

2000-01

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

No. 3

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
NOVEMBER 16, 2000**

The second meeting of the University Senate for 2000-01 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 16, 2000, at 2:33 p.m., as a joint meeting of the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 112 voting faculty/academic professional members, 27 voting student members, 1 ex officio member, and 2 nonmembers. President Yudof presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The November 30, 2000, Senate meetings have been cancelled.

2. MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 28, 2000

MOTION:

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

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/u_senate/000928sen.html
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/faculty_senate/000928fac.html
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/000928tcca.html>

**ROBERTA HUMPHREYS, 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

Margaret D. Doyle
Professor
Food Science & Nutrition
1914 - 2000

John R. Gordon

Professor
Anesthesiology
1923 - 2000

Otis M. Larsen
Professor
Mechanical Engineering
1911 - 2000

Arijit Mukherji
Associate Professor
Accounting
1962 - 2000

Harry E. Myers
Coordinator
Student Activities
1939 - 2000

James L. Nelson
Professor
Science & Engineering - Duluth
1938 - 2000

Kenneth A. Osterberg
Professor
Laboratory Medicine and Pathology
1932 - 2000

William Peterson
Regent
1935 - 2000

Robert C. Rathburn
Professor
General College
1918 - 2000

STUDENTS

Michael Schumacher
University of Minnesota - Morris

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

University Senate

Policy on Use of Class Notes for Commercial Purposes

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents – no action required

Amendments to the Grievance Policy

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Modified by the: Administration July 20, 2000; discussion PENDING
Approved as modified by the: Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Report of the Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity (*in principle*)

Approved by the: University Senate April 20, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents – no action required

Constitutional Amendments to Article III. Constitution

Approved by the: University Senate September 28, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Faculty Senate

Amendments to Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Interpretation of Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 20, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Constitutional Amendments to Article II. Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Approved by the: Twin Cities Campus Assembly September 28, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

5. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), noted that deans and vice presidents are non-voting members of the Senate, and therefore letters have been sent encouraging them to participate. He also directed the senators' attention to two brochures available, one on the biennial request to inform all students, staff, and faculty on the University's needs and the other which lists the successes of the University as a whole.

Professor Morrison then introduced Carolyn Chalmers, the new University Grievance Officer, and Betty Hackett, the new Academic Integrity Officer and gave each a chance to talk about their offices.

Ms. Chalmers said that she was schooled at the University of Minnesota and has been an employment lawyer for over 20 years. She served as a litigator in employment cases and then spent time as a mediator. She began at the University in October. The Grievance Office is for employment disputes. For faculty members, it compliments the Senate Judicial Committee. She noted that the office is available for pre-grievance counseling. Her goal for the office is to provide orderly processing of complaints, do outreach to University constituencies, and incorporate more mediation in the informal stages of the processes.

Ms. Hackett said that it is an honor to assume this role for the University after serving as the University's Student Judicial Affairs Officer. She has received counsel from the National Center of Academic Integrity on establishing an honor code. She also recognizes that there are several working models available from colleges at the University. She looks forward to working closely with the Student Academic Integrity Committee and students in general.

6. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Interpretation of the Grading and Transcript Policy
Information for the University Senate

IV. OTHER PROVISIONS

1. A student may repeat a course once. When a student repeats a course, (a) both grades for the course shall appear on the official transcript, (b) the course credits may not be counted more than once toward degree and program requirements, and (c) only the last enrollment for the course shall count in the student's grade point average. The preceding sentence of this policy shall not apply to courses using the same number but where students study different content each term of enrollment; all such courses falling under this provision must be approved by the college.

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has voted that this policy does not apply retroactively. The previous policy on repeating a course permitted a student to repeat a course as many times as he or she wished. This policy permits repetition of a course only once. Students who had already repeated a course under the old policy shall have the opportunity to repeat it one more time; the grade earned in the course the last time the student enrolls will be the one that counts in the grade point average.

WILBERT AHERN, Chair
SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

7. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Class Notes Policy Revision
Information for the University Senate

Policy on the Use of Class Notes for Commercial Purposes

...

Regulations

1. Students may not distribute, ~~via the Internet or other means, lecture class notes, handouts, or other instructor-provided materials for compensation or for commercial purposes, through the Internet, or for any reason other than personal study among classmates enrolled in the course,~~ without the express written consent of the instructor.
2. The provisions of this policy are enforceable as University rules under the University of Minnesota Statement of Standards of Student Conduct, and violations may result in warning, required compliance, confiscation, probation, suspension, or expulsion.
3. If the faculty of a department or collegiate unit, as a group, or individual faculty in a particular course, have assented to or authorized the distribution of lecture class notes or instructor-provided materials, such a practices does not violate this policy.
4. This policy is effective Spring ~~Fall~~ Semester 2001.

...

WILBERT AHERN, Chair
SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Wilbert Ahern, Chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), said that the University Senate approved this policy last semester, but that the President proposed several changes after discussion with the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC). SCEP reviewed these changes and believed that they better accomplish the intent of the committee and the administration.

8. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Educational Materials Conflict of Interest Policy
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

That the University Senate adopt the following policy.

Educational Materials Conflict of Interest

No member of the instructional staff of the University shall personally profit from the assignment of materials, or assignment of the venue of purchase of materials, to students in classes or any other instructional setting at the University without proper administrative approval.

The administration shall implement this policy by whatever reasonable means are possible. It is expected that the normal approval required will be by the department or the college.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) was recently made aware of an email message distributed to a number of faculty members inviting them to recommend books in their courses for sale through a commercial entity. In return for recommending and obtaining sales the faculty member received a commission. This seemed to be unethical to the members of SCEP and to a number of other faculty who communicated their views to SCEP.

In the course of considering the matter, SCEP was also made aware of an existing administrative policy, dating from 1991, that forbids instructors from assigning materials in a course of which they are the author and from which they receive royalties or other income without the authorization of the department chair or dean. SCEP suspects that few faculty are aware of the existence of this policy.

At the same time, SCEP (and the University, certainly) encourages faculty authorship of instructional materials and does not discourage the use of such materials in courses in the faculty member's department. However, every academic unit should ensure that instructional materials are selected on their academic merit and also ensure that there is no significant conflict of interest or appearance of conflict of interest in the selection of such materials. It is entirely appropriate for a faculty member/instructor to assign materials that he or she has written: they may be the most appropriate materials for that class and instructor. This policy provides only that the individual should not personally profit from the assignment of such material without appropriate departmental approval.

Many faculty find it appropriate to donate an amount similar to the royalties generated by the usage of their own students back to their department, college or the University for purposes that support student learning.

WILBERT AHERN, Chair
SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Wilbert Ahern, Chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), said that this item existed as an administrative letter but was never approved by the University Senate in terms of a policy.

Q: If a faculty member is currently using a textbook that he or she has written, would they need to receive permission to continue to use this textbook?

A: Yes. The administrative letter has been binding for faculty, but most did not know that it existed.

Q: Is there any objection to a faculty member arranging other methods for students to purchase low-cost textbooks as long as the faculty member does not make a profit?

A: There should be no problem arranging alternative textbooks as long as a profit is not made.

Q: Does this policy apply to articles in course packets?

A: There is a procedure for faculty to gain copyright approval for materials in course packets and the packet costs reflect duplicating and copyright expenses only.

Q: Are policy violations undercutting profits for the Bookstore?

A: SCEP did not sense widespread violations of the policy and did not take a position on Bookstore profits.

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

APPROVED

9. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROCEDURES
Information for the University Senate

The proposed document has been withdrawn from consideration at this time.

FRED MORRISON, Chair
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

10. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

That the Senate approve the following amendments to Article III of the bylaws, creating a new Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity, to replace the existing committee (Equal Employment Opportunity for Women) and to broaden its charge. New language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~. (Existing bylaws will be renumbered appropriately if this amendment is approved.)

6. EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Membership

The Equity, Access & Diversity Committee shall be composed of at least 7 faculty members, 2 professional and academic staff members, 2 civil service staff members, 6 students, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Each coordinate campus shall have at least 1 student representative and, where appropriate, 1 faculty or academic professional representative. Members should reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of the campus. Campuses are encouraged to maintain or develop campus committees on related issues. The committee may form standing or temporary subcommittees or task forces on specific issues as appropriate.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To advise the president and administrative offices on the impact of University policies, programs and services on equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity from a system perspective.
- b. To promote compliance among the University community with equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity laws and policies relating to students and staff.
- c. To review policies, programs and services related to equal opportunity for and the diversity of students and employees, and recommend any changes.
- d. To bring concerns to the Senate, as appropriate.
- e. To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- f. To submit an annual report to the Senate.

g. The role and performance of the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee will be reviewed during the 2002-2003 academic year, with a special emphasis on the extent to which the work of the existing Committee on Equal Opportunity for Women has been carried forward.

~~6. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN COMMITTEE~~

~~The Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee was established pursuant to and for the duration of the court decree in the case of *Rajender v. University of Minnesota*. Upon expiration of the decree (January 1, 1991), the committee continues in accordance with the "Women Academic Employees Policy Statement" of the Board of Regents.~~

~~Membership~~

~~The Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee shall be composed of 7 faculty members, 2 members of the academic professional staff, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. The committee shall be selected to reflect the general interest of the University in the pursuit of excellence in teaching and research as well as the special interests of women. The faculty members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. The academic professional staff members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees in consultation with the chair of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee with the approval of the Senate.~~

~~Duties and Responsibilities~~

- ~~a. To promote compliance with the "Women Academic Employees Policy Statement" approved by the University Senate on April 19, 1990 and adopted by the Board of Regents on July 13, 1990.~~
- ~~b. To recommend policies that guarantee equal employment opportunity for all women faculty and academic staff of the University.~~
- ~~c. To propose approaches for assuring that the University has an active affirmative action program for women in all of its academic units.~~
- ~~d. To encourage active measures to expand and strengthen the diversity of the academic community in accordance with the Regents' "Women Academic Employees Policy Statement."~~
- ~~e. To examine policies of the University to determine whether they would have a disparate impact on women and make recommendations to the University president or senior academic officers or to the University Senate if they do.~~
- ~~f. To work with the University's Equal Opportunity Officer to implement the Regents' policy statement on women academic employees.~~
- ~~g. To advise the University president and senior academic officers.~~
- ~~h. To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.~~
- ~~i. To submit an annual report to the Senate.~~

COMMENT:

This modified motion accommodates the concerns expressed by members of the Senate in the Spring of 2000. At that time the task force proposed a consolidation of the EEOWC and Disabilities committees, with an expanded charge. The Senate clearly expressed the view that the Disabilities Committee should remain separate. This draft deals with that concern. The original rationale for a broadly based committee to deal with access, diversity, and equity remains valid. The relevant portions of the task force's recommendation from last year are reprinted below. Although our rationale remains the same this year, in essence we are talking about expanding the charge and scope of EEOWC and creating a new committee that addresses issues of relevance to a number of groups, including women.

Rationale for the creation of a Senate Committee on Access, Diversity, and Equity

The Vision

The University Senate is committed to diversity among faculty, students, and staff and sees this as a common good. We seek to build a community that actively opposes discrimination, that welcomes and celebrates differences of identity and of viewpoint, and that is fully accessible. The journey toward such goals will be greatly enhanced by a strong Senate voice which is committed to this vision and which builds lively links to the many communities touched by it. We believe it is essential to have a committee within our structure charged with furthering this vision of equity, diversity, and access. Only such a committee will allow us to fulfill our responsibilities to provide a faculty voice in support of this vision within a system of shared governance.

Numerous Senate committees and groups have come and gone over the years, each of which addressed portions of this concern. There are, moreover, numerous advocacy groups, offices, and departments within the university that speak for these groups and that are available for consultation. Two of them are Senate Committees that have created models of advocacy on which this proposal builds. The Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity for Women - created in response to the Rajender Class Action Settlement - has a long and honorable history of advancing the interests of women on campus. As a result of their efforts, women are far more numerous, more visible as leaders, and more equitably paid than they were 25 years ago. In addition, temporary committees, such as the GLBT subcommittee of the Social Concerns Committee have performed specific tasks and then faded from existence. On the other hand, the Senate has no body that is charged with consultation on issues of racial discrimination, the promotion of racial and ethnic diversity, or concerns related to sexual orientation.

Therefore, we propose the creation of a Senate Committee on Access, Diversity, and Equity in order to provide for consultative participation on the full breadth of diversity and equal opportunity issues affecting faculty, students, and staff at the University of Minnesota. Our proposal would replace the two existing committees with a single committee that has a broader charge. This committee will be empowered to create subcommittees or task forces on an as needed basis to work on specific issues that may arise or in behalf of specific constituencies that might feel the need for a distinctive voice.

Why now?

1. It is simply not tolerable to have such important concerns unaddressed by any Senate committee.
2. Furthermore, neither of the administrators charged with responsibility for these issues (Rusty Barcelo, Associate Vice President for Multicultural Affairs, and Julie Sweitzer, Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action) has a clearly delineated consultative body linked

to the Senate. EEOWC has tried valiantly to fill this role, but its charge is far narrower than the responsibilities that these administrators bear.

3. We need to coordinate our work in a way that recognizes the intersection of identities and interests, and that creates a strong voice to consult directly and clearly with the administration on the full range of issues regarding diversity, equal opportunity, and access. This effort would underscore the University-wide responsibility for these issues.

4. As we enter the 21st century we also note that conditions today are considerably different than they were 30-40 years ago and solutions must be framed in response to new realities. The proliferation of constituency based groups, departments and programs, resource centers, and the like signal new positions within the University. The committee we propose would not replicate these groups, but instead would reach out to them and provide an environment in which to find the areas of common ground and overlapping interests.

5. It would also be built on the recognition that most individuals have multiple, overlapping identities.

6. We believe that it is essential to recognize the importance of working together within a broad vision and building on the strengths that would have been unimaginable only three decades ago.

The new committee should include members of the current committee that will be dissolved.

**SARA EVANS, Chair
SPECIAL TASK FORCE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Sara Evans, Chair of the Special Task Force, reminded senators that last spring a motion was made to establish a diversity committee by consolidating the Disabilities Issues and Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committees. Disabilities Issues strongly felt that their issues would be lost, and therefore the motion was not approved.

The current proposal is to establish a diversity committee by only consolidating the Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee and leaving the Disabilities Issues Committee free-standing. This new committee would serve in a consultative fashion to Associate Vice President Rusty Barcelo and deal with issues affecting faculty, students, and staff at the University.

Q: Why was bland language chosen for these bylaws instead of mentioning any specifics?

A: The task force wrestled with the language since there is no way to make mention of every possible group affected by the committee's intentions.

Q: How will the proposed committee deal with an influx of different issues?

A: The bylaws state that the committee can establish subcommittees to deal with topical or group issues. Some of these subcommittees may last long-term. Subcommittees also allow for more representation from outside the parent committee.

Q: Is it not possible for a current committee to handle these issues?

A: There is no Senate committee charged with all the issues represented by this proposed committee.

Q: Why was the title, Equity, Access, and Diversity, chosen when language such as 'equal opportunity and affirmative action' is used in the body of the bylaw change?

A: The task force tried to capture the range of possible issues in the committee's title.

Professor Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), noted that there is a separate handout detailing a change to the Senate Rules should the bylaws change be approved.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 112 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

**11. UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
Terms of Service on the University Senate
Action by the University Senate**

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the Constitution, this motion requires a 2/3 majority of all voting members (143) at one meeting for approval, or a majority (108) of all members at two successive meetings. This is the second meeting at which this motion is being presented. It did not receive a majority of all members at the September 28, 2000 meeting. Therefore, it requires a majority of all voting members (108) at this meeting for approval.

MOTION:

To amend the University Senate Constitution, Article III, Section 4(e), as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE

4. Election of University Senate Members

1. ...

