

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES**

**MAY 19, 1994**

The fourth meeting of the University Senate for 1993-94 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, May 19, 1994, at 2:00 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 116 voting faculty/academic professional members, 17 voting student members, 2 ex officio members, and 5 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

**I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 17, 1994**

**Action**

**APPROVED**

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE TO SENATE ACTIONS**

**Information**

- A. Resolution Related to University of Minnesota Investments in Companies with Operations in South Africa  
Approved by:     the University Senate on December 2, 1993  
                          the Administration on December 6, 1993  
                          the Board of Regents on December 8, 1993
- B. Policy on Hazardous Biological Materials Controls and Institutional Biosafety Committee  
Approved by:     the University Senate on December 2, 1993  
                          the Administration on March 1, 1994  
                          the Board of Regents on March 11, 1994
- C. Amendment to Senate Constitution Establishing a Vice Chair Position within the Faculty Senate  
Approved by:     the University Senate on February 17, 1994  
                          the Administration - no action required  
                          the Board of Regents on April 8, 1994
- D. Report of the Review Committee on Awarding Credit for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate at the University of Minnesota  
Approved by:     the University Senate on February 17, 1994  
                          the Administration on April 6, 1994  
                          the Board of Regents - no action required

**III. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS, 1994-95**

**Information**

In recent elections to fill faculty vacancies on the Senate Consultative Committee, Carl Adams (School of Management) and Michael Steffes (Medical School) were elected for 3-year terms (1994-97). The committee's membership for 1994-95 includes:

John Adams, Chair	College of Liberal Arts
Carl Adams, Vice Chair	School of Management
Sara Evans	College of Liberal Arts (winter & spring quarters 1995)
James Gremmels	UMM
Roberta Humphreys	Institute of Technology
Robert Jones	College of Agriculture
Karen Seashore Louis	College of Education
Geoffrey Maruyama	College of Education

Harvey Peterson  
Michael Steffes  
Gerhard Weiss

UMC  
Medical School  
College of Liberal Arts (fall quarter 1994)

Student representatives will be reported fall quarter. In addition, the vice chair of the University Senate, a representative from the Duluth School of Medicine, the Student Senate Chair, and the chairs of the Educational Policy, Finance and Planning, and Faculty Affairs Committees serve as ex officio representatives.

**IV. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1994-95**  
**Action**

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

**DISCUSSION:**

*Professor Sheila Corcoran-Perry was elected as the 1994-95 vice chair of the University Senate.*

**APPROVED**

**V. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Resolution on Bonding Priorities**  
**Action**

**MOTION:**

To approve the following Resolution:

**Resolution**

**Whereas**, the University of Minnesota faces a growing crisis stemming from the decay and obsolescence of existing buildings and facilities;

**Whereas**, the cost of deferring maintenance increases yearly and becomes increasingly difficult to support;

**Whereas**, deferred maintenance may already carry a cost burden of nearly a billion dollars;

**Whereas**, continued deferral of maintenance and life safety improvements will have a serious effect on the functional, psychological, and financial well-being of the University's faculty, students, and staff;

**Whereas**, the current state bonding process does not take sufficient account of the University's need for life safety improvements and facility renewal and maintenance;

**Therefore, be it resolved that** the University Senate supports the administration's emphasis on these matters at the Legislature;

**Be it further resolved that** the University Senate encourages the University administration to develop a specific long-term strategy with the Legislature to define and fund the needed improvements so essential to the University's academic mission.

JUDITH GARRARD, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee

**DISCUSSION:**

*Professor Judith Garrard presented the bonding resolution encouraging the administration to develop a specific long-term strategy for support of needed improvements at the University. The resolution, she said, has received endorsement by the Student Senate and several Senate committees, including the Senate Consultative Committee.*

*One senator raised a question about the timeliness of the resolution coming after the closing of the legislative session. Moreover, he recommended the resolution be developed in a broader context taking into consideration other University assets, such as the quality of its programs and faculty. The resolution, he said, seems to imply that buildings are more important than people and programs and could send the wrong message to the administration.*

*In response to the previous comments, the chair of the Senate Finance and Planning Committee said the resolution was intended to address a fundamental problem at the University concerning its physical facilities. He commended the students for recognizing that the University's physical facilities are an important component of the future of the institution. Furthermore, the resolution should not be misunderstood by the administration, he said, because a number of Senate committees have clearly conveyed the message that faculty are very concerned about programs, compensation, and other issues.*

