

2000-01

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

No. 4

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
APRIL 19, 2001**

The fourth meeting of the University Senate for 2000-01 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 19, 2001, at 2:34 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 102 voting faculty/academic professional members, 21 voting student members, and 6 ex officio members. President Yudof presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There will be a meeting of the Faculty Senate on Thursday, May 31, 2001, starting at 2:30 p.m.

**2. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 22, 2001
Action**

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/010222sen.html
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/faculty_senate/010222fac.html
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/010222tcca.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/STAFF

John R. Borchert
Professor
Geography
1918 - 2001

Robert L. Borg
Associate Professor
Music
1923 - 2001

Nengqian Chen
Research Associate
Pediatrics
1939 - 2001

Theda Hagenah
Professor
Academic Counseling
1917 - 2000

Thomas R. Hamilton
Professor
Microbiology
1911 - 2001

Albert F. Hayes
Professor
Obstetrics and Gynecology
1912 - 2001

John D. Hurrell
Professor
English and Liberal Arts
1924 - 2001

John J. Jurkovich
Assistant Professor
College of Education and Human Service Professions - Duluth
1912 - 2001

Kerry R. Kelts
Professor
Geology & Geophysics
1947 - 2001

Mary K. Klaurens
Professor
Education and Human Development
1924 - 2001

R. John Rath
Professor
History
1910 - 2001

John F. Roby
Senior Buyer
Purchasing
1926 - 2001

Yoshio Sako
Professor
Surgery
1918 - 2001

Charles T. Theisen
Associate Professor
Medical School
1947 - 2001

Helen J. Yesner
Professor
Social Work
1911 - 2001

E. W. Ziebarth
Dean
College of Liberal Arts
1910 - 2001

STUDENTS

Annie M. Hagen
University of Minnesota - Morris

Christine Orzechowski
University of Minnesota - Morris

Jonathan Thielen
General College

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

University Senate

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

Interpretation to the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy

Presented for information to the: University Senate February 22, 2001
Approved by the: Administration - no action required
Board of Regents - no action required

2002-03 and 2003-04 Calendars

Approved by the: University Senate February 22, 2001
Administration March 29, 2001
Board of Regents - no action required

Amendment to the Financial or Business Conflict of Interest Policy

Approved by the: University Senate February 22, 2001
Administration - March 29, 2001
Board of Regents - PENDING APPROVAL at May 11, 2001 meeting

Faculty Senate

Amendments to *Faculty Tenure* (Sections 5.3 and 11)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents March 9, 2001

Interpretation of *Faculty Tenure* (Section 15)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents March 9, 2001

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure (Addition to Rule 2b: Vice Chair)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents March 9, 2001

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure (Revision of 6b: Attorney)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 20, 1999
Administration June 13, 2000
Board of Regents March 9, 2001

Amendments to the Administrative Procedures for the Interim Regents Policy on Faculty Development Leaves

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 22, 2001
Administration March 29, 2001
Board of Regents - no action required

Declaration on Faculty Salaries

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 22, 2001
Administration - *See Response
Board of Regents - no action required

* The Administration has publicly stated that University of Minnesota faculty salaries are not yet competitive. The administration continually voices public and private support for increased faculty salaries for the reasons stated in the resolution, among others. The President has clearly noted that it is a priority objective to increase faculty salaries on the Twin Cities campus at a rate above the level of inflation with decisions on use of funding related to salaried to be based on market and merit. This institutional commitment also extends to the coordinate campuses as appropriate. The Administration agrees that the Legislature and the Governor must be made aware that addressing the issue of competitive faculty salaried is of the utmost importance to the long-term economic health of the state. It must be noted that the need for additional state support for faculty compensation is a critical component of our biennial budget submitted to the State of Minnesota. In our effort to promote that importance of the state's support of the institutional biennial budget we have enlisted the aid of key business and community leaders, previous government officials (in particular, Governors Anderson and Carlson), alumni, and current students and employees to take our message to citizens and legislator. The faculty's strong support for the total biennial budget is needed and appreciated.

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

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill vacancies on the Assembly Steering/Senate Consultative Committee, Professors Arthur Erdman, Candace Kruttschnitt, and Judith Martin were elected to three-year terms (July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2004). The Faculty Consultative Committee membership for 2001-02 will be:

Muriel Bebeau, School of Dentistry
Susan Brorson, University of Minnesota - Crookston
Arthur Erdman, Institute of Technology
Daniel Feeney, College of Veterinary Medicine
Candace Kruttschnitt, College of Liberal Arts
Judith Martin, College of Liberal Arts
Joseph Massey, College of Natural Resources
Paula Rabinowitz, College of Liberal Arts
Jeff Ratliff-Crain, University of Minnesota - Morris
Billie Wahlstrom, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences

ROBERTA HUMPHREYS, Clerk
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

6. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), noted that this is the last University Senate meeting at which he will be SCC Chair. He said that SCC has been dealing with the proposed stadium, health benefits, faculty salaries, and the University budget. He emphasized that each person should contact his or her legislators within the next week to ensure support for the University budget.

7. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements
Information for the University Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

On February 18, 1999, in adopting a policy on "Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements," the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was required to provide to the Senate "data on the mean grade point average by designator and course level, on the percentage of As awarded by course level, and overall collegiate grade point averages . . . for grades awarded each Fall Semester." The policy also provides that "data should be reported for all undergraduate students."

COMMENT:

These data were distributed at the meeting.

WILBERT AHERN, Chair

SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

8. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Policy on Evaluation of Teaching Contributions Information for the University Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

Interpretation of the POLICY ON EVALUATION OF TEACHING CONTRIBUTIONS by the Committee on Educational Policy (new language is underlined):

1. The teaching performance of all faculty, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status, must be subject to evaluation. The frequency and intensity of this assessment will vary. Probationary faculty are already subject to an annual retention review that includes an evaluation of their teaching. All tenured faculty who wish to be considered for a salary increase based on teaching must submit for review evidence of their recent contributions to teaching, including items of information listed below for peer review (Recommendation 2). In addition, faculty to be considered for a teaching-based salary increase must submit written student evaluations for at least one section of each of the courses taught during the previous year; a more accurate assessment of a faculty member's overall performance would include evaluations for at least one offering of each of the courses taught by the instructor during the period since his/her last teaching-based salary review, and all offerings of a course if it was significantly modified from one quarter to another.