All faculty/academic professional members elected to the Senate shall begin service on July 1 and shall serve for three years and/or until their successors shall be elected and qualified. Elected faculty/academic professional members of the Senate shall not serve more than ~~four consecutive years~~ two consecutive terms, and shall be eligible for re-election only after a one-year interval of nonmembership in the Senate.

...

COMMENT:

The Senate Consultative Committee has concluded that having the term of office for faculty/professional administrative members of the Senate be three years but limiting service to four consecutive years is not very logical because it means senators elected to a second term may only serve one year of that term and must then be replaced in another election. The Committee

proposes that individuals be eligible for two consecutive three-year terms followed by at least a one-year interval before being eligible for re-election.

FRED MORRISON, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 122 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

12. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Yudof said that there has been much discussion lately regarding a new football stadium, but his position is that academic programs will come first. Any proposal is dependent upon independent financing from private sources or the state. There are three proposals regarding a stadium: remaining in the Metrodome, a joint-use stadium with the Minnesota Vikings, or a collegiate stadium. Any future planing would include feasibility studies on cost and location.

There have been discussions of building cost over-runs. Reasons for these increased costs range from poor estimates, to changes in the scope of the project, to a hot construction market. There are also concerns about bids being higher than expected, as was the case with Coffman Union and the Duluth Performing Arts Center. The administration will be reviewing every item in the six-year capital plan and making adjustments. Some project will be delayed due to the increased costs.

He also noted that the University needs to generate enthusiasm for the biennial request. This request is important to the University since it serves the basic needs of the Academic Health Center, undergraduate education, and interdisciplinary areas.

The Board of Regents has five vacancies this year since the Governor has decided not to make any interim appointments.

The Committee of 21, which is a result of the Economic Summit, is deliberating issues regarding workforce, research and development, faculty support, and venture capital. The committee will be issuing a report on these deliberations in the future.

13. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: Several weeks ago, Parking and Transportation Services removed several trees from the Law School parking lot to make room for seven additional parking spots. The trees' removal coincided with the release of a global warming message. What will be done to replace these trees?

A: The University needs to apologize for its actions since the removal was done without any consultation. Parking will be meeting with Dean Sullivan on this issue, but they have said that in addition to needing the space, some of the trees were already dead. The current plan is to line the parking lot with trees, although they will be much smaller than the ones that were removed.

Professor Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), noted that Eastcliff has been placed on the National Register of Historic places which means that no changes, such as President Yudof leaving, can be made without a federal permit.

Q: There was an article in the paper stating that for a \$200 million stadium investment, \$14 million would be returned in net profit per year for football. Given the normal return on endowments, would it not be better to have people endow the football team?

A: This idea will be taken under advisement!

14. HEALTH PLAN TASK FORCE Action by the Faculty Senate

Recommendation 1. The University should establish a standing Benefits Advisory Committee to monitor the benefits packages available to employees and to advise the University administration. The committee membership should include representatives of all affected groups.

Recommendation 2. The University administration should continue the recently-initiated negotiations with the State Department of Employee Relations (DOER) to acquire a management flexibility that has not been available through the state up to now. The flexibility should include:

1. Direct negotiations between the University and DOER.
2. The ability to modify plan design and employer contribution strategy of the state plans.
3. The ability to offer additional plans and benefits.
4. The ability to determine eligibility.
5. The option to have a separate risk pool.

As a contingency, the University administration should continue to pursue an employee benefits purchasing program separate from that of the state.

Recommendation 3. The University should maintain a diverse and stable set of health and dental plans, as well as group policies for long-term care, to meet the needs of its diverse set of employees, retirees, and graduate assistants.

1. **Diverse** plans should include the option to better cover alternative medicine and non-network expenses.
2. **Stable** plans require flexible management of employer contributions to direct more funding to plans that attract poor risk.

Recommendation 4. The University should offer to domestic partners the same benefits available to married employees.

**RICHARD McGEHEE, Chair
HEALTH PLAN TASK FORCE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor McGehee, Chair of the Health Plan Task Force (HPTF), said that nothing has changed in the final report, except that the full report is now available on-line. The material today is just the executive summary, the final recommendations, and a proposed charge for the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC).

Of the four recommendations, there has been some controversy regarding establishing a BAC. The HPTF feels that this type of committee is important since it is the only mechanism for non-union employee input into the process. In a discussion regarding the charge, the task force felt that the BAC should be jointly appointed by the Faculty Senate, Civil Service Committee, and the Academic Staff Advisory Committee. The task force also advises that graduate students have representation on the committee, and that their role be determined by their involvement in the employee health plans. Unions should also have representatives, but with non-voting positions. The name was also chosen to reflect the scope of benefits that the committee would need to deal with should the University separate from the state.

Professor Morrison, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that the University had not been represented in the formation of health benefits prior to the appointment of the HPTF. The task force has given the University's employees a greater voice in developing benefits with the state, and this needs to continue.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate would like to ask the HPTF members to continue as the interim BAC, with a charge limited to health care and related benefits, until the charge is approved by the Faculty Senate, Civil Service Committee, and the Academic Staff Advisory Committee. This proposal would allow the people with experience, HPTF members, to continue working on the issues from the final report and negotiating changes with the state.

Another concern has been the graduate students' position. He has been told that graduate students are interested observers in this process and have no plans to eliminate their separate insurance plan at this time. They should remain as non-voting members on the BAC. If at some point graduate students decide to join the employees' health coverage, then they should have voting positions on the BAC.

Lastly, the University needs to proceed on two tracks. On one hand, one group will need to handle the administrative matters involved with carrying out the recommendations. President Yudof has designated Senior Vice President Cerra to chair this administrative group. On the other hand, a committee, such as the BAC, will need to continue to represent the employees' interests.

President Yudof then thanked Professor McGehee and the HPTF members for the years of work on this issue. If these recommendations are approved, he will adhere to them. He did note that there is no conflict of interest because the University does not plan to offer its own health plan, although University providers will continue to provide services through other health plans. In closing, he noted that the work of both groups will not be easy as the University is faced with rising employee and employer health benefit costs, although the state seems to be open to changes for University employees.

Q: Recommendation 3, part 2 calls for the University to cross-subsidize plans to provide stability. Would the cross-subsidy allow for plan stability?

A: There are two ways to look at subsidy. First, if all employees were in a single risk pool, then the healthy would subsidize the sick and the young would subsidize the old. Most people do not think of this since they consider themselves lucky when they are well. When risk adjustments are needed, it can look like a subsidy, but these adjustments are needed to keep plan prices lower even though these plans might have all the higher cost employees. The right amount of adjustment is a delicate question, but if diverse plans are desired, then the question needs to be answered.

Q: Is there a possibility that higher-income and higher-cost employees would choose the higher cost plan and then be subsidized by the poorer employees who choose the lower cost plans?

A: This situation could happen if the situation is not managed closely. The University would need to have costs at the actuarial level, not at the experience cost of the plan.

Q: Why do employees need to carry University insurance if they are covered somewhere else?

A: The HPTF has looked at this question and posed it to the state. The main reason is a subsidy issue. From the view of the state, if they allow employees with other insurance to opt-out, then the price will increase for everyone remaining. If the University decides to separate from the state, then this situation can be rectified; if the University remains with the state, then more negotiations will be needed.

Q: What is the definition for domestic partners, all couples or only same sex?

A: The definition was purposely left vague. The intent is to comply with Regents policy, however there is a movement through MnSCU to have domestic partners, defined as same and opposite sex, covered at the state level.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the four recommendations were approved.

A motion was then made to ask the HPTF to continue to serve in an interim basis as the HBAC until a permanent charge is established.

Q: Will the students continue on the HBAC?

A: Yes.

Q: What will be the duties of the interim HBAC?

A: The HBAC will focus on working with the state on the elements in recommendation 2.

Q: Will the HBAC be looking at long-term care insurance and defined contributions versus defined benefits?

A: These issues will need to be addressed at some point.

