirement funds that this amount will ever be restored. Senators should be aware of this fact before they vote for or against the proposal.

Q: Funds from the current retirement account can be withdrawn in a lump sum. Would this be possible from the PRHCSP?

A: It would depend on how health care costs are incurred since they are not payable as a lump sum or eligible for roll-over to IRAs or other qualified plans. However, if a person's account was exhausted for a year, but the person still had their receipts, then the receipts could be submitted as claims for reimbursement from the account.

A senator then said that this decision should not be tied to domestic partner benefits since it is out of the University's control, just like other retirement accounts. The decision to oppose the plan, however should be tied to the fact that there is no guarantee that the 1.5 percent will be returned to the retirement fund and it send a bad message to perspective faculty. Also, people do not become sicker just because they earn more money. This proposal is tied to one-year's salary at the time of retirement, but plan options are not tied to the same variable.

Another senator stated that Medical School faculty do not see the positives in this plan because they can find post-retirement health care at a much cheaper rate than other faculty.

Several senators then noted that most younger faculty oppose the plan, and the funding option being proposed will impact hiring and make recruitment more difficult in many fields.

A senator then commented that in light of the economic conditions and scrutiny, faculty should not assume that the 13 percent will absolutely remain. In terms of recruiting, it is noted that the

University does not have a formalized post-retirement health care plan. Voting should hinge on the merits of the plan, not on the specific amount being contributed.

Another senator said that while insurance might cost up to \$20,000, 90 percent of medical costs are spent by 10 percent of the population.

With no further discussion a vote was taken and the motion was not approved with only 30 in favor and 40 opposed.

NOT APPROVED

17. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

18. NEW BUSINESS

A motion was made and seconded 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. A vote was then taken and the motion was approved.

19. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

APPENDIX A MEMORIAL STATEMENTS

William S. Hays

Dr. William Scott Hays, 38, a fourth-year Department of Surgery resident, died on October 23, 2002, after a brief battle with cancer. He had just received, in June 2002, the Humanism and Excellence in Teaching Award from the nationally renowned Arnold P. Gold Foundation. That award, presented for the first time at the University of Minnesota, commends humanism and excellence in teaching medical school students and in interacting with patients and families. (The Gold Foundation is perhaps best known for introducing the White Coat Ceremony in 1991 at Columbia University—a ceremony now held at 130 medical schools worldwide, including the University of Minnesota.)

Hays was born on August 5, 1964, at Edwards Air Force Base, California. He graduated from a military high school, the New Mexico Military Institute, in 1981, and then from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1986. Stationed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, he volunteered for medical work and met his future wife (who was in the Medical Service Corps). After he left the Army, he earned a Ph.D. in 1997 and an M.D. in 1999, both from the University of New Mexico. In the summer of 1999, he began his general surgery residency at the University of Minnesota. He remained in the Army reserves, most recently in a medical support unit based in Rochester.

In his all too few years as a Department of Surgery resident, Hays was an exemplary, intensely respected role model. One fourth-year University of Minnesota Medical School student, Martin Zielinski of Chanhassen, was quoted in a full-length obituary about Hays by Trudi Hahn (Star Tribune, October 27, 2002). Zielinski said of Hays, "He instilled values in everybody...hard work, dedication, truly wanting to take care of not just a surgery patient but a person."

The chairman of the Department of Surgery, Dr. David Dunn, paid tribute to Hays in the fall 2002 issue of the departmental newsletter, "The Cutting Edge." Dunn said that sending the announcement of Hays' untimely death to the faculty and residents was "one of the hardest things I have ever had to do." He lauded Hays' "professional and personal achievements," noting that "Bill was a special and gifted man" who "cherished his family and friends, valued his career, and truly made an impact on each of us."

A memorial fund has been established in Hays' name through the Department of Surgery (contact person: Tracy Wolfe, Ph.D., Director of Development, Department of Surgery, MMC 195, 420 Delaware St. S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455, 612-626-4848).

Hays is survived by his wife, Toni Hays, and daughter, Devon Hays, of Hopkins, Minnesota; his parents, Rossanna and William Hays of Albuquerque, New Mexico; and his brother, Gregory Hays, of Austin, Texas.