Students must be made aware that their ratings will be used in making personnel decisions. A small number of questions common to all courses throughout the university will be used in the student evaluations of instructors. The use of common questions provides one means of making judgments on teaching effectiveness university-wide, and allows calculation of statistical norms. It is important to stress that this type of information can be used with other types to identify very good instructors who deserve rewards as well as instructors who may need assistance in improving their classroom effectiveness, but does not have the resolution necessary to allow fine discrimination between instructors in intermediate categories. In addition to questions that request a numerical score, survey forms must include provisions for written comments by students.

2. The required evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions must have two major components, peer review and student surveys. Academic units must make provisions for peer review for faculty being considered for tenure and promotion. This is to be supplemented by information from student evaluations of all their courses, as described in Recommendation 1. Faculty peers must evaluate course objectives and syllabi, handouts, assignments and tests, theses and dissertations, and examples of graded student work in order to measure their quality and appropriateness. Peers must also assess the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, contributions to departmental teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions, such as development of new courses or innovative instructional materials, authorship of texts or laboratory manuals, or publications on discipline-specific teaching techniques. Peer review could also include assessment of student performance on certification exams (if appropriate to the discipline), survey of the extent of mentoring and participation in other activities related to instruction, or assessment of an instructor's classroom performance via personal visit or videotaping of the class. It is to a faculty member's benefit to prepare and regularly update a teaching portfolio that contains materials that will be considered during his/her evaluation.

It is essential that the information collected to evaluate teaching effectiveness for personnel decisions remain confidential. The results must be shared with the faculty member being reviewed, but general access to information on a specific instructor must be restricted to those responsible for decisions on promotion, tenure, and salary adjustments.

Interpretation by the Committee on Educational Policy: This policy applies to all instructors regardless of whether they are tenure-track/tenured, term/P&A, or adjunct faculty or hold any other kind of teaching appointment at the University.

COMMENT:

SCEP received an inquiry about the application of this policy to those who hold teaching appointments of some kind (e.g., teaching specialist, education specialist, adjunct faculty, and others who hold faculty or faculty-like appointments but who are not on tenure-track appointments as defined by the tenure code). The language of the policy provides that it applies to "all faculty, regardless of their academic rank or tenure status" but there apparently has nonetheless been a question about its applicability to those who do not have tenure-track or tenured appointments.

This interpretation is intended to make it as clear as possible that the policy applies to everyone who teaches at the University.

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

**9. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Interpretation of the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy - Plus/Minus Grading
Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION

Interpretation of the UNIFORM GRADING AND TRANSCRIPT POLICY; new language is underlined.

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. There are two distinct grading systems on each campus of the University of Minnesota, A-B-C-D-F (with pluses and minuses) and S-N. The S-N system is a self-contained alternative to the A-F system and the two may not be combined for a particular student in a particular course. Students may receive grades or symbols only from the grading system under which they have registered for a course.

Interpretation by the Committee on Educational Policy: The policy does not require any instructor to use pluses and minuses.

COMMENT:

There continue to be questions addressed to the Senate office about whether or not instructors are obligated to use pluses and minuses. The Committee on Educational Policy takes the position they are not.

When the current grading policy was presented to the Senate, over a number of meetings and with considerable discussion, both Professors Laura Coffin Koch and Judith Martin (chairs of the

Committee on Educational Policy when the grading policy and subsequent amendments were discussed) told the Senate that use of plus-minus grading was not mandatory. The Committee does not believe that the promises made during the debate about the policy should be ignored. The Committee thus proposes that this interpretation be included in the policy.

WILBERT AHERN, Chair
SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

10. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Semester Conversion Amendment
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To amend the Standards for the Semester Conversion as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

SECTION 4A: The Senate affirms the standard (first adopted by the University Senate on February 16, 1922, and reaffirmed subsequently) that one semester credit is to represent, for the average University of Minnesota undergraduate student, three hours of academic work per week (including lectures, laboratories, recitations, discussion groups, field work, study, and so on), averaged over the term, in order to complete the work of the course. Enrollment for 15 credits in a semester would thus require approximately 45 hours of work per week, on average, over the course of the semester. All grades for academic work are based on the quality of the work submitted, not on hours of effort. ~~or approximately 45 hours of work over the course of an enrollment period. Expectations of faculty and students will be made clear.~~ It is expected that the academic work required of graduate and professional students will exceed three hours per credit per week or 45 hours per semester.

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

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy proposed a change in the semester conversion standard that governs student academic work per credit at the last Senate meeting; it was suggested that it should be made clear in the standard that the grade in a course is based on the quality of the work, not the time spent on it.

The Committee also believes that departments should review undergraduate course syllabi from time to time in order to determine if credits for a course are appropriate, given the Senate standard that each credit is to equal about three hours of work per week on average for the average undergraduate.

WILBERT AHERN, Chair
SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Wilbert Ahern, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), noted that this amendment was presented at the February Senate meeting, but senators felt that it placed too much emphasis on the number of hours of work versus a student's performance. A statement was added to address this understanding.

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

APPROVED

**11. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Undergraduate Residency Credit Requirements
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

That the Senate adopt the following policy (which amends in small part the Twin Cities Campus Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies and Practices, as noted).

MINIMUM UNIVERSITY CREDITS FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES

(1) To be eligible for a University of Minnesota undergraduate degree, a student must present at least 30 semester credits awarded by the University of Minnesota.

(2) These 30 credits must include at least 24 credits taken after declaration of or admission to the student's major or program, and these 24 credits must be taken from the college (in the case of the Twin Cities Campus) or campus (in the case of Morris and Crookston) offering the major or program. It is up to the college or campus to decide if "declaration of" or "admission to" is the appropriate description of how a student's major is determined.

(3) Of the last 30 credits earned prior to the award of a University degree, at least 15 credits must be awarded by the University of Minnesota.

A student's college or campus may waive the requirements in sections 2 and 3 above, but not section 1.

All credit awarded by the University, regardless of the type of instruction, shall count toward the credit requirements for the degree.