*Another senator pointed out that the resolution encourages the administration to work with the Legislature on a long-term strategy for funding and, hence, did not believe the timing of it was a problem.*

*With no further discussion, the resolution was approved by a majority of those members present and voting.*

**APPROVED**

**VI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
Policy Relating to the Use of Human Subjects in Research  
Action**

**MOTION:**

To approved the following Policy Relating to the Use of Human Subjects in Research:

Policy Relating to the Use of Human Subjects in Research

The Board of Regents at the University of Minnesota adopts and continues its policy that all research involving human subjects conducted at the University of Minnesota shall be conducted in accordance with federal regulations including but not limited to the "Guidelines for Protection of Research Subjects" 45 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 46 established by the National Institutes of Health, revised June 1991 and regulations to protect human subjects, 21 CFR 50, 56, 312, 812 as established by the Food and Drug Administration.

In furtherance of that policy the Board of Regents directs as follows:

1. The University shall establish an Institutional Review Board (IRB) whose members shall be appointed by the Vice President for Research. At the discretion of the Vice President for Research, in consultation with administrative staff of the IRB, IRB panels shall be appointed to manage the research workload. Each IRB panel shall consist of at least five members, one of whom comes from the community external to the University.
2. The IRB and its staff shall be responsible for assuring that all University personnel, including students, comply with applicable federal regulations and guidelines. In addition, the IRB shall monitor and review all University research involving human subjects in accordance with the policies and procedures to be established hereunder.

3. The IRB is authorized to inspect research facilities, obtain records and other relevant information relating to the use of human subjects in research, and take such actions that are in their judgment necessary to ensure compliance with the Guidelines and Regulations, applicable federal and state law, and the policies and procedures to be established hereunder, including the suspension or cessation of research in the event of a violation of policy or procedure which may create a hazard to human subjects.
4. The Vice President for Research shall be responsible for the implementation of this policy through the establishment of appropriate policies and procedures and is delegated the authority to establish and oversee such policies and procedures.

JUDITH GARRARD, Chair  
Senate Consultative Committee

***DISCUSSION:***

*Professor Garrard introduced the proposal and told senators that it had been approved by the Institutional Review Board panel chairs, the Senate Research Committee (which has oversight for the compliance committees), and the Senate Consultative Committee. With little discussion, the motion was approved by a majority of members present and voting.*

**APPROVED**

**VII. U2000 UPDATE**  
**Discussion**

College planning--President Hasselmo reported that college planning is in progress and in many cases colleges are building on strategic plans that have been developed over the years. Furthermore, the plans, as they existed, were used in the recent budget process.

Cluster planning--While the President believes cluster planning is an excellent idea, it seems to be having some difficulty being embraced with great enthusiasm. The idea, he said, was to provide a mechanism for faculty to identify areas in which the University needs to position itself strongly for the year 2000 and the future. It seems, he said, that the planning process has to be driven by the intellectual issues that the University faces. As a starting point twelve clusters were originally suggested. The President would like to continue to find ways to encourage discussion across disciplinary lines, not primarily to develop new interdisciplinary linkages, but to try to identify disciplinary as well as interdisciplinary frontiers that the University has to consider in its planning effort.

Institutional planning--Progress is being made in institutional planning, reported President Hasselmo. The restructuring and reallocation plans from 1991 have been incorporated into the current planning efforts and the recent budget included the fourth year of that major effort. An important ingredient in the plans was the new liberal education curriculum that the Senate adopted a couple of years ago. In fact, a number of courses will be available for implementation of that new liberal education curriculum beginning fall 1994.

The most recent installment of institutional planning, the President said, is the development of institutional measures of outcomes and a simultaneous effort at the college level to develop measures and benchmarks that are appropriate to the particular disciplines. This is extremely important as a means of communicating with the Legislature, the Governor, and with the public. It is also important for the University in its own internal evaluation of progress towards plans.

Another important feature of institutional planning is the phase of action plans. By action plans the President means implementation of initiatives such as University College, plans that deal with research and scholarly development, continuation of the undergraduate initiative, diversity, accountability, and so forth. The President anticipates presenting an overview of the action plans to the Board of Regents at its June meeting.