Ralph H. Hopp

Ralph Hopp, former University Librarian, died Friday, February 7 after a lengthy battle with Parkinson's disease. He was 87.

Dr. Hopp was a leader in the planning of the O. Meredith Wilson Library and was instrumental in the relocation of the collections and staff from Walter Library to the new library on the West Bank. He was particularly concerned that the design of the new library be easy for people to use.

Before coming to the University of Minnesota he was a science and technology librarian at the University of Nebraska and the librarian of the Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio. He earned his bachelor's degree in chemical engineering at the University of Nebraska and a doctoral degree at the University of Illinois. In 1962, he served as a Fulbright Lecturer at the University of Ankara in Turkey.

Dr. Hopp was active professionally serving on numerous committees of the American Library Association and as president of the Association of Research Libraries. He was also very active in the St. Anthony Park Association and the Boy Scouts of America.

He is survived by his wife of 62 years, Dorothy, son Thomas of Steamboat Springs, Colorado; daughter Susan of Minneapolis and two grandchildren.

Ralph L. Hossfeld

Ralph L. Hossfeld, Professor Emeritus of the University of Minnesota and President of the Hossfeld Manufacturing Company, Winona, died January 31, 2003 at the age of 88.

Born in Stockton, Minnesota, Dr. Hossfeld graduated from the University of Idaho with a B.S. in Chemical Engineering in 1937 and an M.S. in Wood Chemistry with a minor in Bacteriology in 1939. He received a Ph.D. in Agricultural Biochemistry in 1942.

In 1946, he became a professor of wood chemistry in the University of Minnesota School of Forestry's Forest Products Department. He remained in this position for 34 years, an inspiration to students and faculty, retiring as Professor Emeritus in 1980. He was an outstanding scholar who was known as very principled and "quite a thinker." He spent his retirement no less active, pursuing glass making, pottery, and iron work in his studio.

Dr. Hossfeld is survived by his wife of 60 years and fellow chemist, Dr. Mildred Malm Hossfeld, and by their children and grandchildren. Those who had the pleasure of working closely with Ralph remember him as a man of high principle and strong service ethic to his university and community. Loved and respected by all, he was fondly known by staff and friends at Hillcrest Rehabilitation and Health Center as "Professor."

Andrew Hustrulid

Andrew Hustrulid, professor emeritus, died peacefully in his sleep in Spokane, Washington, on January 9, 2003, in his own apartment with his wife of 65 years, Annie, by his side. He obtained his B.S. degree in electrical engineering from the University of Minnesota in 1931 and in 1937 his Ph.D. degree in physics. Upon receiving his doctorate, he joined the Department of Agricultural Engineering on the St. Paul campus. He was known as a superb teacher by several generations of students and retired from the University in 1971.

Hustrulid's research activities were wide-ranging, including rural electrification, frozen food storage, and grain drying. After the war he, helped find ways to use electricity to enhance life in rural areas, where electricity was relatively new. Hustrulid also worked to determine how moisture is transferred within kernels, helping engineers determine the best types of electrical grain dryers. Grain drying became important to minimize spoilage as new corn harvesting methods were adopted that harvested moist corn kernels. As home freezers became popular after World War II, Hustrulid also worked to determine the best temperature for freezing food. His work demonstrated that zero degrees was sufficiently cold for food storage. A member of the

American Society of Agricultural Engineers for nearly 65 years, he was made Fellow in 1965. He was a past-president of the Minnesota Federation of Engineering Societies and a member of the American Association of Physics Teachers, the Minnesota Academy of Science, the American Society for Engineering Education, and Sigma Xi.

Most of his retirement years were spent in Salem town, Oregon. He lived in Spokane for his last four years. In addition to his wife, Annie, Hustrulid is survived by his sons, Dr. Bob Hustrulid (Spokane) and Dr. Bill Hustrulid (Salt Lake City); his sister, Clara (Minneapolis); seven grandchildren, Todd, Ginelle, Andrew, Ann-Mari, Inger, Björn, and Jan-Erik; and one great-grandchild, Stefan Anders.

The Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering Department will establish a scholarship in his name with funds contributed to the University of Minnesota Foundation in memory of Dr. Hustrulid.