COMMENT:

The Senate has not to date passed a policy on this matter adjusted for semester credits. The previous quarter-system Senate policy required that 45 quarter credits be earned at the University of Minnesota for a degree, and this substantially conforms with that. The Twin Cities Campus Assembly adopted the Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies and Practices, which called for (1) 30 semester credits at the U of M, (2) 24 semester credits at the U of M following the declaration of a major or program, and (3) 20 semester credits at the U of M of the student's final 30 credits. Morris Campus officials noted that the third, 20-credit rule, might result in hardship for some students, as it would impose a residency requirement that could not readily be met in one term. Thus the Committee on Educational Policy proposes a 15 semester-credit rule for #3, which would apply to Twin Cities, Morris, & Crookston campuses, and which would replace that small portion of the Twin Cities Campus Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies.

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

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

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

MOTION:

The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy has approved the following interpretation (the underlined language) to Section 2 of the TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY SUPPLEMENTAL POLICY OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE POLICY ON CLASSES, SCHEDULES, AND FINAL EXAMINATIONS FOR THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS for semesters. It is also recommending to the Assembly an amendment: that reports on study arrangements made for students participating in athletic competition are only to come from the Twin Cities athletic academic counseling program. The Assembly and the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy have no authority or responsibility for the programs on the other campuses and they should not have been included in this (Assembly) policy. (Language to be deleted is ~~struck out.~~)

2. Athletic Events during Study Day and Finals Week

In those instances where post-season competitive events occur during Study Day or Finals Week (either of Day School or of Extension Classes), the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy shall consider them approved (that is, without requiring explicit action on the part of the Committee) subject to the following conditions:

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

The chair of the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy will receive, on an annual basis, a report from the Director of Academic Counseling (~~on the Twin Cities campus~~) or the appropriate individual (~~on the Crookston, Duluth, and Morris campuses~~) on the arrangements that are made pursuant to paragraph 2, above.

The Athletic Directors will annually report to the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy, early in the Fall Semester, on the number of student-athletes who missed any Study Day or any part of Final Examinations during the preceding year and on the academic performance of those student-athletes. These may be written reports.

Post-season or other athletic events that are invitational in nature, rather than a natural progression to a championship, and which would take place during Study Day or Finals Week, require the specific approval of the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy before participation may occur.

Subject only to the exception noted in this policy, no travel or competition is permitted from the period beginning with, and including, Study Day and ending with the last day of Final Examinations. Home events may be scheduled in the evening of the last day of Final Examinations if the examination schedule is concluded by 1800.

Interpretation by the Committee on Educational Policy: This Section 2 applies only to intercollegiate athletic teams, not teams competing under the aegis of the Department of Recreational Sports or any other unit of the University.

COMMENT:

Although the interior language of Section 2 of the policy makes it clear that the policy applies to the departments of men's and women's intercollegiate athletics, there has nonetheless recently been confusion on the point. Students who compete on a Recreational Sport team qualified for a national championship event and claimed they were entitled to an exemption under the provisions of Section 2 of this policy. It was never intended that the policy include all recreational competition, where participation is entirely voluntary; students who participate in intercollegiate athletics, however, are obligated to participate in post-season championship competition or they risk losing their status and their financial aid.

The deleted language removes reference to other University campuses, over which neither the Assembly nor the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy has any authority or responsibility. The language should not have been in the original policy.

**GORDON HIRSCH, Chair
ASSEMBLY EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**13. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Policy on Makeup Examinations for Legitimate Absences
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

That the Senate approve the following revised policy. The new policy is underlined; the older policy is ~~struck out~~.

~~POLICY ON MAKEUP EXAMINATIONS FOR LEGITIMATE ABSENCES~~

~~Students should not be penalized for absence due to unavoidable or legitimate circumstances. Such circumstances include, but are not limited to, verified illness, participation in athletic events or other group activities sponsored by the University, serious family emergencies, subpoenas, jury duty, military service, and religious observances. It is the responsibility of the student to notify faculty members of such circumstances as far in advance as possible. It is the responsibility of faculty members to provide makeups for major examinations, ordinarily including midquarter and final examinations. Should unusual situations make this impractical, appropriate alternative arrangements should be approved by the department chair. Except for~~

~~major examinations, for which accommodations must be made by the instructor, special arrangements for absences are at the instructor's discretion in the course concerned.~~

POLICY ON MAKEUP EXAMINATIONS FOR LEGITIMATE ABSENCES

Students shall not be penalized for absence due to unavoidable or legitimate circumstances. Such circumstances include, but are not limited to, verified illness, participation in intercollegiate athletic events or other group activities sponsored by the University, subpoenas, jury duty, military service, and religious observances. Students are responsible for providing documentation to the instructor to verify the reason for the absence.

1. It is the responsibility of the student to notify faculty members of such circumstances as far in advance as possible.

2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide reasonable accommodations or opportunities to make up exams or other course assignments that have an impact on the course grade.

COMMENT:

Because of ambiguities in the existing policy, leading to a number of questions presented repeatedly to the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee recommends that this revised policy be adopted. This policy broadens the entitlement of students to be accommodated in the event they miss class because of a University sponsored event or for other legitimate reasons as specified in the policy, but it also allows the instructor to accommodate the student, for example, by waiving minor class requirements, rather than being obligated to offer makeup work. The revised policy does provide that a student is entitled to accommodation or makeup for any work that has an impact on the grade, unlike the earlier version of the policy. The Committee believed, however, that if a student is legitimately absent from a class, any work which have an impact on the grade, whether major or minor, should be taken into account.

The accommodations that might be made in lieu of make-up work or examinations, especially for elements of the course that are relatively minor, might be to grade a student on the work completed. For example, if there are 10 quizzes during the term but a student is only able to take 6 because of legitimate absences, the student can perhaps be graded on the results of the 6.

The criteria that can be used in deciding whether the event is "University-sponsored" include, for example, the extent to which University funding is provided, whether University facilities are used, whether the student's participation is obligatory or nearly so, whether the student is representing the University (as on a debate or athletic team or in music presentations, and so on), whether the appropriate University faculty or staff agrees that the student is representing the University in the activity, and whether the University has had a role in scheduling the event."

WILBERT AHERN, Chair
SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Q: How can a faculty member verify an illness?

A: Faculty are empowered to ask for verification for absences.

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

**14. SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
Intellectual Property Procedures
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following Intellectual Property Procedures.

