

2003-04 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

FEBRUARY 26, 2004

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 3
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES: No. 3
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 4
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 4**

The meeting of the University Senate, Twin Cities Campus Assembly, and Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, February 26, 2004, 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 139 voting faculty/academic professional members, 32 voting student members, 1 ex officio member, and 1 non-member. President Bruininks presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

2. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 2 AND OCTOBER 30, 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/031002sen.html>

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/031030sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

DISCUSSION:

A senator questioned language from Professor Martin that appeared in the October 30 Senate minutes.

Another senator then made a motion to lay the motion on the table until the next meeting. The motion was seconded and approved by a majority.

APPROVED

3. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Herbert Atwood
Assistant Professor
Education – Waseca
1925 – 2004

Marjorie L. Austin
Staff
UMD Administration
1919 – 2003

Morton Hamermesh
Professor
Physics and Astronomy
1915 – 2003

Gustav Hard
Professor
Landscape Architecture
1923 – 2003

Klaus Jankofsky
Employee
English – Duluth
1938 – 2003

Robert M. Jordan
Professor
Animal Science
1920 – 2003

Gisela Konopka
Professor
Center for Adolescent Health and Development
1910 – 2003

Rachel Lukkason
Librarian
University Libraries
1910 – 2003

Burton P. Olson
Professor
MN Extension
1925 – 2003

Frederick Noble
Professor
Restorative Sciences
1918 – 2004

Benjamin S. Pomeroy
Professor
Veterinary Medicine
1911 – 2004

William J. Price
Associate Professor
Audiovisual Library
1913 – 2003

Pierre C. Robert
Professor
Soil, Water, and Climate
1941 – 2003

Hermann Schlenk
Professor
Hormel Institute
1914 – 2003

Elaine Saline
Teaching Assistant
Nursing
1936 – 2004

Geneva H. Southall
Professor
Afro-American/African Studies
1925 – 2004

Eugene Stolarik
Professor
Aerospace
1919 – 2003

STUDENTS

Matthew D. Carlson
Continuing Education – Duluth

James A. Chasteen Jr.
College of Biological Sciences

Nguyen H. Nguyen
College of Liberal Arts

Arica A. Pagel
Mortuary Science

Louis W. Somrak
University of Minnesota – Crookston

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

University Senate

Recycling Paper Resolution

Approved by the: University Senate October 30, 2003

Approved by the: Administration - PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Printer Resolution

Approved by the: University Senate October 30, 2003

Approved by the: Administration - PENDING

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

5. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE Child Care Report Information for the Faculty Senate

February 2, 2004

President Robert Bruininks
President's Office
202 Morrill Hall

Vice President Carol Carrier
Human Resources

120 Morrill Hall

Dear Bob and Carol:

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.

We discussed this report at the January 29 meeting of FCC. 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. We suggest that a conversation with Jerry Fischer might in order to learn if there are donors who might be willing to help out in this area.

We would appreciate knowing how you might approach this issue.

Cordially,

Judith A. Martin, Chair
Faculty Consultative Committee

To: SCFA
From: SCFA Subcommittee: Child care
Date: 12/22/03
Re: Revised report

In today's market place, employers must consider the availability of child care in relationship to the overall compensation and quality of life of their employees. The reality is that employees will virtually always place their child care responsibilities above their responsibilities in the workplace. Thus, the University will benefit from ensuring the availability of child care that will minimize the impact of child care responsibilities on employee productivity.

To this goal, the following question can be raised. What are the necessary and sufficient aspects of child care that will minimize the negative impact on work place productivity?

First and foremost, child care must be available. The gestational period in humans is nine months, which includes as many as three or four months of uncertainty of the existing condition. Thus, child care must be made available with no more than a four-month wait.

Second, the child care must be of sufficient quality to allay the natural guardian/parental concern for the child's safety and welfare. Although state licensure provides a modicum of assurance, most parents/guardians demand much higher standards.

Third, the care must be affordable. Current costs at the University child care center in the Twin

Cities range from \$8,320 to \$13,520 per year for fulltime care, with costs depending on family income and age of the child. Even the lowest fee of \$8,320 is quite high for many members of the University community.