Senate discussion--One senator raised a concern about the performance measures, particularly the lack of Senate

discussion on them. The chair of the Senate Consultative Committee responded that the measures have been and still are being discussed in a number of key Senate committees, including the Educational Policy Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Consultative Committee, and Finance and Planning Committee. The President anticipates that a set of institutional measures will be presented to the Regents in July with the collegiate measures following sometime later. It was suggested the measures be outlined in a *Footnote* article and placed on the fall Senate agenda for discussion. Senators interested in commenting on the measures before July were encouraged to contact Professor George Copa or members of the Senate Consultative Committee.

Faculty are feeling frustrated because U2000 decisions are being made before faculty are able to provide adequate input, commented one senator. She suggested a planning and decision schedule be provided to the Senate early in the fall so it can plan accordingly.

A final question related to distance learning and the extent to which people from around the world will be able to study at the University of Minnesota. President Hasselmo responded that distance learning is one area in which an action plan will be forthcoming. In particular, technological and internal logistical issues will be addressed.

## **VIII. UPDATE ON 1994-95 BUDGET**

### **Discussion**

Evaluation of the new budgeting process--The University, President Hasselmo reported, has gradually moved toward a budgeting process that is beginning to integrate various elements in institutional and collegiate planning. It has become clear to the administration that a calendar needs to be developed indicating when budget decisions will be made in order to allow individuals and groups time to provide input.

1994-95 budget approved at the May Regents meeting--The 1994-95 budget that was approved at the May Board of Regents meeting included a 6 percent average faculty and staff salary adjustment, of which 3.25 percent will come from State funding and 2.75 percent from internal reallocation, an average 4.2 percent tuition increase, a 3 percent inflationary increase on equipment and supply budgets, and an \$8.5 million strategic investment pool.

Results of requests to the Legislature (SIP and Capital Request)--President Hasselmo reported that \$9.1 million in funding for the University was proposed by the Conference Committee along with supportive language regarding U2000 initiatives. Unfortunately, the Governor then vetoed the \$9.1 million together with a number of other items for the State. The President said he believes the lesson to be learned from this session was that the University needs to be specific and concrete in what it asks the State to invest in (e.g. specific initiatives in research and graduate and professional education, undergraduate education, etc). In the final analysis it becomes a very political process in which the University is competing with many other organizations for funding.

## **IX. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

President Hasselmo said he was pleased to announce that he recently returned from a national celebration for service-learning. The University, he said, was selected as one of four sites to help initiate President Clinton's Americore project which provides federal funding for service-learning opportunities for students. The other three institutions selected were Harvard, Georgia Tech and UCLA. Service learning, he added, is an important component being built into the University's curriculum development.

The President also announced the appointments of Dr. Mel George as the new Vice President for External Relations, Dr. Bill Brody as the Provost for Health Sciences, and Dr. Mario Bognanno as the new Associate to the President.

In conclusion, the President expressed appreciation to outgoing student and faculty governance leaders for their valuable support and advice throughout the year.

## **X. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT**

No questions were forthcoming.

## **XI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Professor Judith Garrard, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, took several minutes to identify and thank a number of individuals who have provided outstanding service in governance activities this year, and to introduce the incoming leadership for next year.

The Senate in turn expressed appreciation to Professor Garrard for her leadership and service as the Senate Consultative Committee chair during 1993-94 and gave her a warm round of applause.

## **XII. 1993-94 ANNUAL REPORTS Information**

### **DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE Annual Report, 1993-94**

In 1993-94 the Disability Issues Committee has had three strands of discussion.

The committee met with Pat Mullen to clarify the relationship between the Disability Issues Committee and the recently formed administrative Steering Committee on the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The ADA committee had a legal mandate to plan implementation and oversight of broad guidelines. To avoid overlap of effort and to insure continuity of consultation, the ADA steering committee will always include at least one member of the Senate Committee, and the Chair of the ADA steering committee (currently Pat Mullen) will meet annually with the Senate Committee.

Library accessibility has been uneven in the past in spite of good intentions and efforts of library staffs. Directors of key areas of service and administration in libraries on the Twin Cities and Crookston campuses were consulted early in the year. Subsequent interim reports to the committee indicate new purchases of accessible technology and workstations, and commitments to broader dissemination of information about accessible services and accommodations.