Procedures for the Intellectual Property Policy

Intellectual Property: Disclosure of Potential Intellectual Property

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer
Vice President for Research

Responsible Office
Patents and Technology Marketing

Intellectual Property: Disclosure and Review of Potential Intellectual Property

General Principles

A member of the faculty, staff or student body of the University who creates protectible intellectual property or any other individual subject to the Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property* (the "Intellectual Property Policy ") (a "Creator" under the terms of the Intellectual Property Policy) that potentially may be owned by the University (or by the sponsor of the work leading to the creation of the intellectual property) has the responsibility to promptly disclose, in writing, the existence of that intellectual property to the University through the office of Patents and Technology Marketing ("PTM"). The University will look to the Creator to decide in the first instance whether an invention or work is at a stage of development that disclosure to the University is advisable or required. That disclosure triggers PTM's review of sponsor requirements with respect to the intellectual property as well as an evaluation of the commercial potential of the intellectual property and its potential for protection. The disclosure is often the triggering event for creating a relationship between the Creator and the staff of PTM in assessing and developing the technology transfer potential of the intellectual property.

Procedures

1. When to disclose Intellectual Property. A Creator shall decide when to disclose to PTM the existence of a patentable invention once the Creator has conceived of the invention by having a mental picture of the invention or by being able to define the invention by its method of preparation, its physical or chemical properties or by whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it. A Creator shall decide when to disclose the existence of a copyrightable work once the work has been fixed in a tangible medium of expression. For Other Intellectual Property, prior to any disclosure to PTM, a Creator shall decide when to notify his or her immediate supervisor of the creation of such intellectual property. The University encourages Creators to consult with PTM in making the determination of when an

intellectual property must be disclosed to the University under the Intellectual Property Policy. The Creator shall promptly submit to PTM an Invention Disclosure Form once a determination has been made that the intellectual property must be disclosed. The Invention Disclosure Form along with its Instructions are available at PTM's website at www.ptm.umn.edu.

2. Sufficiency of Disclosure. The Creator submitting an Invention Disclosure Form shall ensure the disclosure is sufficiently complete to allow the University to make a reasonable evaluation of the prospects for protecting and licensing the disclosed intellectual property. For this purpose, the disclosure must contain the following at minimum: a description of the intellectual property sufficient to determine what may be protected and the potential commercial value, including experimental results; a list of the people involved in the development of the intellectual property; the funding sources for the creation of the intellectual property; a list and copies of the Creator's publications and manuscripts relevant to the intellectual property, including the dates of actual or anticipated publication; and copies of publications by others relevant to the intellectual property of which the Creator is aware. PTM will determine if the disclosure is complete and sufficient for evaluation and will so inform the Creator.
3. University Review of Disclosure. PTM will determine whether to attempt to protect and license the intellectual property. PTM should normally complete its review within three months of receipt of the complete disclosure, but circumstances may require a longer or shorter period. For example, if it is important to contact companies to gauge commercial merit, three months may not be adequate to provide the information to companies and obtain their feedback. On the other hand, patenting deadlines or licensing opportunities may make quick decisions necessary.
4. University Waiver. If it determines not to proceed with protecting and licensing the intellectual property, PTM shall send each Creator of that intellectual property identified in the Invention Disclosure Form a written notice of the University's decision not to attempt commercialization, and if there are no contractual or other legal requirements preventing waiver of the intellectual property, PTM shall also notify each Creator of his or her right to request a waiver of the University's rights and interests in the intellectual property. (See *Procedure on Intellectual Property: Waiver of University Rights or Acknowledgement of No University Rights.*)
5. University Abandonment. Even after determining to protect and license an intellectual property, the University may abandon its efforts if it decides the intellectual property cannot be commercialized because the property cannot reasonably be adequately protected by law, the property is not expected to deliver a reasonable return to the University and the Creators, or for other appropriate reasons. In deciding whether to abandon an intellectual property, the University shall consult the Creators of the property.

Intellectual Property: Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer
Vice President for Research

Responsible Office
Office of the Vice President for Research

Intellectual Property: Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest

General Principles

The University and the University community have a strong interest and responsibility for preserving the University as an institution free of conflicts of interest that could cloud scientific and scholarly judgments, could improperly influence the distribution of resources within the University, and could undermine the public's confidence in the University as an institution of high integrity. The University's early review of potential conflicts of interest is especially important when licensing to business or commercial interests in which the Creator is an officer or holds an executive position or has significant financial interests. The University and the University community then have as a goal the elimination of actual and the management of potential conflicts of interest.

A Creator's business or financial interest (be it as a shareholder, partner, or other holder of a present or future ownership interest, or as a director, officer, employee or consultant) in or with a company, does not constitute, standing alone, a conflict of interest. However, because of the potential for both personal and institutional financial benefit, transactions involving University-based intellectual property require careful consideration and review to ensure that potential conflicts of interest do not rise to the level of actual conflicts. The Board of Regents' *Policy on Conflict of Interest* (the "Conflict of Interest Policy"), as well as the Procedures for implementing the policy, applies to potential and actual conflicts of interest arising from University-based Intellectual Property. The procedures presented below provide a supplementary framework for intellectual property-based potential conflicts of interest.

Procedures

1. Creator's Disclosures. A Creator shall disclose to the University all of the Creator's business and financial interests reportable to the University under the Conflict of Interest Policy (i) when the Creator submits an Invention Disclosure Form to Patents and Technology Marketing ("PTM"), (ii) when the University enters into an agreement to license or otherwise transfer some or all of its rights in the Development disclosed in the Invention Disclosure Form, and (iii) when the University agrees to waive its rights in the Development to the Creator, the Creator shall make these disclosures using the Report on External Professional Activities ("AREPA") form. At each reporting juncture, the Creator should review his or her most recently submitted AREPA and determine if it accurately and completely discloses all the Creator's reportable business and financial interests. The Creator shall submit an updated AREPA if the most recently submitted version is inaccurate or incomplete. The staff of PTM will review with each Creator the accuracy and completeness of the disclosures in the Creator's AREPA. During this review, the Creator shall disclose to and discuss with PTM any additional business or financial interests of the Creator that could potentially create a conflict of interest. If such additional interests exist, the Creator shall update her AREPA and shall ensure it is reviewed by her departmental and collegiate administration so that adequate management of the potential conflict will occur.
2. Prohibition on Licensing. The University will not enter into any license or other agreement to transfer some or all of its rights in an intellectual property until (i) after each Creator of that property has submitted to the University an accurate and complete AREPA, disclosing all of each Creator's business and financial interests reportable to the University under the Conflict of Interest Policy as of the date of or a date just before the date of such license or agreement; (ii) after each Creator's departmental and collegiate administration has reviewed the updated AREPA(s); (iii) after the development and implementation of a plan to manage any reportable conflicts of interest, and (iv) in those instances in which the Provost's or the

Senior Vice President for the Academic Health Center's Conflict Review Committees (CRCs) approval is required, after such approval has been given and is subsequently reviewed by the Creator's collegiate administration.