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

A final motion was then made to express a debt of gratitude and recognize the efforts of the Health Plan Task Force members throughout this process. With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with a round of applause.

APPROVED

15. FACULTY EMERITI ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES **Information for the Faculty Senate**

COMMENT:

At the April 20, 2000, Faculty Senate meeting Faculty Emeriti Administrative Procedures were approved. In October 2000, the procedures were approved by Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks with one linguistic change. The deleted language in the Faculty Senate policy

is ~~struck out~~ and the additional language in the Executive Vice President and Provost policy is highlighted. This change is being reported to the Faculty Senate for information.

Faculty Emeriti Administrative Procedures

...

Special circumstances. As provided in the policy, Section III, subdivision 2, the emeritus title can be awarded ~~or promotion in rank made for~~ a faculty member not meeting the definition of faculty to emeritus as set forth in the policy, Section I, subdivision 1; or a promotion can be made in the emeritus rank.

...

**RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

16. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS Discussion and Action by the Faculty Senate

COMMENT:

In light of suggestions from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, the "Principles Regarding Instructional Personnel" have been modified since the preparation of the Senate docket. Both the committees have endorsed the statement as revised.

Draft of November 10, 2000

PRINCIPLES REGARDING INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

In order to provide a sound program of instruction for its students at all levels, undergraduate, graduate and professional, the University must rely on its regular faculty to take principal responsibility for developing and teaching courses carrying degree credit. Academic staff and adjunct faculty support this mission of the University through their important contributions in the fields of their special qualifications.

The tenured and tenure-track professors are the regular faculty of the University. They participate in all three missions of the University: teaching, research, and service. The core instruction in every discipline should be provided primarily by these members of the faculty. This is especially true in courses in the major and at the graduate level. These faculty have responsibility for recommending the establishment of courses of study and have teaching duties at all levels. These responsibilities for instruction may be shared with visiting and temporary faculty. In circumstances in which the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure precludes regular appointments, contract faculty may also share in this responsibility. All faculty members must be carefully selected and reviewed by a process that includes peer review.

Other instructional personnel make a valuable contribution to the University, but have more specialized functions. Most of them participate primarily in the teaching mission of the University. Members of the academic professional staff (lecturers and teaching specialists) provide instruction in some multi-sectioned courses, especially at the introductory level, and in skills courses. Adjunct faculty from inside and outside the University and members of the University's non-instructional administrative staff teach in the specialized fields in which they

have professional expertise. Graduate assistants provide instruction to other students while obtaining experience for their own future careers. These groups complement, but do not supplant, the regular faculty, who retain primary responsibility at all levels for the instructional programs and their academic standards.

The Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure describes the appropriate use of non-faculty instructional personnel. The Senate urges the Executive Vice President and Provost to issue administrative instructions further detailing these expectations. The administrative policy should be reviewed thoroughly in five years.

The Senate also urges the University to make provision for appropriate employment conditions, including appropriate notice periods and full health and retirement benefits, for individuals who are in the academic professional category.

FRED MORRISON, Chair
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Morrison, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that academic appointments have been a subject of debate at the University for over two years, during which time the University has discovered that each college has a different situation.

Through the efforts of a joint committee chaired by Professor Kent Bales, recommendations were made and approved by the Faculty Senate. These recommendations were sent to a second task force chaired by Dean John Brandl. This committee agreed with the recommendations, but made some adjustments.

Following the two reports, there was a conclusion that the University needed some administrative procedures to deal with future planning in terms of limiting and restricting the appropriate use of non-regular faculty. This document is currently being developed, but since it is an administrative document, it will not come to the Faculty Senate for approval. Therefore, a set of principles was created to provide the Senate with a voice in this matter. These principles have been endorsed by the FCC, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), and are now being presented for Faculty Senate approval.

Professor Morrison noted that the most recent version was on the one-page handout, but that a friendly amendment had been made to remove the word 'core' from the second paragraph.

Q: In terms of the administrative procedures, will it be reviewed before being implemented and who will conduct the review in five years?

A: The administrative procedures have been and will continue to be reviewed by SCEP and SCFA, but this review is at a level of detail too great for a Faculty Senate meeting. In five years, the policy review will also be conducted by SCEP, SCFA, and possibly the Faculty Senate. The procedures also call for the annual review of appointments by the Tenure Subcommittee.

Professor Kent Bales, Chair of the Academic Appointment Subcommittee, said that this is a negotiated conclusion which he is in favor of. There are still some minor problems in the proposed procedures, but the questions that remain will be worked out in the future. The Faculty Senate will also have the opportunity to review issues once the procedures have been in place.

Professor Wilbert Ahern, Chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), noted that SCEP spent three meetings thoroughly reviewing these materials. He expressed special appreciation to Professor Bales and Vice President Carol Carrier. SCEP originally had concerns with three areas: what would trigger creating a special plan for appointments?, what level was permissible before a special report would be made?, and is a statement of principles needed? Each of these questions received an appropriate response from the drafting committee. One continuing concern, which SCEP will watch, is the balance between full-time and part-time non-regular faculty appointments.

Several senators expressed support for the essence of these principles.

Q: Who is creating the details of these procedures and has there been any student input?

A: Each college will develop a plan as well as special plans for departments with over 25% of the instruction from non-regular faculty. These plans are then approved by the collegiate governance organizations, at which point students are included.

Q: The second paragraph refers to many different kinds of faculty. The last sentence notes, "all faculty members." What was the intent of this phrase?

A: The intent is that there should be peer review of all faculty, although the procedures recognize that this might be harder for some faculty, such as visiting faculty.

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

APPROVED

17. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

18. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

19. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
NOVEMBER 16, 2000**

The third meeting of the Faculty Senate for 2000-01 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 16, 2000, at 2:33 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 112 voting faculty/academic professional members, 1 ex officio member, and 2 nonmembers. President Yudof presided.

**1. ANNOUNCEMENTS
(Senate Agenda Item 1)**

The November 30, 2000, Senate meetings have been cancelled.

**2. MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 28, 2000
(Senate Agenda Item 2)**

MOTION:

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

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/u_senate/000928sen.html
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/faculty_senate/000928fac.html
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/000928tcca.html>

**ROBERTA HUMPHREYS, Clerk
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**3. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS
Information
(Senate Agenda Item 4)**

Faculty Senate

Amendments to Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Interpretation of Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999

Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 20, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents NOT YET SUBMITTED

**4. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
(Senate Agenda Item 5)**

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), noted that deans and vice presidents are non-voting members of the Senate, and therefore letters have been sent encouraging them to participate. He also directed the senators' attention to two brochures available, one on the biennial request to inform all students, staff, and faculty on the University's needs and the other which lists the successes of the University as a whole.

Professor Morrison then introduced Carolyn Chalmers, the new University Grievance Officer, and Betty Hackett, the new Academic Integrity Officer and gave each a chance to talk about their offices.

Ms. Chalmers said that she was schooled at the University of Minnesota and has been an employment lawyer for over 20 years. She served as a litigator in employment cases and then spent time as a mediator. She began at the University in October. The Grievance Office is for employment disputes. For faculty members, it compliments the Senate Judicial Committee. She noted that the office is available for pre-grievance counseling. Her goal for the office is to provide orderly processing of complaints, do outreach to University constituencies, and incorporate more mediation in the informal stages of the processes.

Ms. Hackett said that it is an honor to assume this role for the University after serving as the University's Student Judicial Affairs Officer. She has received counsel from the National Center of Academic Integrity on establishing an honor code. She also recognizes that there are several working models available from colleges at the University. She looks forward to working closely with the Student Academic Integrity Committee and students in general.

**5. HEALTH PLAN TASK FORCE
Action by the Faculty Senate
(Senate Agenda Item 14)**

Recommendation 1. The University should establish a standing Benefits Advisory Committee to monitor the benefits packages available to employees and to advise the University administration. The committee membership should include representatives of all affected groups.