Examination of University 2000 planning as it might have impacts on students with disabilities occupied a series of meetings (and are ongoing at the time of this report.) While U2000 planning documents have been for the most part devoid of specific content, several areas of concerns have been raised. The first is equitable access. While many potential University students who have disabilities are high achieving in high school, it is also true that many students with disabilities do not achieve high school ranks or admission test scores at levels commensurate with their potential, owing to uneven special education resources and services and interrupted education. The movement toward concentrating University admissions in the upper quartile will work to exclude students with disabilities disproportionately. The University is restricted in the information it can obtain about students in the admissions process, compounding the difficulty of moving toward higher standard measures of prior achievement without negative impacts on disabled citizens. University planners and admissions personnel met with the committee, were made aware of the concern about access, but have not, as yet, satisfactorily addressed this concern with specific plans. Second, as programmatic outcome measures are written and implemented, the potential to provide disincentives to the recruitment of students with disabilities is presented. For example, to the extent that standard graduation timelines are a measure of a program's "success," and are tied to budget allocations or quality measures, that program will find itself wishing to admit students who are not likely to experience delays or interruptions owing to accessibility limits or health/treatment stopouts. Insuring that departments are not tacitly discouraged from actively recruiting students with disabilities who might have special needs for accommodations is a central concern to the committee which has not yet been addressed by planners who have met with the committee (additional meetings are envisioned at which this will be a focus).

Finally, the committee was happy to acknowledge central administration's support for access in the form of increased funding for disability services on the Twin Cities campus.

**REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE OFFICER  
ANNUAL REPORT, 1993-94**

The University Grievance Office has received more than 60 grievances within the first seven month operating period under the new University Grievance Policy which became effective September 15, 1993. The volume of grievances is not too surprising, given that the new policy now covers non-bargaining unit Faculty, Academic Professional/Administrative, Civil Service and Student employees.

**Summary of Statistical Information**

Of the 143 office consultations that have taken place prior to the filing of a formal grievance, 62 (43%) of those potential cases resulted in the receipt of an official grievance.

Thus far in the grievance process, 27 grievances have been settled; 16 at Phase I and 11 at Phase II of the grievance process. I should note that there are currently 20 cases at the mediation stages of Phase I and Phase II of the grievance process. Of the 15 remaining cases, 13 have progressed to Phase III (Panel Hearing); 1 has been withdrawn and 1 file has been closed.

The system appears to be working and is being utilized extensively by all categories of University employees except Academic Professional & Administrative employees, who have filed only 2 of the 62 grievances received to date. The 15 faculty, 31 Civil Service, and 14 Student grievances deal with a wide variety of employment issues.

**Preparation for the Implementation of the new Grievance Policy**

After approval of the Policy by the Board of Regents, the Grievance Officer accomplished the following tasks:

1. Printed and Distributed the new policy in booklet form.
2. Worked with the Office of the General Counsel in the development of the Waiver and Release Agreement for Binding Arbitration.
3. Coordinated a two-day training session for members of the University Grievance Board and the Hearing Officers' Panel.
4. Worked with the Bureau of Mediation Services to compile lists of Arbitrators for grievances which continue to Phase IV - Arbitration.
5. Developed Written Statement of Grievance form for use with the new policy.
6. Developed Guidelines for Phase III Panel Hearings to assist both panelists and participants in the Phase III portion of the grievance process.

**Caseload**

University downsizing, layoffs, and the imposition of involuntary early retirement have contributed to the increased workload of the Grievance Office. The new Grievance Policy is an internal mechanism for good faith review and resolution of cases considered under the Policy. It is important that such a policy is in place during this period of institutional restructuring.

Another reason for the increased activity being experienced by the Grievance Office is that more issues are

grievable under the new policy. An analysis of the attached Summary of Grievances Received; Issues and Decisions, shows that many discretionary actions by supervisors are being challenged by employees throughout the University.

Also, experience thus far indicates that most grievants perceive the mediation efforts that are built into the grievance process to be fair and neutral. Consequently, employees are more likely to seek redress through the grievance process.

In spite of budgetary constraints, the Grievance Office has been able to handle the cases so far and the process seems to be working; however, I do not believe that this vital activity can continue to be successful with an unrealistic annual operating budget of \$110,000. This budget allocation includes the Grievance Officer's salary and benefits; an assistant's salary and benefits; training expenses; travel and lodging expenses for panelists and Hearing Officers on branch campuses as well as for the Grievance Officer to conduct Phase I and II proceedings at the other campuses; equipment and service contracts; telephone expenses; printing; office supplies and numerous other expenses.