Intellectual Property: Clarifying Definitions

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer

Vice President for Research

Responsible Office

Office of the Vice President for Research

Intellectual Property: Clarifying Definitions

Definition of "Course Requirement"

"Course Requirement," as defined in the Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property*, means "[i]ntellectual property created solely for the purpose of satisfying a course requirement" (Section VI, Subd. 2). The term refers to intellectual property created solely as a requirement for completion of a formal organized course offered and conducted by the University of Minnesota. The term does not apply to work required in individual studies or research courses. In particular, the term does not apply to work conducted in order to complete a thesis or a dissertation.

Definition of "Other Intellectual Property"

"Other Intellectual Property," as defined in the Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property* (the "Intellectual Property Policy"), is "intellectual property disclosed to and licensed or otherwise transferred by the University's technology transfer unit and not covered by [Section VIII] subdivision 1 and 2" (Section VIII, Subd. 3). For example, if the University required an employee, as part of his or her employment duties, to write a software application program, the program would be "Other Intellectual Property" and net income from a sale or licensing of it would be governed by Section VIII, Subd. 3 of the Policy on Intellectual Property. The term does not refer to, and expressly excludes, intellectual property which is the result of Academic Research or Scholarly Study or intellectual property created by a member of the faculty, staff or student body of the University or any other individual subject to the Intellectual Property Policy pursuant to and in conformance with the terms of the Board of Regents' *Policy on Outside Consulting, Service Activities and Other Work*.

Definition of "Out-of-Pocket Expenditures"

Net Income, as defined in the Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property*, is the "gross monetary payments the University receives as a result of transferring rights in intellectual property less the University's out-of-pocket expenditures (including legal fees) directly attributable to protecting, developing and transferring that intellectual property." (Section III, Subd. 3) The term means cash or other consideration paid to entities not owned by the University, including the fees and expenses of consultants and lawyers. In addition, expenses for levels of service and support provided by a University of Minnesota unit that are well beyond that customarily provided to support Patents and Technology Marketing or Sponsored Projects Administration in the process of protecting, developing and transferring that intellectual property

may be treated as out-of-pocket expense. Such payments will be made with the approval of the Vice President for Research and will be subject to review by the President. In no case will service provided by a unit reporting to the Vice President for Research be considered for payment as an out-of-pocket expenditure.

Intellectual Property: Handling Net Income Derived from “Other Intellectual Property”

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer
Vice President for Research

Responsible Office
Patents and Technology Marketing

Intellectual Property: Handling Net Income Derived from “Other Intellectual Property”

General Principles

The Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property* (the "Intellectual Property Policy") distinguishes intellectual property created as part of Academic Research or Scholarly Study from Other Intellectual Property owned by the University under Section V of the Intellectual Property Policy or law. The Board of Regents authorized the administration of the University to develop rules for determining if or how the University would distribute to Creators a share of the moneys earned from Other Intellectual Property. The University is under no obligation to distribute to Creators any portion of the moneys earned in connection with Other Intellectual Property. This Procedure sets forth the process under which the University shall determine the amount of any distribution to Creators of Other Intellectual Property.

- Opportunities for generation of net income from Other Intellectual Property are to be promptly disclosed to Patents and Technology Marketing (PTM) by the supervisor responsible for the work as soon as there is a belief by the supervisor that the work may have specific potential to generate net income.
- The supervisor functions in the role of principal investigator in making disclosures to PTM. PTM recognizes that supervisors may not have the expertise of a principal investigator and will work closely with the supervisor to explain the process and evaluate the opportunity.
- It is important to recognize the contributions of employees who develop Other Intellectual Property and to consider the difficulty of the work, the potential to generate net income and the level of innovation in determining the type of recognition. It is appropriate to provide monetary recognition in the form of a bonus or a series of bonuses for work that generates significant income.
- It is appropriate to provide a portion of the net income to the unit performing the work. The use of the net income should be determined by the unit and the funds used in a manner consistent with University policies and procedures. The receipt of the net income should not affect the unit's otherwise budgeted allocation of funds.

Procedures

1. After the Creator's disclosure to the University of the Other Intellectual Property, the Creator's supervisor and the Assistant Vice President for Research of PTM (or his or her designee) shall jointly author a letter to the Creator's departmental personnel file that

describes the Creator's role in developing the Other Intellectual Property and commends the Creator.

2. After the submission to PTM of an Invention Disclosure Form for the Other Intellectual Property and a determination by PTM that the Other Intellectual Property is commercially marketable, the Creator's immediate supervisor shall recommend to PTM how much, if any, of the Net Income from the University's granting of a license or otherwise entering into an agreement to transfer its rights in the Other Intellectual Property should be distributed to each Creator.
3. The University may distribute to a Creator a portion of the Net Income from the University's granting of a license or otherwise entering into an agreement to transfer its rights in the Other Intellectual Property. In deciding whether and, if so, how much to remunerate a Creator for the creation of the Other Intellectual Property, the University shall consider (i) the general importance of recognizing the contributions of employees who develop Other Intellectual Property; (ii) the difficulty of the work, (iii) the potential to generate significant net income, (iv) the level of innovation in determining the type of recognition, and (v) other appropriate factors. The University shall make such a determination each academic year the University expects to receive significant Net Income from the Other Intellectual Property.
4. The University may allocate to the unit or department of the Creator a portion of the Net Income from the University's granting of a license or otherwise entering into an agreement to transfer its rights in the Other Intellectual Property.
5. After PTM's receipt of the supervisor's recommended income distribution, the Vice President for Research, in consultation with PTM, shall decide how much, if any, of the Net Income from the University's granting of a license or otherwise entering into an agreement to transfer its rights in the Other Intellectual Property should be distributed to each Creator and to each Creator's department or unit.
6. The Vice President for Research's decision as to the distribution of Net Income from Other Intellectual Property shall be final and non-grievable. No provision of these Procedures shall cancel, limit or otherwise affect the right to grieve the University's failure to adhere to the notice and related procedural terms of these Procedures.