Recommendation 2. The University administration should continue the recently-initiated negotiations with the State Department of Employee Relations (DOER) to acquire a management flexibility that has not been available through the state up to now. The flexibility should include:

1. Direct negotiations between the University and DOER.
2. The ability to modify plan design and employer contribution strategy of the state plans.
3. The ability to offer additional plans and benefits.
4. The ability to determine eligibility.
5. The option to have a separate risk pool.

As a contingency, the University administration should continue to pursue an employee benefits purchasing program separate from that of the state.

Recommendation 3. The University should maintain a diverse and stable set of health and dental plans, as well as group policies for long-term care, to meet the needs of its diverse set of employees, retirees, and graduate assistants.

1. **Diverse** plans should include the option to better cover alternative medicine and non-network expenses.
2. **Stable** plans require flexible management of employer contributions to direct more funding to plans that attract poor risk.

Recommendation 4. The University should offer to domestic partners the same benefits available to married employees.

**RICHARD McGEHEE, Chair
HEALTH PLAN TASK FORCE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor McGehee, Chair of the Health Plan Task Force (HPTF), said that nothing has changed in the final report, except that the full report is now available on-line. The material today is just the executive summary, the final recommendations, and a proposed charge for the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC).

Of the four recommendations, there has been some controversy regarding establishing a BAC. The HPTF feels that this type of committee is important since it is the only mechanism for non-union employee input into the process. In a discussion regarding the charge, the task force felt that the BAC should be jointly appointed by the Faculty Senate, Civil Service Committee, and the Academic Staff Advisory Committee. The task force also advises that graduate students have representation on the committee, and that their role be determined by their involvement in the employee health plans. Unions should also have representatives, but with non-voting positions. The name was also chosen to reflect the scope of benefits that the committee would need to deal with should the University separate from the state.

Professor Morrison, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that the University had not been represented in the formation of health benefits prior to the appointment of the HPTF. The task force has given the University's employees a greater voice in developing benefits with the state, and this needs to continue.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate would like to ask the HPTF members to continue as the interim BAC, with a charge limited to health care and related benefits, until the charge is approved by the Faculty Senate, Civil Service Committee, and the Academic Staff Advisory Committee. This proposal would allow the people with experience, HPTF members, to continue working on the issues from the final report and negotiating changes with the state.

Another concern has been the graduate students' position. He has been told that graduate students are interested observers in this process and have no plans to eliminate their separate

insurance plan at this time. They should remain as non-voting members on the BAC. If at some point graduate students decide to join the employees' health coverage, then they should have voting positions on the BAC.

Lastly, the University needs to proceed on two tracks. On one hand, one group will need to handle the administrative matters involved with carrying out the recommendations. President Yudof has designated Senior Vice President Cerra to chair this administrative group. On the other hand, a committee, such as the BAC, will need to continue to represent the employees' interests.

President Yudof then thanked Professor McGehee and the HPTF members for the years of work on this issue. If these recommendations are approved, he will adhere to them. He did note that there is no conflict of interest because the University does not plan to offer its own health plan, although University providers will continue to provide services through other health plans. In closing, he noted that the work of both groups will not be easy as the University is faced with rising employee and employer health benefit costs, although the state seems to be open to changes for University employees.

Q: Recommendation 3, part 2 calls for the University to cross-subsidize plans to provide stability. Would the cross-subsidy allow for plan stability?

A: There are two ways to look at subsidy. First, if all employees were in a single risk pool, then the healthy would subsidize the sick and the young would subsidize the old. Most people do not think of this since they consider themselves lucky when they are well. When risk adjustments are needed, it can look like a subsidy, but these adjustments are needed to keep plan prices lower even though these plans might have all the higher cost employees. The right amount of adjustment is a delicate question, but if diverse plans are desired, then the question needs to be answered.

Q: Is there a possibility that higher-income and higher-cost employees would choose the higher cost plan and then be subsidized by the poorer employees who choose the lower cost plans?

A: This situation could happen if the situation is not managed closely. The University would need to have costs at the actuarial level, not at the experience cost of the plan.

Q: Why do employees need to carry University insurance if they are covered somewhere else?

A: The HPTF has looked at this question and posed it to the state. The main reason is a subsidy issue. From the view of the state, if they allow employees with other insurance to opt-out, then the price will increase for everyone remaining. If the University decides to separate from the state, then this situation can be rectified; if the University remains with the state, then more negotiations will be needed.

Q: What is the definition for domestic partners, all couples or only same sex?

A: The definition was purposely left vague. The intent is to comply with Regents policy, however there is a movement through MnSCU to have domestic partners, defined as same and opposite sex, covered at the state level.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the four recommendations were approved.

A motion was then made to ask the HPTF to continue to serve in an interim basis as the HBAC until a permanent charge is established.

Q: Will the students continue on the HBAC?

A: Yes.

Q: What will be the duties of the interim HBAC?

A: The HBAC will focus on working with the state on the elements in recommendation 2.

Q: Will the HBAC be looking at long-term care insurance and defined contributions versus defined benefits?

A: These issues will need to be addressed at some point.

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

A final motion was then made to express a debt of gratitude and recognize the efforts of the Health Plan Task Force members throughout this process. With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with a round of applause.

APPROVED

6. FACULTY EMERITI ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES
Information for the Faculty Senate
(Senate Agenda Item 15)

COMMENT:

At the April 20, 2000, Faculty Senate meeting Faculty Emeriti Administrative Procedures were approved. In October 2000, the procedures were approved by Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks with one linguistic change. The deleted language in the Faculty Senate policy is ~~struck out~~ and the additional language in the Executive Vice President and Provost policy is highlighted. This change is being reported to the Faculty Senate for information.

Faculty Emeriti Administrative Procedures

...

Special circumstances. As provided in the policy, Section III, subdivision 2, the emeritus title can be awarded ~~or promotion in rank made for~~ a faculty member not meeting the definition of faculty to emeritus as set forth in the policy, Section I, subdivision 1; or a promotion can be made in the emeritus rank.

...

RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

7. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS
Discussion and Action by the Faculty Senate
(Senate Agenda Item 16)

COMMENT:

In light of suggestions from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, the "Principles Regarding Instructional Personnel" have been modified since the preparation of the Senate docket. Both the committees have endorsed the statement as revised.

Draft of November 10, 2000

PRINCIPLES REGARDING INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

In order to provide a sound program of instruction for its students at all levels, undergraduate, graduate and professional, the University must rely on its regular faculty to take principal responsibility for developing and teaching courses carrying degree credit. Academic staff and adjunct faculty support this mission of the University through their important contributions in the fields of their special qualifications.

The tenured and tenure-track professors are the regular faculty of the University. They participate in all three missions of the University: teaching, research, and service. The core instruction in every discipline should be provided primarily by these members of the faculty. This is especially true in courses in the major and at the graduate level. These faculty have responsibility for recommending the establishment of courses of study and have teaching duties at all levels. These responsibilities for instruction may be shared with visiting and temporary faculty. In circumstances in which the Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure precludes regular appointments, contract faculty may also share in this responsibility. All faculty members must be carefully selected and reviewed by a process that includes peer review.

Other instructional personnel make a valuable contribution to the University, but have more specialized functions. Most of them participate primarily in the teaching mission of the University. Members of the academic professional staff (lecturers and teaching specialists) provide instruction in some multi-sectioned courses, especially at the introductory level, and in skills courses. Adjunct faculty from inside and outside the University and members of the University's non-instructional administrative staff teach in the specialized fields in which they have professional expertise. Graduate assistants provide instruction to other students while obtaining experience for their own future careers. These groups complement, but do not supplant, the regular faculty, who retain primary responsibility at all levels for the instructional programs and their academic standards.

The Regents Policy on Faculty Tenure describes the appropriate use of non-faculty instructional personnel. The Senate urges the Executive Vice President and Provost to issue administrative instructions further detailing these expectations. The administrative policy should be reviewed thoroughly in five years.

The Senate also urges the University to make provision for appropriate employment conditions, including appropriate notice periods and full health and retirement benefits, for individuals who are in the academic professional category.