### **Issues Observed**

A number of issues have arisen over the course of the 1993-94 Academic year that are related to the University Grievance Procedure:

First, some respondents view the grievance process as an unnecessary intrusion upon their time and managerial prerogative. In many cases, respondents react to a grievance with indignation and astonishment that an employee is allowed to grieve an action that they believe is procedurally and legally correct.

Unfortunately, individuals that are unreceptive or simply misunderstand the new policy compromise the process and underlying philosophy of "good faith review and resolution of employment grievances."

Second, the role of the Grievance Officer is misunderstood by some individuals. The Grievance Officer is policy-bound and has limitations on refusing to process a written grievance filed under the University Grievance Policy. The acceptance of a grievance by the Grievance Officer does not infer that a case has merit, nor does it confer any rights. It is the purview of Hearing Panel at Phase III that will determine the appropriateness and validity of a grievance, should a grievance progress to that stage.

The first two observations quite naturally lead to a third issue; namely, there is an unmet need to train respondent administrators as to the Policy's intent, purpose and proper use.

Fourth, while it might be inevitable that an employee may submit a grievance under the Policy to harass a respondent, this does not as yet appear to be a significant problem.

Fifth, the Policy calls for a prescribed number of Hearing Officers and Panelists that are available for service. Given the caseload and the number of cases currently at Phase III, this number needs to be increased.

With adequate training and the accumulation of experience, the previous issues described can be resolved and the University of Minnesota can have a well functioning and effective internal grievance process.

### **Conclusion**

Strong leadership is essential if an atmosphere of cooperation and communication is to be created and maintained throughout the University community. Hard and difficult decisions can be made in a fair and objective manner. Employment related grievance resolution is an integral part of the management of our human resources. To ensure that the University Grievance Policy operates as a fair and vital process, a commitment from Central Administration to provide both financial and leadership support is imperative.

Successful utilization of the grievance process is a cost-effective alternative to more expensive legal resolution of employment related grievances.

Clarence S. Carter

**Summary of Grievances Received; Issues and Decisions**

<u>Employee Classification</u>	<u>VP Reporting Category</u>	<u>Issue(s) Grievied</u>	<u>Decision/ Status</u>
1. Faculty	Agriculture, Forestry & Home Economics	Reprimand	Phase III
2. Faculty	Arts, Sciences & Engineering	Reprimand	Mediated Settlement at Phase I
3. Faculty	Health Sciences	Policy Interpretation	Mediated Settlement at Phase I
4. Faculty	Health Sciences	Withholding of Information	Mediated Settlement at Phase I
5. Faculty	Health Sciences	Due Process	Phase III
6. Faculty	Research	Due Process	Phase III
7. Faculty	Health Sciences	Disciplinary	Phase III
8. Faculty	Health Sciences	Reprimand	Mediated Settlement at Phase I
9. Faculty	Arts, Sciences & Engineering	Reprimand	Phase III
10. Faculty	Health Sciences	Sabbatical Denied	Mediated Settlement at Phase I
11. Faculty	Health Sciences	Due Process	Postponement
12. Faculty	Health Sciences	Discrimination	Phase III
13. Faculty/Adj	Academic Affairs	Termination	Phase I
14. Faculty	Health Sciences	Salary Equity	Phase I
15. Faculty	Academic Affairs	Reprimand	Phase I
16. P & A	Academic Affairs	Breach of Contract	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
17. P & A	Health Sciences	Reprimand	Phase III
18. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Reclass	Postponement
19. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Rules Violations	Phase II

20. Civil Serv	Arts, Sciences & Engineering	Termination	Phase III
21. Civil Serv	Health Sciences	Termination (Probationary)	File Closed; Lack of Timely Response
22. Civil Serv	Student Affairs	Reclass	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
23. Civil Serv	Student Affairs	Discrimination	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
24. Civil Serv	Student Affairs	Demotion	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
25. Civil Serv	Health Sciences	Termination	Phase III
26. Civil Serv	Health Sciences	Reprimand	Postponement
27. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Preferential Treatment	Mediated Settlement at Phase I
28. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Rules Violations	Phase III
29. Civil Serv	Academic Affairs	Breach of Contract	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
30. Civil Serv	Academic Affairs	Breach of Contract	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
31. Civil Serv	Academic Affairs	Discrimination	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
32. Civil Serv	Academic Affairs	Termination	Withdrawn before Phase I
33. Civil Serv	Student Affairs	Termination	Phase II
34. Civil Serv	Health Sciences	Termination (Probationary)	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
35. Civil Serv	Arts, Sciences & Engineering	Discrimination	Phase III
36. Civil Serv	Academic Affairs	Termination	Mediated Settlement at Phase II
37. Civil Serv	Health Sciences	Termination	Phase III
38. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Rules Violations	Phase II
39. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Performance Evaluation	Mediated Settlement at Phase I
40. Civil Serv	Health Sciences	Termination	Phase III