Intellectual Property: Waiver of University Rights or Acknowledgement of No University Rights

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer
Vice President for Research

Responsible Office
Patents and Technology Marketing

Intellectual Property: Waiver of University Rights or Acknowledgement of No University Rights

General Principles

The University will waive intellectual property claims to the Creator if the University determines not to protect and attempt to license that intellectual property. The University will also waive intellectual property to the Creator if it determines to abandon all efforts to protect and commercialize that intellectual property. The University will grant no waiver of intellectual property to the Creator if there are any contractual or other legal requirements that prevent the waiver. The University will acknowledge that it does not have rights to intellectual property at

the request of the Creator if the factual circumstances of the development of the intellectual property support such conclusion and are verified. Patents and Technology Marketing (PTM) shall be the responsible office for such waivers and acknowledgements.

Procedures

1. University Waiver. A Creator if only one individual created the intellectual property or all the Creators if two or more individuals created the intellectual property may submit to PTM a written request the University waive its rights and interests. This request may be submitted at any time after the University has determined the Invention Disclosure Form for the intellectual property is complete and after the University has delivered to each Creator a written notice of the University's intention not to commercialize the intellectual property.

The University may waive its rights and interests in a properly disclosed intellectual property if the University determines that the intellectual property cannot be commercialized because the property cannot reasonably be adequately protected by law, the property is not expected to deliver a reasonable return to the University and the Creators, or for other appropriate reasons. If the University waives its rights in an intellectual property, the University shall also assign its intellectual property rights existing at the time of the waiver, such as patent applications, or copyrights, to the Creator. PTM will cooperate with the Creator to effect such assignments.

The University will generally not grant waivers to intellectual property that is simply an idea with no associated proof of principle or significant test result. The University will also have discretion to determine the form and jurisdiction for pursuing protection for the intellectual property, and will not waive other forms or jurisdictions of protection. The University will not grant partial waivers, waiving to a Creator some but not all of the University's rights in a Development. For example, the University may pursue copyright protection only but will not waive any patent rights or the University may pursue patent rights in the U.S. only but will not waive European patent rights.

PTM shall promptly inform each Creator in writing if PTM determines to abandon all efforts to protect or maintain protection for the intellectual property. This written notice shall include an offer to waive if there are no contractual or other legal requirements preventing waiver (a decision to abandon some forms or some jurisdictions of protection while maintaining others shall not require an offer to waive). If a Creator requests the waiver, PTM shall promptly provide them a suitable written form and specify any known obligations to which the waiver is subject.

2. University Acknowledgment of No Rights. A Creator may request in writing to PTM that the University confirm that it does not have rights to specific intellectual property. Such request must explain the circumstances of the creation of the intellectual property in sufficient detail for PTM to determine that the intellectual property either does not fall within the scope of Section V of the Intellectual Property Policy or that it falls within one of the exceptions detailed in Section VI of the policy. A form for making such a request is available at www.ptm.umn.edu. PTM need not evaluate a Creator's request for acknowledgment of no rights until after the Creator's department head or other relevant supervisor has certified the accuracy and completeness, to the best of the department head's or supervisor's knowledge, of the representations in the Creator's request. Promptly after receipt of such request and certification, PTM will evaluate the information contained in the request and, if appropriate, generate a written acknowledgment that the University does not have rights in the intellectual property. Such acknowledgment will be contingent upon the accuracy of the information contained in the request.

3. Routine requests from publishers. Increasingly, publishers are requesting that the University provide documentation that it will make no claims on copyrighted materials such as scholarly papers and monographs be provided prior to publication (or even review). As this practice has become more widespread, the process described clearly does not scale for the very high volume of scholarly production of the University of Minnesota faculty. A form letter acknowledging that the University of Minnesota exercises no claims to rights or ownership in intellectual property created as a Regular Academic Work Product (unless assigned in writing) is available at www.ptm.umn.edu. Regular Academic Work Product is defined in the Regents' Policy on Intellectual Property in Section III, Subd. 4.

Intellectual Property: Notifying Sponsors

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer
Vice President for Research

Responsible Office
Patents and Technology Marketing

Intellectual Property: Notifying Sponsors

General Principles

The principal investigator on a grant has the responsibility of knowing and understanding the sponsor's requirements for reporting intellectual property. The principal investigator shall promptly disclose to Patents and Technology Marketing (PTM) any intellectual property subject to reporting to the sponsor. PTM shall be responsible for making the appropriate report to the sponsor.

Procedures

Specific procedures for principal investigators to make disclosures to meet sponsor requirements may be found at www.ospa.umn.edu.

Intellectual Property: Material Transfer Agreements

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer
Vice President for Research

Responsible Office
Patents and Technology Marketing
Office of Sponsored Projects Administration

Intellectual Property: Material Transfer Agreements

General Principles

The University encourages the transfer of biological and research materials. It is important that such transfers do not violate the terms of any contract or law. The University's Office of Sponsored Projects Administration (OSPA) and Patents and Technology Marketing (PTM) are responsible for ensuring the University meets these goals. A member of the faculty, staff or student body of the University who intends to receive biological or other research materials from a source that requires the University enter into a written material transfer agreement should route that request to the Office of Sponsored Projects Administration (OSPA). A member of the faculty, staff or student body of the University who intends to deliver biological or other research materials that they believe ought to be covered by a material transfer agreement should contact Patents and Technology Marketing (PTM).