Fourth, the child care facility must be conveniently located. A facility close to the workplace is desirable and on-site care is preferred. It is important to note that this factor has less to do with commuting time, parking, etc., than it has to do with the concern for the child. That is, guardian/parental proximity to the child is critically important in reducing the anxiety of leaving a child with hired caretakers. This factor lessens with age of the child.

Fifth, the very nature of the problem requires flexibility/understanding. Children inherently defy regimented scheduling. There will be common occurrences when extra time is needed. Illnesses are particularly problematic, which are unpredictable and often occur at the worst times. They can be long term (e.g., one to two weeks for chicken pox). They can occur during working times or when classes must be taught. They create a great deal of stress and often are responsible for sleep deprivation of both child and parent/guardian. Probably the greatest negative impact is that virtually no child care facility will allow a sick child to remain on site. One recommendation by the work-life task force was that we provide backup child care, which has been shown to have a high return on investment (see p. 22 of report). It would be very helpful if this backup child care included care for sick children.

Another issue related to flexibility is the disconnect between the schedule of primary school and the work environment. Whereas it is anticipated that children in primary school and middle school will need supervision for the summer, there are also a great number of days that they do not have to attend during the school year. The length of the school year is deceptive in that many of the 'days' are actually two half days, which requires innovative scheduling by the parent-particularly if they are responsible for transportation

In addressing these important aspects of child care (availability, quality, cost, convenience, and flexibility), the university has succeeded to a varying extent. We have an on-site child care facility on the Twin Cities campus, which has an excellent reputation for quality. They have a structured fee system that attempts to minimize the high cost on those least able to afford it. However, there is only child care facility for the East Bank, West Bank, and St Paul campuses. The wait list appears to range from 1 to over 2 years, which is unsatisfactory.

The University should receive a long-term benefit in employee satisfaction and productivity by investing in additional infrastructure to increase the capacity of the day care facility (see report, pp. 5 and 51).¹ Although the work-life task force concluded that building another child care center on the Twin Cities campus is not realistic at this point for budgetary reasons, it may be possible to secure additional funds for expanding the current child care facilities through fundraising. Because this is an important issue for faculty and staff, foundations and corporations may contribute to this cause. Another option to explore is finding space for child care activities in the proposed new stadium. Whether or not we can build a new facility, we support the recommendations of the work-life task force with regard to continued funding for child care referral resources, forming partnerships with area child care providers, and developing back-up child care services (see p. 22 of report).¹ We also support the recommendation to expand the

child care referral resources to the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Rochester campuses.

The U also could enhance satisfaction by adopting policies that specifically grant additional flexibility with no central cost and minimal peripheral unit cost. For example, the six week maternity leave must be taken as a single block of full time leave. Whereas some units may allow part time leave, the policy can be rewritten to have this at the option of the employee. Providing more flexible hours so that parents can attend to the days off for children in primary school is another possibility. Increasing the number of family emergency days perhaps at the expense of sick days may be of benefit. The work-life task force also recommended exploring ways to make the current parental leave policy more flexible.¹

Although outside of the charge of this subcommittee (but yet not completely unrelated perhaps in their solutions), consistent with the recommendations of the work-life task force, we encourage the University to address the problems encountered by employees that become responsible for the care of elderly parents (e.g., by expanding referral resources to include elder care system-wide).¹

1. 2002-2003 Work/Life Steering Committee, Professor Dan Detzner, Chair. "2003 Work/Life Report and Action Plan" submitted 2/26/03.

Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

**JOHN FOSSUM, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

6. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Judith Martin, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), stated that the Senate reorganization discussion is continuing and a vote is planned for April. The Faculty Senate met two weeks ago to discuss this topic.

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has had informational meetings with the University Foundation and McKnight Professors, and has discussed the proposed stadium and electronic class scheduling. FCC is also continuing to monitor the University's Capital Request. Several members of the committee also testified to the legislature about compensation at the University. The good news in the report was that University staff are not overpaid, but this does not help the University attract employees.

FCC has also heard from Senior Vice President Cerra about the increasing need for security badges in certain parts of the University. At the last quarterly report to the Regents, she was asked what faculty are thinking about and her response was how faculty find time to do all the things that they are expected to do and if the Regents could create more time.

Today, the Senate will be discussing the evolving policy on the use of royalty funds from the Research Committee and the Finance and Planning Committee.