(Probationary)

41. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Reprimand	Phase I	
42. Civil Serv	Agriculture, Forestry & Home Economics	Reclass	Postponement	
43. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Disciplinary	Phase I	
44. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Harrassment	Phase I	
45. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Performance Evaluations	Phase I	
46. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Performance Evaluation	Phase I	
47. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Harrassment	Phase I	
48. Civil Serv	Finance & Operations	Rules Violations	Phase I	
49. Grad	Academic Affairs	Reclass/back pay	Phase II	
50. Grad	Academic Affairs	Termination	Mediated Settlement at Phase II	
51. Grad	Arts, Sciences & Engineering	Termination	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	
52. Grad	Agriculture, Forestry & Home Economics	Termination	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	
53. Undergrad	Finance & Operations	Demotion	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	
54. Undergrad	Arts, Sciences & Engineering	Termination	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	
55. Undergrad	Finance & Operations	Termination	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	
56. Undergrad	Finance & Operations	Reprimand	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	
57. Undergrad	President's Office	Termination	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	
58. Undergrad	Student Affairs	Termination	Mediated Settlement at Phase II	
59. Undergrad	Finance & Operations	Termination	Phase II	
60. Undergrad	Health Sciences	Termination	Phase II	
61. Undergrad	Finance & Operations	Harassment	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	
62. Undergrad	Academic Affairs	Payroll Dispute	Mediated Settlement at Phase I	

**Statistical Summary of Grievance Office Activity**

Consultations since September 15, 1993:	143	
Grievances Filed:	62	100%
Mediated Settlements:	27	44%
Phase I: 16	26%	
Phase II: 11	18%	
Postponements:	4	6%
Withdrawn:	1	2%
Files Closed:	1	2%
Grievances Open:	29	47%
Phase I: 10	16%	
Phase II: 6	10%	
Phase III: 13	21%	
Phase IV: 0	0%	

**Summary of Mediated Settlements by Employee Classification**

Faculty

Grievances Filed:	15
Mediated Settlements:	5
Percent Settled:	33%

Academic Professional & Administrative

Grievances Filed:	2
Mediated Settlements:	1
Percent Settled:	50%

Civil Service

Grievances Filed:	31
Mediated Settlements:	10
Percent Settled:	32%

Students

Grievances Filed:	14
Mediated Settlements:	11
Percent Settled:	79%

**Statistical Comparison of Issues Grievied by Employee Classification**

<u>Issue Grieved</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>P &amp; A</u>	<u>Civ Serv</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractual		1	2		3
Demotion			1	1	2
Discipline	2		1		3
Discrimination	1		4		5
Due Process	4				4
Equity	1				1
Harrassment			2	1	3
Payroll				1	1
Performance Eval			3		3
Reclassification			3	1	4
Reprimand	5	1	2	1	9
Rules Violation	1		4		5
<u>Termination</u>	<u>1</u>		<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>19</u>
<b>Total Grievances:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>62</b>

### **XIII. OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

### **XIV. NEW BUSINESS**

In response to an inquiry about a resolution developed and approved by the Senate Research Committee relating to the Animal Care and Use Committee, Professor Al Yonas, chair of the Research Committee, explained that it "strongly encourages the University of Minnesota General Counsel to consider, a high priority, the personal safety and health of all individuals involved with animal care, and especially protecting these individuals from possible litigation." The resolution has been forwarded to the General Counsel's Office.

### **XV. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY**

#### **FACULTY**

**Floyd H. Bellin, Jr.**  
**1928-1994**

Floyd J. Bellin, Jr., Extension Educator and Professor Emeritus with the Minnesota Extension Service (MES), died January 26, 1994. His extension career spanned April 1951 to September 1988, and included positions as

Goodhue County 4-H club agent, LeSueur Country agricultural agent, and Martin County extension educator. He held a B.S. degree from the University of Minnesota in agriculture and agronomy. Floyd was active in Kiwanis, the Martin County Planning Association, Epsilon Sigma Phi (the national Cooperative Extension fraternity), and the Minnesota Christmas Tree Association. Christmas trees from the Bellin farm at North Branch won several blue ribbons at the State Fair. Floyd is survived by his wife, Helen, who lives in Fairmont, Minnesota.