Procedures

1. **Receiving materials.** Requests for material transfer agreements to cover materials received by the University should be routed by the recipient to OSPA using the routing form available at www.ospa.umn.edu. OSPA is responsible for determining the appropriate agreement to use (the Uniform Biological Materials Transfer Agreement is used whenever possible), for ensuring that the agreement will not conflict with any sponsor rights for the projects specified by the recipient in which the material will be used, and for negotiating appropriate terms as applicable. The recipient will be responsible for knowing and understanding the terms of the material transfer agreement and ensuring that they are met, including using and monitoring the material as specified in the agreement, and invention reporting and other reporting as required. The recipient will not use the material for any project other than the projects specified in the routing form to OSPA.
2. **Sending materials.** A member of the faculty, staff or student body of the University or any other individual subject to the Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property* (the "Intellectual Property Policy") who plans to send biological or other research materials to another university, a company or some other entity not owned by the University of Minnesota, prior to the delivery of the material, shall contact PTM if (i) the materials reasonably have potential commercial marketability or significant research potential; or (ii) if the materials were developed under a agreement granting some other entity rights in the materials (for example a funding agreement or material transfer agreement). In all other instances, the University encourages members of the faculty, staff or student body of the University and any other individual subject to the Intellectual Property Policy to contact PTM prior to the delivery of the materials if it is important or necessary for the transfer to be recounted in a written agreement.

In consultation with the member of the faculty, staff or student body of the University or the other individual subject to the Intellectual Property Policy who proposes to deliver biological or other research materials, PTM shall determine whether it is required or desirable for the University and the proposed recipient to enter into a written material transfer agreement. PTM is responsible for determining the appropriate written agreement to use (the Uniform Biological Materials Transfer Agreement is used whenever possible) and for negotiating appropriate terms as applicable. In order to fulfill contractual requirements concerning the material or in order to evaluate the material for purposes of determining appropriate means to handle the transfer, the University may require a Creator to submit to PTM an Invention Disclosure Form for the material.

Intellectual Property: Resolution of Disputes

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer
Vice President for Research

Responsible Office
Office of the Vice President for Research

Intellectual Property: Resolution of Disputes

Procedures

Disputes or unresolved questions may arise concerning the application of the Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property* and related procedures. Such disputes or questions should be raised with the Vice President for Research. The Vice President shall consult with the Office of General Counsel, the Senate Committee on Research and others as may be appropriate in order to resolve the dispute or question. The Vice President for Research will annually report to the Senate Research Committee on the number, nature and resolution of such disputes and questions. Consistent with University policy and state or federal law, other policies and procedures for addressing grievances arising from application of the Intellectual Property Policy (and its related procedures) may be invoked.

Intellectual Property: Intellectual Property Policy Acknowledgment

PROCEDURE x.x.x.x

Responsible University Officer
Vice President for Research

Responsible Office
Patents and Technology Marketing
Office of Human Resources

Intellectual Property: Awareness of the Intellectual Property Policy

General Principles

The federal government mandates (Part 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations Section 401.14) that the University require, by written agreement, employees to disclose intellectual property created under federal sponsorship and that employees cooperate in the execution of paperwork necessary to protect that intellectual property.

Broad dissemination of the Board of Regents' *Policy on Intellectual Property* (the "Intellectual Property Policy") is necessary not only to comply with federal regulations but also to protect the interests of the University and members of its community. Faculty, including visiting faculty, scholars and researchers, and all employees of the University are governed by the Intellectual Property Policy.

Procedures

1. **New Employees.** At the time of appointment, new faculty members, professional and administrative employees, graduate assistants and others judged likely by their supervisors to have a reasonable potential to create intellectual property will be provided with a copy of the Intellectual Property Policy.

2. **Continuing Employees.** Discussion of the Intellectual Property Policy is a component of the required training for Principal Investigators in the Responsible Conduct of Research. A copy of the policy will be provided to each participant in the RCR training. Each participant will be instructed to review the policy.
3. **Visiting Faculty, Visiting Scholars or Visiting Researchers.** Visiting Faculty or Visiting Scholars supported on funds administered by the University of Minnesota are subject to the provisions of the Intellectual Property Policy. Because such visitors may also be subject to Intellectual Property policies of their principal employers, it is important that visitors be provided with a copy of the Intellectual Property Policy prior to arrival on campus. If there is a conflict in institutional policies, the Office of Patent and Technology Marketing will work with the visitor and his/her home institution to prepare an agreement to accommodate the visit while protecting the interests of the University and its research sponsors.

COMMENT:

The procedures for the Regents Policy on Intellectual Property were approved in draft form by the Faculty Consultative Committee in June, 2000. It was intended that the draft policies would be brought to the Senate's meeting in the Fall of 2000, but because of issues identified in the Office of the General Counsel it was necessary to delay them until this meeting of the Senate. The procedures have been approved by the *ad hoc* working group and by the Senate Committee on Research.

**DAVID HAMILTON, Chair
SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor David Hamilton, Chair of the Research Committee, said that these procedures concern the previously approved Intellectual Property policy and clarify the policy's implementation. The procedures were written by a faculty group and then revised by the Office of the General Counsel. The reason for the multiple procedures is to separate each by the circumstance to which it pertains. Two issues not addressed by these procedures are the distribution of equity and the procedure for acknowledging awareness of the Intellectual Property Policy. Professor Hamilton then read through each section division.

Q: Under what conditions is course work the property of faculty or the student, whether graduate or undergraduate?

A: Materials created by an undergraduate for a course are the property of the student. A thesis is the property of the graduate student, but anything patentable within the thesis is the property of the University.

Q: What happens if a student applies for a patent on their independent work and then uses the work in a thesis?

A: There is a procedure for disputer resolution, but in this case the University would not make a claim on intellectual property developed elsewhere.

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

APPROVED

15. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

**Office of Information Technology Network Guidelines
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following guidelines.

University Network Management Guidelines

Purpose: To preserve Internet access and campus network capacity for core mission applications. This guideline outlines how the Office for Information Technology will administratively manage the data network bandwidth and prevent any one application from monopolizing this limited and valuable resource.

Every year the University contracts for a finite amount of aggregated Internet access. In order to provide the expected service level to traffic related to core institutional activities, choices must sometimes be made regarding traffic priorities.

Goal: No one application will affect the total network usage by consuming an inordinate amount of the University internet/intranet network bandwidth. OIT will intercede in normal traffic routing and flow as little as possible. It is not the goal of OIT to inhibit general use of the Internet or campus networks.