Continuing issues for FCC are University business incubator project and stem cell research. A statement was distributed today for information from the Research Committee on not stopping stem cell research. Reports still to be presented this semester will be issued by task forces on academic freedom and instrumentalization. These reports will be forwarded to the Senate once reviewed by FCC. Discussions on the intellectual future of the University also continue with the president and provost.

Lastly, Professor Martin reported on the issue of Mount Graham and the Large Binocular Telescope. In 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.

7. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Amendment to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Supplemental Policy of the
University Senate Policy on Classes, Schedules, and Final Examinations
for the Twin Cities Campus
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly

MOTION:

To approve the following amendment to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Supplemental Policy of the University Senate Policy on Classes, Schedules, and Final Examinations for the Twin Cities Campus.

STANDARD CLASS HOURS
Minneapolis Campus
75 minute class times

<u>Period</u>	<u>East Bank/West Bank</u>	<u>St. Paul Campus</u>
I	8:15-9:30	8:45-10:00
II	9:45-11:00	10:15-11:30

III	11:15-12:30	11:45-13:00
IV	12:45-14:00	13:15-14:30
V	14:30-15:45	15:00-16:15
VI	16:00-17:15	16:30-17:45

COMMENT:

The class schedule for Tuesday/Thursday classes for the Twin Cities campus was inadvertently left off the policy recommendation that the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy made to the Assembly in 2000. The schedule needs to be approved by the Assembly; action now confirms what has been the practice since the original policy recommendation a few years ago.

**EMILY HOOVER, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**8. UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT
Ex Officio Members
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 2 of the University Senate Rules as follows (language to be added is underlined). As an amendment to the Senate/Assembly Rules, a motion requires a simple majority.

ARTICLE III. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

...

2. Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees

...

- Student Affairs--Office of the Vice President for Campus Life; Office of the Vice President for University Relations

COMMENT:

The Student Affairs Committee requests that its ex officio membership be expanded to include the newly-created Student Community Relations Coordinator position as this position deals directly with many of the same issues as the committee.

**ADAM VANWAGNER, CHAIR
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**9. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Proposed Amendments to the University Senate
Discussion by the University Senate**

Professor Dan Feeney, chair of the Reorganization Working Group, thanked the working group members and thanked senators for their comments. He noted that the documents distributed are working drafts and will continue to evolve. The plan is to distribute a straw poll within the next few days to assess Senate input on the different options being proposed for the number of senators from each represented group.

He said that while the University has an effective consultative system in place, the University Senate did not represent all non-bargaining unit employees. The goal was to reorganize the University Senate into a common forum, eliminate the redundancy created by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly structure, realign committee reporting lines with primary and secondary reporting lines, and keep the Senate at a manageable size.

Throughout this process, no changes were made to any of the committees themselves or to the integrity of the employee-specific representative bodies, such as the Faculty Senate and Student Senate. The reorganization will allow two groups to disagree on an issue and send separate views to the University Senate and administration.

Q: What are the number of faculty and faculty-like academic professionals currently eligible in the Senate?

A: There are roughly 2800 eligible faculty and roughly 800 eligible faculty-like academic professionals.

Q: Why were 25 seats proposed each for CAPA and the Civil Service Committee?

A: 25 was felt to be large enough to give each body a representative voice.

A senator commented that other number options should be proposed in the straw poll for CAPA

and Civil Service representatives, as well as an explanation of how issues move through the various bodies to the Senate and administration.

Professor Feeney said that a draft constitution, bylaws, and rules are being developed, which will help to clarify some aspects of the reorganization that are not easily represented on an organizational chart.

10. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
RESEARCH COMMITTEE
Use of Royalty Monies
Discussion by the University Senate

Professor Judith Martin said that the University has monies coming in from royalties that it must decide how to spend. A policy has been proposed over the last year that would allow some of these funds to be put to new uses. The proposed Regents policy has been brought to several committees for information and review.

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. One remaining issue for the committee is how decisions will be made on what will or will not receive funding. The discussion has been for a committee to establish a set of metrics to use in these determinations and then to have a formal process in place for faculty input.

David Hamilton, Interim Vice President for Research, said that faculty input is important in this process. A committee of administrators, faculty, the Research Committee Chair, the Finance and Planning Committee Chair, and representatives from the provost office, Academic Health Center, and the finance office has been established to make recommendations to the President.