**Charlotte Weeks Hill  
1926-1994**

Charlotte Weeks Hill, assistant professor emeritus of ophthalmology, died from lung cancer at the age of 67 on March 18, 1994.

Born in Minneapolis, she received a B.A. degree in Latin American studies from the University in 1948. In 1954 she earned a nursing degree from New York University followed by a M.D. in 1959 from this University. Her internship year was spent at St. Paul's Miller Hospital prior to an ophthalmology residency at the Veterans Administration Medical Center and Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin from 1960-1963.

Beginning as a clinical instructor in 1963, through 1983 as a clinical professor, Charlotte was responsible for teaching ophthalmic pathology, anatomy, histology, and embryology to every resident enrolled in the Department of Ophthalmology's training program. There was rarely an ophthalmologist in the five-state area who had not come under her instruction.

Additionally during this time period she was an attending physician in the glaucoma clinic at St. Paul-Ramsey Medical Center, head of the eye department at Group Health, Inc., and a member of the board of directors of the Minnesota Society for the Prevention of Blindness and Preservation of Hearing. She was a charter commissioner of the Joint Commission on Allied Health Personnel in Ophthalmology and directed the Department of Ophthalmology's Ophthalmic Pathology Laboratory from 1976-1979.

In 1983 she was appointed as assistant professor and the first executive director of the Minnesota Lions Eye Bank in the Department of Ophthalmology. Her dedication and her organizational abilities gained her respect from colleagues in every area of eye banking.

In 1986 Charlotte retired in order to care for her seriously ill husband, Conrad Wortz, whom she married in 1985. After his death she volunteered for many medical organizations. She was an avid horsewoman, volunteering as a medic during local horse shows and riding in competitions. Shortly before her death she converted to Roman Catholicism.

Charlotte was an individual with impact. She always wore short cropped hair and was dressed only in black and white. She expected, and got, punctuality and hard work. She was known for her energy, uproarious laugh and saucy irreverence. But her impact was greatest in the unending dedication and loyalty she had for her work and for her friends.

**Norman W. Moen  
1917-1994**

Norman W. Moen was an exceptional product of the state's educational system and an outstanding teacher and administrator at this University for 41 years from 1946 to 1987. He was born on October 15, 1917, in Canby, Minnesota, where his father, the Reverend Paul Moen, was killed in an automobile accident just six weeks after his birth. In his early years in depression-wracked Canby, he presented a preview of his later talents by winning the state high school declamation contest, humorous division, and leading both the Mixed Chorus and Glee Club to "A" ratings in the state music contest. After graduation from high school, he taught in a nearby rural school before he came to

Minneapolis and enrolled at the University. He paid for his education and living expenses by working in a grocery store and singing in Minneapolis church choirs. He received his undergraduate degree, with distinction, from the College of Education in 1941. It was during that period that he developed an affinity for and interest in those economically disadvantaged who persisted in college.

Before Norman Moen could begin his career as a high school social studies teacher, the nation was immersed in World War II. He entered the U.S. Army in March 1942, and rose to the rank of major in the Field Artillery. During the war he was decorated first for gallantry during the Battle of the Bulge in the Ardennes, and later for heroic achievement in the Central European Campaign. At the end of the conflict, he was urged by his commanding officer to remain in the Army, but chose to return to the campus and enrolled in graduate school. He earned a master's degree in American Studies in 1947, and a doctorate in History in 1958.

During Norman Moen's period of graduate study, he began his long affiliation with the General College as an assistant to Dean Horace T. Morse in 1946. He remained to serve as Assistant Dean under Alfred L. Vaughan, and left administration in 1971 to teach full time. During that period of steady expansion in University enrollment, he took over the instruction of the course in Minnesota History which had been initiated in the General College by Theodore C. Blegen. He taught the one-quarter course several times a year to both day and evening students, who totaled over 5,000 by the time he retired in 1987. While working in the Dean's office, he also undertook the study of higher education administration with Professors Horace Morse and Robert Keller, and worked with Professor Ruth Eckert on the study of curricular trends in American higher education. In the 1970's and 1980's, he taught graduate seminars on those subjects in the College of Education.