**FRED MORRISON, Chair
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Morrison, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said that academic appointments have been a subject of debate at the University for over two years, during which time the University has discovered that each college has a different situation.

Through the efforts of a joint committee chaired by Professor Kent Bales, recommendations were made and approved by the Faculty Senate. These recommendations were sent to a second task force chaired by Dean John Brandl. This committee agreed with the recommendations, but made some adjustments.

Following the two reports, there was a conclusion that the University needed some administrative procedures to deal with future planning in terms of limiting and restricting the appropriate use of non-regular faculty. This document is currently being developed, but since it is an administrative document, it will not come to the Faculty Senate for approval. Therefore, a set of principles was created to provide the Senate with a voice in this matter. These principles have been endorsed by the FCC, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), and are now being presented for Faculty Senate approval.

Professor Morrison noted that the most recent version was on the one-page handout, but that a friendly amendment had been made to remove the word 'core' from the second paragraph.

Q: In terms of the administrative procedures, will it be reviewed before being implemented and who will conduct the review in five years?

A: The administrative procedures have been and will continue to be reviewed by SCEP and SCFA, but this review is at a level of detail too great for a Faculty Senate meeting. In five years, the policy review will also be conducted by SCEP, SCFA, and possibly the Faculty Senate. The procedures also call for the annual review of appointments by the Tenure Subcommittee.

Professor Kent Bales, Chair of the Academic Appointment Subcommittee, said that this is a negotiated conclusion which he is in favor of. There are still some minor problems in the proposed procedures, but the questions that remain will be worked out in the future. The Faculty Senate will also have the opportunity to review issues once the procedures have been in place.

Professor Wilbert Ahern, Chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), noted that SCEP spent three meetings thoroughly reviewing these materials. He expressed special appreciation to Professor Bales and Vice President Carol Carrier. SCEP originally had concerns with three areas: what would trigger creating a special plan for appointments?, what level was permissible before a special report would be made?, and is a statement of principles needed? Each of these questions received an appropriate response from the drafting committee. One continuing concern, which SCEP will watch, is the balance between full-time and part-time non-regular faculty appointments.

Several senators expressed support for the essence of these principles.

Q: Who is creating the details of these procedures and has there been any student input?

A: Each college will develop a plan as well as special plans for departments with over 25% of the instruction from non-regular faculty. These plans are then approved by the collegiate governance organizations, at which point students are included.

Q: The second paragraph refers to many different kinds of faculty. The last sentence notes, "all faculty members." What was the intent of this phrase?

A: The intent is that there should be peer review of all faculty, although the procedures recognize that this might be harder for some faculty, such as visiting faculty.

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

APPROVED

**8. OLD BUSINESS
(Senate Agenda Item 17)**

NONE

**9. NEW BUSINESS
(Senate Agenda Item 18)**

NONE

**10. ADJOURNMENT
(Senate Agenda Item 19)**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

**STUDENT SENATE MINUTES
NOVEMBER 16, 2000**

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2000-01 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 16, 2000, at 11:32 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 37 voting student members. Mr. Percy Chaby presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The November 30, 2000, Student Senate meeting has been cancelled. The next Student Senate meeting will take place on Thursday, February 22, 2001.

2. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT

NONE

3. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Jason Reed, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, reported that SSCC recently discussed the six year capital plan, which is the University's request for buildings and building improvements in the even-numbered years. The items being proposed for 2002 include: Northrop Auditorium, an IT Technology and Teaching facility, AHC Translational Research Building, Bede Hall improvements at Crookston, Social Science Building renovations and sprinkler system at Morris, and a Lab Science Building at Duluth. This project list will be approved by the Regents in December.

At the University Senate meeting, an Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee is being proposed in place of the Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee. Student senators should be present when the vote is taken so that the Bylaws change is approved.

In regards to the due date for Fall Semester, there was a proposal by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) to change this from the current 72 hours to the week before spring semester classes started. The issue was then brought to the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) and it was decided to not make any changes to this policy.

SSCC has also looked at the budget figures for financial aid distribution in the state and the Student Legislative Coalition Legislative agenda.

4. CAMPUS REPORTS

Crookston - Chris Shulstad noted that CSA is filling a student representative to the Regents position as well as several student senate positions.

Duluth - Amber Benning reported that UMDSA is trying to work with the faculty union to provide student evaluations.

Morris - No report.

Graduate and Professional Student Association - Paul Enever noted that GAPSA had a few representatives attend the National Association of Graduate and Professional Students regional conference. As a result of this conference, GAPSA is looking at establishing a committee on diversity issues as they relate to graduate and professional students. Other issues for this year will be Coffman renovation and Boynton Health Services. Jeanette Lauger has also been named the new SLC representative.

Minnesota Student Association - Ryan Nagle said that MSA is focusing on the light rail transit central corridor plans and approving the Fees Committee slate.

5. STUDENT SERVICE FEES TASK FORCE UPDATE

Paul Enever, Chair of the Student Service Fees Task Force, said that there have been two meetings, one of which was system-wide, since the last Student Senate meeting. At the system-wide meeting, good information was gathered from the coordinate campuses to help formulate a best practice for the University. A web site for comments is now available at: www.umn.edu/ssftf.

Paul Enever then noted that the lawsuit against the University has been dropped. Following the Supreme Court's ruling on viewpoint neutrality, the plaintiffs asked to amend their lawsuit. This request was denied, the lawsuit was dropped, and the plaintiffs were discouraged from refiling.

In regards to the Twin Cities component, the task force has decided to focus on the composition of the fees committee, how members are chosen, what their roles are, as well as the scope, charge and responsibilities of the fees committee. Access to the fees process will also be discussed. Any interested students are welcome to attend a meeting or leave comments via the web.

Q: Is there any concern with a conflict of interest for students who are serving on the task force and on the fees committee?

A: No conflict of interest has been expressed by members of either group.

6. ASSOCIATION OF BIG TEN SCHOOLS (ABTS) UPDATE

Percy Chaby, Student Senate Chair, noted that the Association of Big Ten Schools (ABTS) holds conferences three times per year at different Big Ten schools. At the last ABTS meeting, issues such as corporatization, lobby efforts, building relationships with administrators, transportation, and technology fees were discussed to share solutions across campuses. The ABTS is looking for stable office space and coordinating a lobbying effort at the federal level.

Q: How many students attended and how was it funded?

A: Two students attended this conference and the trip was funded by MSA and the Student Senate. The University will be hosting this conference in the Fall 2001, so central funding is being looked for.

Q: Does the ABTS focus on the entire university system or just the Twin Cities campus?

A: The focus is on the Twin Cities, but some issues relate to the coordinate campuses.

**7. STUDENT LEGISLATIVE COALITION (SLC)
2000-01 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA
Action**

The Student Legislative Coalition (SLC) supports the University's budget request but does not support the raise of our tuition which will happen if the legislature does not fully support the proposed budget. SLC would like to align ourselves to be educated and fully aware of the University initiative while being responsive to the main issue of students, price.

As a two part plan, SLC supports the money to be spent by the University to provide a foundation and investment for the future while keeping the affordability for students a priority. This is in consideration with our mission which is to advocate for affordable, accessible, and quality education. This agenda supports all three of these issues.

**PERCY CHABY, President
STUDENT LEGISLATIVE COALITION**

DISCUSSION:

Percy Chaby, President of the Student Legislative Coalition (SLC), noted that SLC is the main student lobbying organization on campus. SLC is run by a board of governors, which is comprised of the student body presidents from each campus, legislative designees from each campus, and the Student Senate Chair. There are also employees and interns on each campus to research issues pertinent to each campus.

SLC has an office on the Twin Cities campus and employs an executive director, a grassroots coordinator, and a professional student lobbyist. This past summer, SLC became incorporated.

Each year, SLC brings its legislative request to the Student Senate for approval. This year's request will be focusing on tuition because it affects the most students. A survey will also be conducted during the year to learn about other issues that students might have.