Vice President Hamilton then addressed a number of questions that were supplied for senators. For the first question, the effect on his office from this new process, he described the royalty income stream. Commercialization of intellectual property is required by federal law under the Bayh-Dole Act. Before this act was passed, the federal government owned all intellectual property and they took it. Once the act was passed, institutions could commercialize intellectual property developed with federal funding as long as it shared the revenue with the inventor. The University's policy on shared revenue allots one-third to the inventor, one-third to the inventor's unit, and one-third to the Vice President for Research

University royalty funds are budgeted into three areas. One is to foster commercialization of intellectual property. Currently the University has \$2 million devoted to this effort. A second part goes to the 21st-Century Graduate Fellowship Fund which provides matching funds for fellowships. This fund will grow to \$45-50 million over the next few years and is managed by the Graduate School. The third fund was started this year, the 21st-Century Research Fund, to

fund operational research infrastructure to run labs and buy equipment. This fund should reach \$35 million over the next few years.

Last year, the University's Glaxo patent brought in \$34.5 million, so Vice President Hamilton's office received \$11 million. Some was put into these endowments, but \$2 million over four years was also contributed to the University Libraries to purchase on-line subscriptions to journals. The University anticipates \$41.4 million from the Glaxo stream this year, so funding from this policy would be provided through this increase in revenue.

Q: Will the graduate fellowship fund and the research fund both be handled as endowments?

A: They will both be endowments so that only the interest and not the principle is used each year so that both funds remain viable for many years.

Q: Can students receive royalty monies under the Bayh-Dole Act?

A: If a student is deemed to be an inventor, then he or she will share in the royalties.

Q: A professor stated that a student cannot share in the royalties if they develop a product during the course of their schooling. Is this correct?

A: While the Bayh-Dole Act states the revenue from intellectual property developed using federal funds must be shared with the inventor, the University's Intellectual Property Policy extended revenue sharing to all intellectual property developed at the University. However, state resources cannot be used to develop intellectual property without it becoming University property. It is good to know that professors know the regulations and advise students accordingly.

Q: What is an incubator and what does it do?

A: An incubator is like a hotel that rents or leases space to start-up companies, and provides services that these companies need. The purpose of the incubator is to allow companies that do not yet have a commercialized product to work for three to four years on product development. The company can then leave the incubator and become independent. It provides a bridge between research and venture capital investment, and allows for resources from the public and private sectors to be pooled for experimentation. There are some areas of the country that are very good at generating ideas, which are then exported to some other place. This is where an incubator is useful. There is some risk associated with this project, which is why oversight metrics are important

Q: While the University is doing well in startups and knows how to generate ideas, is it good at providing venture capital? If only \$500,000 is going to be provided for four years, is this enough to do any good? Should funds continue to be spent on other areas, such as graduate students and the libraries?

A: The University is successful in the field of commercialization and it has many business

advisors in this area. The University is also undergoing a process to be more business-oriented in this area.

11. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks said that he has finished his first year as president, and it has been a great honor and privilege, as well as a challenge. The easiest part of his job is to talk about the deep dedication of the faculty and staff to their work, students, and the state. The University can take pride in its academic community and the connections to all parts of the state.

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.

However, it reminds the University of the challenge to communication its complicated work and its critical importance to the state. A number of points need to be made to citizens, and it needs to happen consistently and often. The first sentence he makes in speeches is that the University is one of the greatest public assets to the state today and in the future. It is the only research institution in the state, and it brings \$530 million into the state each year through this research. There are many people today who believe that public institutions will need to learn to be private institutions. However, he believes that it is everyone's job to support the work of the University and keep the University affordable for its students.

President Bruininks said that this has been a tough time for everyone at the University, but it will make its case to the state for next year. The University cannot recover simply by increasing private fundraising, cutting budgets, or increasing tuition. The University would need 25 years of fundraising efforts to make-up for what it lost from the state last year. Citizens need to be made aware of the long-term importance of the University and the long-term consequences to the state if funding levels continue to decrease.

He said that he is displeased with the Governor's recommendation of less than half of the University's capital request, which was a modest request as a whole. As the University has worked to decrease its operating costs, this is the time to invest in the core infrastructure and keep the University strong. If progress is not made this year, it has a domino effect on capital requests in future years.