Paul E. Meehl

Paul Everett Meehl, emeritus Regents Professor of Psychology at the University of Minnesota, died Friday, February 14, at age 83.

Meehl received his bachelor's (1941) and doctoral (1945) degrees in psychology from the University of Minnesota. Meehl had served as director of the clinical psychology training program, chair of the Psychology Department, and President of the American Psychological Association.

Meehl is internationally recognized for a wide range of scholarly works, concerning the genetics, psychopathology and pathophysiology of schizophrenia, clinical vs. statistical prediction, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, taxometrics (a type of numerical taxonomy), philosophy of science, law and psychology, religion and values, and political psychology. In recent years, he was working on methods for statisticizing theory evaluation in science and philosophy of science, called cliometrics. He was awarded an Honorary Doctorate from the University of Minnesota in 2001.

Meehl was predeceased by his first wife Alyce Roworth Meehl and survived by his wife and scientific collaborator Leslie Jane Yonce. He is also survived by a daughter, Karen Enid Meehl Hill (Sheldon N. Rosen) of Seattle; a son, Erik Rolf Meehl of Hopkins, Minn; and grandsons Seth Jacob Hill, Jonathon David Hill, and Spencer Thomas Hill.

More information on Meehl's work can be found at <http://www.umn.edu/~pemeehl>.

Carol J. Pederson

Associate Professor Carol Pederson died on February 12, 2003 after a brief illness with pancreatic cancer. Professor Pederson first came to the School of Nursing as a master's student in the 1970s. She was a research assistant for Ida Martinson's study of home care for children

dying of cancer beginning a career-long interest in pain control and end-of-life studies.

She joined the faculty as an instructor in 1978 and became an assistant professor when she completed the Ph.D. in Educational Psychology in 1990. She taught pediatric and research courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and advised over 60 masters students. The School of Nursing Alumni Society recognized her teaching in 1988 with the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Award. She was an active member of the Zeta Chapter of Sigma Theta Tau and served as the school's student academic grievance officer in addition to other governance responsibilities.

She completed a number of studies in pain management and opioid tapering in infants and young children, culminating in 1997 in a National Institutes of Health-funded study, "Effectiveness of Morphine Tapering Algorithm in Bone Marrow Transplant Patients." She also led the school's participation in a national end-of-life curriculum initiative.

Charles J. Scott

The Department of Mechanical Engineering lost a friend and colleague, and the Institute of Technology lost a faculty member when Charles J. Scott (Scotty to all of his friends) passed away January 6, 2003.

Charles Scott served first as a Lecturer in the Department of Mechanical Engineering in (June 1962) later being promoted to Associate Professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Minnesota from 1964 to June 1999.

Prof. Scott completed his undergraduate degree with honors in the Department of Aeronautical Engineering, University of Minnesota, in 1951. Other undergraduate honors were memberships in Sigma Tau Omega, Tau Beta Pi, and Sigma Psi. His M.S. and Ph.D. degrees were awarded also from the Aeronautical Engineering Department of the University of Minnesota in 1954 and 1964, respectively. Graduate honors included the Laverne Noyes Scholarship and a Ford Foundation Grant. Professor Scott was able to study in Italy under a NATO fellowship and earn a Ph.D. degree in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Naples in 1966.

Prior to joining the faculty of the University he worked at Rosemount Aeronautical Laboratories, working on heat transfer and flow measurements in high-speed flows. His research topics included development of transpiration cooling for reentry from space, aircraft engine cooling, plasma arc flow and heat transfer, boundary layer transition, and parachute design. His interest in heat transfer, turbulence, and high-speed flows remained as a theme throughout his continuing research.

At the University of Minnesota Prof. Scott made teaching his primary focus. Courses of particular interest and joy to him were undergraduate thermodynamics, heat transfer, and the thermal-science laboratory. He also advised numerous capstone design projects conducted by undergraduate students in their senior year. Graduate courses, which he frequently taught, included convective heat transfer, boiling heat transfer, and compressible flow.

Upon his retirement, Prof. Scott lived at North Oaks, MN enjoying his loving wife Marion and a family of six children and numerous grandchildren. The faculty of the Institute of Technology expresses their deep appreciation for Prof. Charles Scott's 35 years of service to the University of Minnesota.