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

APPROVED

8. DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT YUDOF

President Yudof said that funding for a stadium will not be put ahead of academic priorities. The University already has a six year plan which does not include any funding for a stadium. There are other possibilities, such as a joint-use facility. He believes that the state needs to provide financing if they want this project to proceed. He then asked for any questions that the students might have.

Q: There is a rumor that if George Bush is elected president you would be asked to serve as the Secretary of Education. Is there any truth to this rumor?

A: He is committed to finishing projects at the University and a cabinet position is not an attractive job offer, although it would be hard to say no to the President. He has accepted a position on the Educational Testing Services Board which relates to his history of studying educational policy and the law.

Q: In terms of the biennial budget, how much will tuition increase if state funding is not received?

A: Tuition is not the preferred choice for raising funds. It will depend on how short the funding is. If the University receives less than it needs to pay its health benefits and a three percent raise for staff and faculty, then a five to six percent raise is possible. If the University receives enough funding for basic operations, then it could stay at three percent. The University needs to fund its health benefits and cannot increase faculty and staff pay less than inflation. He does not believe that it is fundamentally fair for the state to reduce its contribution and force students, who are the least able, to pay the difference.

Q: Are there any plans to have the coordinate campuses participate in future economic development summits?

A: There are no plans for summits at the coordinate campuses, but he would support any of the chancellors if they decided to host a summit. Many people attended in the Twin Cities from across the state and various proposals from the summit were responsive to greater Minnesota. It is true, though, that the research and development areas are disproportionately oriented to the Twin Cities campus.

Q: What has been the legislature's response to the University's request?

A: There has not been any current response because of the election. Before the election, the University met with legislative leaders and there was a sympathetic response. Until the session starts, it will be hard to get a definite read. He is pleased that Peggy Leppik will continue as the Chair of the House Higher Education Committee, since she has been a strong supporter of the University. Senator Weiner will serve as the new Chair of the Senate Higher Education Committee.

The biggest issue is that higher education's request does not fit into the Governor's budget structure. The University's supplemental budget is only \$70 million, considerably less than recent requests at Wisconsin or Michigan. The base budget also includes improvements in undergraduate education, such as more advisors, opportunities for undergraduate research and study abroad, and funding for 40 new professors.

Students have been very influential during the past sessions, and will need to continue to talk with the legislators. Parents should also be asked to write letters in support of this budget.

Q: Did the Executive Vice President and Provost bring anything back for you from Crookston?

A: He brought back a shirt. Thank you!

Q: What are your feelings about the Benefits Advisory Committee being proposed by the Health Plan Task Force?

A: It is needed because he does not feel comfortable making decisions without consultation with faculty and staff. He will also try to fulfill all the task force recommendations although some recommendations might be hard with the rising premiums costs.

Q: In terms of graduate assistants joining the University's health benefits pools, who do you envision making this decision?

A: The administration would consult with the graduate student organizations before any decision would be made.

With no further questions, the Student Senate thanked President Yudof for meeting with them.

9. HEALTH PLAN TASK FORCE Action

MOTION:

To approve the final recommendations from the Health Plan Task Force. The Student Senate will vote separately on each recommendation.

Recommendation 1. The University should establish a standing Benefits Advisory Committee to monitor the benefits packages available to employees and to advise the University administration. The committee membership should include representatives of all affected groups.

Recommendation 2. The University administration should continue the recently initiated negotiations with the State Department of Employee Relations (DOER) to acquire a management flexibility that has not been available through the state up to now. The flexibility should include:

3. Direct negotiations between the University and DOER.
4. The ability to modify plan design and employer contribution strategy of the state plans.
5. The ability to offer additional plans and benefits.
6. The ability to determine eligibility.
7. The option to have a separate risk pool.

As a contingency, the University administration should continue to pursue an employee benefits purchasing program separate from that of the state.

Recommendation 3. The University should maintain a diverse and stable set of health and dental plans, as well as group policies for long-term care, to meet the needs of its diverse set of employees, retirees, and graduate assistants.

8. **Diverse** plans should include the option to better cover alternative medicine and non-network expenses.
9. **Stable** plans require flexible management of employer contributions to direct more funding to plans that attract poor risk.

Recommendation 4. The University should offer to domestic partners the same benefits available to married employees.

**RICHARD McGEHEE, Chair
HEALTH PLAN TASK FORCE**

DISCUSSION:

Jason Reed, Health Plan Task Force (HPTF) member, said that the Student Senate and Faculty Senate would each be voting separately on these recommendations since each group is a separate risk pool. He then read through the first recommendation and asked for any comments.

A student senator said that he has read through the task force report and, in general, is supportive of the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) but with strong reservations in terms of the graduate assistants participation. No one seems to be able to definitely say whether or not graduate

assistants are considered an affected group and who will decide if graduate assistants join the main University health benefits pool since graduate assistants only have a non-voting position on the BAC. Additionally, if the graduate assistants do join the main University pool, they are only allowed to vote on issues that affect their benefits. Why does this voting stipulation not pertain to other employee groups on the BAC? Even with these questions, he still felt that the recommendation should be approved so that the process can move forward.

With no further questions, a vote was taken and the first recommendation was approved.

Jason Reed then read each of the next three recommendations. With no comments, separate votes were taken on each of the recommendations and all three were approved.

APPROVED

10. CLASS NOTES Information

Policy on the Use of Class Notes for Commercial Purposes

...

Regulations

1. Students may not distribute, ~~via the Internet or other means, lecture class notes, handouts, or other instructor-provided materials for compensation or for commercial purposes, through the Internet, or for any reason other than personal study among classmates enrolled in the course,~~ without the express written consent of the instructor.
2. The provisions of this policy are enforceable as University rules under the University of Minnesota Statement of Standards of Student Conduct, and violations may result in warning, required compliance, confiscation, probation, suspension, or expulsion.
3. If the faculty of a department or collegiate unit, as a group, or individual faculty in a particular course, have assented to or authorized the distribution of lecture class notes or instructor-provided materials, such a practices does not violate this policy.
4. This policy is effective Spring ~~Fall~~ Semester 2001.

...

**WILBERT AHERN, Chair
SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Jason Reed, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, noted that last February the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) brought forth this policy to the University Senate. It was approved but with many questions from the students. This fall, the President discussed the policy with the SSCC and mediated a compromise between the students and faculty. The revised policy allows students to share notes with other students as long as they do not receive compensation.

Percy Chaby, Student Senate Chair, stated that this policy should also stop companies from coming on campus and recruiting students.

A student senator noted that this policy does not prohibit campus organizations from distributing notes for cost.

11. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

12. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

13. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:38 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

APPENDIX A MEMORIAL STATEMENTS

Margaret D. Doyle

Professor Emerita Margaret D. Doyle died October 14, 2000. She was 86. Professor Doyle was a faculty member at the University of Minnesota from 1960 to 1980, where she taught Sociocultural Aspects of Nutrition and World Food Supply Problems, and served for a time as chair of the nutrition program. In 1972 she spent a sabbatical leave in England as honorary research fellow, Department of Anthropology, University College, University of London.

Professor Doyle received an M.S. (food chemistry) and a Ph.D. (Nutrition) from the University of Chicago. Her professional and honor society memberships included the American Institute of Nutrition, American Dietetic Association, American Home Economics Association, Society for Nutrition Education, American Board of Nutrition, American Association for Advancement of Science (fellow), Sigma Xi, Iota Sigma Pi, Sigma Delta Epsilon, and Gamma Sigma Delta. She was listed in *American Men of Science* and *Who's Who Among American Women*.

After retirement, Professor Doyle lived in Dune Acres, Indiana, where she was an active member of the community. This past summer the Duneland Chamber of Commerce presented her with its Senior Service Award.

She is survived by her daughter, Jean Winnike, of West Point, Iowa.

John R. Gordon

Dr. John R. Gordon of Minneapolis, emeritus professor of anesthesiology at the University of Minnesota, died on Friday, March 17, 2000 from complications associated with Alzheimer's disease.