President Bruininks then spoke about the Governor's task force to address the future of higher education in the state. The Governor has asked the Citizen's League to take on this responsibility. The Itasca Project, which involves business and political leaders from the metro region, will be looking at the metro area and its economy. Another group, sponsored by the Blandin Foundation, will consider the same issues for greater Minnesota. If anyone has the opportunity to testify before these groups, he hopes that they speak.

Lastly, he said that one of the most important responsibilities is to provide a world-class education for students. To do this, an ambitious fundraising campaign for scholarships and fellowships will be announced. The goal will be to exceed \$100 million over the next few years, mainly through offering matching funds to private donors. The quality of education and service needs to continue to improve for undergraduates, graduate, and professional students.

12. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: The University seems to take it as inevitable that health care costs will continue to rise and will cost employers and employees more each year. Is there anything that the University can do to prevent these rising costs?

A: The University took decisive action two years ago to separate itself from the state health care system, which saved the University millions of dollars. The University is working hard to put pressure on health care systems and keep the increases at reasonable levels. Since the separation, the University no longer pays health insurance companies as it is self-insured. The University simply pays providers the actual cost for services and the companies act as administrators in this process.

Since 20 percent of health care costs cover prescription drugs, the University is looking for ways to reduce these costs. Disease management is also an issue since most health care costs are generated by a few employees. The University wants to encourage effective management of health conditions and prevention. One way to do this is through the implementation of a wellness program.

The Governor has appointed a commission to address these issues as well. The problem is that the nation cannot come to a consensus on how to address the issue. A report was released this week and addresses the broader social questions.

13. REPORT OF THE FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly confirm the reappointment of four faculty for additional three year terms on the Nominating Committee. A simple majority is required for approval.

F. RONALD AKEHURST: Professor, French & Italian, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1994-97, 1999-2002, 2003-06. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Council on Liberal Education, 1997-99; Judicial, 1986-88, 1994-97, 2001-03; Library, 1992-95; Nominating, 2002-03, Tenure, 2002-05 (Chair, 2003-04).

GARY GARDNER: Professor, Horticultural Science, College of Agricultural, Food, and

Environmental Sciences. University Senate member: 1992-95, 2001-04. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Consultative, 1997-98; Nominating, 2002-03.

JEAN QUAM: Professor, Social Work, College of Human Ecology. University Senate member: 1986-89. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 1992-95 (Chair, 1994-95); Nominating, 2002-03; Student Affairs, 1988-91.

W. PHILLIPS SHIVELY: Professor, Political Science, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1983-86, 1989-92. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 1997-98; Consultative, 1986-89 (Chair 87-88); Faculty Affairs, 1985-86; Finance 1986-87 (Chair, 1986-87); Nominating, 2001-02, 2003-04; University College Assembly, 1995-96.

INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Faculty Steering Committee may present the name of an individual, eligible for re-election, to the Assembly for confirmation of reappointment without another candidate on the ballot to fill the position.

**JUDITH MARTIN, CHAIR
FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

14. REPORT OF THE FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE ELECTION Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly approve the following slate of nominees to fill one 2004-07 Twin Cities faculty vacancy on the Nominating Committee. A simple majority is required for approval. Once the slate is approved, a ballot will be distributed for voting.

JUDITH GARRARD: Professor, Institute for Health Service Research, School of Public Health. University Senate member: 2001-03. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): AHC Faculty Consultative, 1996-2000 (Chair 1996-97); All-University Honors, 1995-98; Consultative, 1991-94 (Chair 1993-94).

EDWARD GRIFFIN: Professor, English Language & Literature, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1984-85, 1987-90, 1999-2002. Senate/Assembly Committee participation (past and present): Library, 1997-99.

FOR INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Assembly shall elect by written ballot faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Nominating Committee from a slate of candidates provided by the Faculty Steering Committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Assembly. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the slate must be in the hands of the Clerk of the Assembly on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted. The elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2004-05 are:

Charles Campbell, Professor, Institute of Technology
W. Andrew Collins, College of Education and Human Development
Nelson Rhodus, Professor, Dentistry
Carol Wells, Professor, Medical School

**JUDITH MARTIN, CHAIR
FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion a vote was taken and the motion was approved. Ballots were then distributed and Judith Garrard was elected to the Nominating Committee.

APPROVED

15. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

16. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**