From the mid-1960's to the mid-1980's, when the General College and the University served a wider range of educational needs, Norman Moen was a facilitator and active participant in educational outreach. When the state community college system was established, he was a major organizer in bringing representatives of those units together with the General College to explore faculty concerns in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. As minority student enrollment grew, he developed a sequence of courses on the history and issues affecting Minnesota Indian peoples. Those courses were later taken over by the Department of Native American Studies. He also served as a consultant on curriculum development for a junior college for Indian peoples in Quebec, Canada. He was involved in initiating Afro-American Studies in the General College, before such a program existed elsewhere at the University, and he served on the All-University Planning Committee to create the Martin Luther King Program.

As part of the University's outreach mission, and the General College's commitment to innovative education, Professor Moen offered Minnesota History to the prison system, on educational television, and at the Minnesota Courage Center. To meet the baccalaureate education component of the college's Minnesota Studies curriculum, he developed several courses; the longest taught was Minnesota Arts and Letters, which focused on the artists, architects, musicians, and writers of the state. He devolved courses under the heading of "current history," which looked at the background of modern communism and divided areas of the world from Northern Ireland to the Middle East to Korea. In addition, he was a regular lecturer in the college's team-taught courses based on such interdisciplinary themes as the search for a good life, and conflict and social change.

Because of his exceptional and unflinching skill as a teacher and lecturer, Professor Moen was sought after as a guest participant in day and evening classes, and also as a banquet speaker. In the late 1970's, the Minnesota Elderhostel program was established and brought senior citizens from across America to campus for short courses on a variety of topics. Moen was repeatedly asked to present lectures on various aspects of Minnesota History. When William Berkeley, president of the national organization, heard Moen in 1979, he commented, "In all my visits to Elderhostels throughout the country, I have yet to sit in on a lecture that was as exciting and as mesmerizing as Dr. Moen's."

With his strong interest in the University, his administrative experience, and his knowledge of higher education, Professor Moen was asked by Vice President Henry Koffler to become the Acting Dean of the General College at the time of the sudden death of Dean Richard P. Bailey. He declined but continued to have an influence on the direction of the college through his writings and presentations. He produced several papers about the history of the college, the evaluation of its curriculum, and its relation to "Commitment to Focus." In connection with the latter, he proposed the creation of new units variously called "Justin Morrill College" or "Regents' College." They contained many features similar to those in "University 2000," and others which were equally innovative.

After his 41 years of service Norman Moen received numerous honors including, in 1975, the Morse Award for outstanding contributions to undergraduate education. However, he is perhaps best remembered by his colleagues for four things:

- His ability to compress the rambling discourses of faculty assemblies into motions of consensus that moved the meetings along.
- His mastery of the English language and his ability to turn reports in the most mundane of topics into presentations of eloquence laced with humor.
- His interest in the plans and progress of his colleagues and the initiatives he took in mentoring their careers.
  
- His courage and good spirit in the face of radical cancer surgery and the debilitating effects of the disease which took his life on December 28, 1993.

He was a faculty member very grateful to this University for the doors it opened for him, the range of study it provided, the array of students and faculty he came to know, and the support it earned from the people of this state by saying: "Welcome; there is a place here for you."

**Alfred O.C. Nier  
1912-1994**

Alfred O.C. Nier, Regents' Professor Emeritus with the School of Physics and Astronomy, died May 16, 1994. Al's career at the University began in 1938. He was appointed Regents' Professor in 1966 and retired in 1980. Al left the University for three years, 1943-45, joining the Kellogg Corp. Upon his return to the University he assumed the position of acting chairman, 1950-51 and chairman, 1953-56 of the School of Physics and Astronomy. Many honors and awards and an extensive list of publications signify his great successes in a broad range of research areas, specifically in nuclear physics, geochemistry, atmospheric physics and, during the years after retirement, in extraterrestrial sample analysis. Early in his career Al developed a worldwide reputation in mass spectrometry and gas analysis. Al is survived by his wife Ardis of Roseville, two children, Janet Marx of Springfield, Virginia, and Keith Nier of Madison, New Jersey, and four grandchildren.

**ACADEMIC STAFF**

Cornelius "Neil" Bakkenist  
1943-1994

Thomas W. Barron  
1922-1994

**STUDENTS**

Wendy D. Hintsala  
College of Education

Susan R. Schenk  
College of Education

Lisa J. Wray  
College of Liberal Arts

**XVI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

**Martha Kvanbeck**  
**Abstractor**