Dr. Gordon was born on March 16, 1923 in Schreiber, Ontario, Canada. Before entering medical school he served as a flight navigator in the Royal Canadian Air Force during WWII. He served from 1942 to 1944 and was later honored as a war hero and decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross. After being shot down over enemy territory he was credited with aiding fellow crew members in escaping their disabled aircraft. He was held as a prisoner of war until the war ended in 1944. Following his military service he married Colleen M. Carroll of Fort William (now Thunder Bay), Ontario. He received a full scholarship to attend a four-year college and medical school at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. He was also the president of his 1951 medical school graduating class. Following graduation he completed a residency in anesthesia at the University of Minnesota and subsequently joined the anesthesia department. During his tenure he served as president of the Minnesota Society of Anesthesiology and as an examiner for the American Board of Anesthesiology. His research interests in the 1950's included the physiology of intrapleural and intrapulmonary pressures. He was an outstanding teacher and admired by his colleagues, residents, and medical students for his ability to bring clinical relevance to basic science subjects. His lectures were always well prepared, very coherent, and easy to comprehend. He was a leader in the field of anesthesiology and published many articles and authored chapters in several anesthesia textbooks. His fellow anesthesia academicians always held him in the highest esteem. We remember him as a scholarly, honest, straightforward, gentle clinician.

In addition to his professional work, Dr. Gordon was a poet, an avid historian, a philatelist, an ice hockey buff, a lover of classical and popular music and Shakespearean and classical theater. Most notably he will be remembered as a steadfast, trusting colleague who was loved by many for his generosity, humility, social charm, and engaging sense of humor.

Otis M. Larsen

Otis "Mel" Larsen passed away October 7, 2000 at the age of 89.

Otis M. Larsen served as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Minnesota from 1937 to 1976.

Professor Larsen's alma mater was the University of Minnesota where he earned a B.S. in 1933, and an M.S. in 1934, both in Mechanical Engineering. His thesis was "Harmonic Analysis of Vibration Phenomena." Professor Larsen's focus in Mechanical Engineering design continued throughout his career, both in the classroom and through outside activities.

Professor Larsen provided design and test engineering consultation for many companies including General Electric, Fairmont Railway Motors, John Deere Co., Kearney Trecher Co., and C & S Tool; and found time to work in his own shop, Larsen and Sons, where many of his inventions came to life.

At the University of Minnesota Professor Larsen taught Measurements Laboratory, Photoelasticity, Experimental Stress Analysis, Analysis of Mechanical Engineering Systems, Machine Design, and Engineering Systems Design.

Professor Larsen was recognized for his valuable service to advising students. In 1976 he had advised 52 Institute of Technology students through the central advising office. There he demonstrated willingness, interest and recognition of the importance of the advising function, and provided a learning experience for students in choosing a career after college.

Professor Larsen was preceded in death by his wife, Dorothy, and survived by sons, Robert and Richard; daughters, Marilyn and Karen; seven grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. He will be remembered for his wonderful outlook on life and his compassion for others.

The faculty of the Institute of Technology expresses their deep appreciation for Professor Otis "Mel" Larsen's 39 years of dedicated service to the University of Minnesota.

William Peterson

William Peterson, a member of the University of Minnesota board of regents, died Friday, October 20, at Regions Hospital, St. Paul. He was 65. An at-large member of the University Board of Regents, Peterson was elected to a six-year term in 1993 and re-elected in 1999. He had served as chair of the litigation review committee since 1995.

"Regent Peterson was a stellar member of the board of regents," said Patricia Spence, chair of the board. "His wise counsel anchored the handling of the most sensitive issues over many years. Minnesota and our university have lost a great leader. He will be deeply missed by his colleagues."

"Bill Peterson was a brilliant, compassionate and politically astute member of the board of regents," said university President Mark Yudof. "We will miss his leadership, his wisdom, his common sense and his good humor."

Gov. Ventura will appoint a replacement to serve until the legislature has had an opportunity to fill the vacancy.

Born June 2, 1935, in St. Paul, Peterson graduated from Cathedral Grade School and Mechanic Arts High School and served in the U.S. Navy from 1952 to 1956, including active service in the Korean War. An iron worker by trade, Peterson was elected business representative of Ironworkers Local 512 in 1970 and served until 1981, when he was elected executive secretary of the St. Paul Building Trades Council. He also served as president of the Minnesota State Building Trades Council and secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota AFL-CIO and on the Governor's Job Training Council, the Minnesota State Unemployment Advisory Council, the United Way board of directors and the board of directors of what is now Regions Hospital in St. Paul.

Peterson is survived by his wife of 43 years, Katherine; daughters Lori (Dennis) Bellows, Jean (Charles) Groshens, and Kristin (Jeff) Bullis; son, Joseph; and five grandchildren.

Robert C. Rathburn

Robert C. Rathburn was born December 17, 1918, in Chicago, Illinois, and died September 2, 2000, at Lingstenbloom Home. He is survived by his wife, Louise, and nieces and nephews. The Rathburns were long-time residents of St. Anthony Park.

In 1946, Rathburn came to the University of Minnesota where he taught English, Literature, Writing, and Rhetoric in the General College until his retirement in 1987. He also taught classes for Agriculture, the School of Liberal Arts, and University College. Rathburn was known and respected for his knowledge of English and Literature. It was at this time he met and later married Louise E. Jones who was serving as Program Director for the University of Minnesota YWCA.

In his earliest positions, Rathburn worked as an assistant in a law office in Chicago, served as managing editor with the Daily Northwestern University newspaper, then as reported with the Cedar Rapids Gazette.

Professor Rathburn received a B.A. degree in 1941 and an M.A. in 1942, both from Northwestern University and a Ph.D. in 1957 from the University of Minnesota where he majored in English with a minor in French. Rathburn became especially strong in the history of the novel. His Ph.D. thesis subject was "Dickens' Periodical Essays and Their Relationships to the Novels".

Rathburn's undergraduate honors included membership in Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Eta Sigma, and Sigma Delta Chi and Rathburn being a Nolan Scholar. He also received a graduate school scholarship, a membership in Lambda Alpha, Psi-Pi, and Delta Phi. During these years, Rathburn also served as a teaching assistant at the University of Pennsylvania.

During his tenure in the General College, Rathburn wrote in-depth reviews for publishers including Macmillan, Prentice-Hall, Rand McNally, Yale University Press, Salem Press, Bucknell University Press, and University of Minnesota Press. He was often called upon to edit documents for his peers, and came to be THE consultant for all things written. He was often called upon to lead a task force when a need arose. His service is noted by the following quotes:

"..(the Dean) conveys her appreciation for the dispatch with which you moved..., the resolutions of problems you arrived at, the fairness of your recommendations, and the timely preparation of your report."

"Had it not been for Bob's clear perception of the situation, his ability to be objective, to distinguish between facts and opinions, and his skill in writing...the cause would have been lost."

Rathburn served on numerous committees within the General College and the University including the University College Assembly, the Faculty Committee, the Executive Committee, the Social Committee, and various search committees. He also contributed his skills to the University YMCA and the University Westminster Foundation. His community service included membership in the Minnesota Historical Society, ST. Anthony Park Association, and the Minnesota Ornithological Union.

Rathburn edited (with Professor Martin Steinmann) From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad. The book included a sound and scholarly essay by Rathburn entitled "The Makers of the British Novel." His talents were solicited by many educational groups and publishers. He became editorial consultant to the Indiana University journal, Victorian Studies, and edited 75 Prose Pieces for Scribner, among many others.

The professional organizations Professor Rathburn belonged to included the Modern Language Association of America, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the American Association of University Professors.

Robert Rathburn's contribution to his field and to the University is best illustrated by his division head in the following statement: "...most of all I am encouraged by Dr. Rathburn's exuberant love of reading and of writing. He has a gay, fluent, and lively style, and he derives so much personal exhilaration in using it...he must convert his buoyancy and good humor, his canny wit and sharp observation...into eloquent and sinuous prose. The man must write to live..."