Implementation: OIT will set time-dependent rate limits, when needed, on any application or protocol which exceeds established parameters. In order to set differentiating guidelines, we have classified applications into two separate categories. One (Primary) are those applications which have general consensus as having merit and purpose to the core mission of the University of Minnesota (teaching, education and research) and Secondary applications are those which may prove to have significant bandwidth requirements and as such impede core mission applications.

Primary applications include:

HTTP (web browser)

SMTP, POP, IMAP (e-mail)

DNS (address information)

Other applications that use less than 7% of total internal or external network capacity.

Secondary bandwidth priorities include:

Applications not listed above that use more than 10% (or an updated percentage determined by the CIO) of total internal or external network capacity with provisions for specific exceptions (e.g. research requirements) that may be made by approval of the CIO.

Consultation and Notification: When intervention measures are necessary, every effort will be made to work with campus populations who utilize the said application(s) to arrive at mutually agreeable methods of controlling or minimizing campus resources impact. When rate-limiting methods are determined necessary, these will be put into place and approved by the CIO, who will then notify the appropriate faculty governance committees.

COMMENT:

Network applications are created, practically, every day. Frequently these new application have a major negative impact on the university's computer network. The Office of Information Technologies and the Senate Committee on Information Technologies felt strongly that some guidelines should be in place to assist OIT in managing our internal and external bandwidth.

The guidelines were jointly developed by OIT and the 2000-01 Senate Committee on Information Technologies.

ANDY LOPEZ, Chair
SENATE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

16. SENATE COMMITTEE ON DISABILITIES ISSUES
Disability Access to Boynton/AHC from River Road Parking Ramp
Discussion by the University Senate

Professor James Carey, Chair of the Disabilities Issues Committee, read the following statement to the Senate:

As Chair of the University Senate's Disability Issues Committee, I come before you to make a statement of objection. The goal is not to belittle the University but to improve it by making this governing body aware of a problem and, if perhaps too late to correct it now, to at least prevent its recurrence in the future.

The problem is the inadequate access for people with disabilities, the elderly and the ill to the Boynton Health Service and the Academic Health Center from the River Road Parking Garage that is under construction. The current plans include a bank of elevators near the center of this large garage with a walkway to Coffman. In order for these people to gain access to Boynton, without traversing the Delaware St. hill on the north side of Boynton, they would have to walk north from their parking spot, through Coffman, then outside to Washington Ave, east to Church street and finally backtracking south to the Boynton main entrance. The total distance would be a mile. This distance, however, could be reduced to a few feet and would be entirely indoors if elevators and an entrance were constructed at the east end of the garage, which abuts Boynton. In fact, one of the earlier plans included this pathway but was eliminated because of 1) the rising cost of the garage, and 2) it would divert pedestrian traffic away from Coffman, which could jeopardize the success of the retail shops planned for Coffman.

Access to Boynton is important because 1) it is a health care facility used by the disabled, the elderly and the ill, and 2) it represents a critical indoor link to other areas of the Academic Health Center, that are in desperate need of improved public access.

The Disability Issues Committee is acutely aware of the financial difficulties that befall this University and the \$3.5 million dollar cost needed to accomplish the desired and previously planned link. But neither this problem nor the retail interests of Coffman should block the rights of people with physical impairments to gain access to needed areas of this University. Indeed, the stated mission of this University, under the Outreach and Public Service section, includes "making the knowledge and resources created and preserved at the University accessible to the citizens of the state, the nation, and the world."

We find it unacceptable that the University plans to address the needs of these individuals with added handicapped parking spots on Church Street. Although this plan may satisfy

the letter of the law of the Americans with Disabilities Act, it does not satisfy the spirit of the law or the mission of this University. Dedicating more on-street parking to people with disabilities may be a reasonable alternative solution to making expensive renovations to buildings that are old. But the important point is that we are now at the beginning of a new century and the beginning of a new building. Yet, and despite our stated mission, we continue to give the disabled, the elderly and the ill the same second-class attention, respect, and access to resources that caused the Americans with Disabilities Act to be legislated in the first place. The Disability Issues Committee simply does not want to see any campus construction fail to meet the needs of its intended users, and efficient on-campus transportation is an important need for these individuals.

Finally, the Disability Issues Committee has met with the Academic Health Center's Finance and Planning Committee and also the Faculty Consultative Committee on this topic. The meeting minutes with both these groups indicate support for the desired access, yet there is nothing more they can do as decisions have already been made. It is at this point that I, and other members of the Disability Issues Committee, express our frustration. Because in an institution that is centered on faculty governance, we sadly observe that a major decision affecting this University for years to come has been made by a few without substantive faculty input. As well, student organizations including the Student Health Advisory Committee, the Council of Graduate Students, and the Minnesota Student Association would like more input into these important decisions. Regardless of whether or not the construction of this garage is too far along now to accomplish the desired access, the Disability Issues Committee believes that the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly should be aware of this problem for the future.

A senator commented that this is an important issue since many areas of campus are hard to maneuver through, even in new buildings. It is important that plans are seen and concerns are raised before being approved.

Eric Kruse, Vice President of University Services, showed a campus map to the Senate, illustrating that there is currently a tunnel to Boynton and the Basic Science Building. The pathway was also not eliminated for funding reasons, but because Boynton did not want a direct connection when planning started. The Disabilities Services Office has been involved throughout the planning and accepted the proposed concept. Future plans have also been proposed to Boynton, but it is now a funding issue for them.

Professor Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that this issue was brought to the SCC in January, but he is not sure what other faculty or student input there was prior to this date. The issue was raised with the administration but there is little to be done now.

Q: With Boynton being primarily a student health service, are there plans to provide patient parking in the new ramp?

A: The ramp will hold 1900 spaces, of which two-thirds will be contract parking. The rest will be daily and hourly parking, mostly for students attending class, not going to Boynton.

Professor Carey noted that there is a difference of opinion, since many people do not feel that the underground tunnel is satisfactory. Boynton has also provided a different story to the Disabilities Issues Committee in that they are not willing to fund a connection. Lastly, it remains to be seen how many patients and disabled faculty and staff use, and then complain about the ramp and connection.

17. ELECTION OF SENATE/ASSEMBLY VICE CHAIR(S) FOR 2001-02
Action by the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales was elected Vice Chair of the University and Faculty Senates and Mr. Ryan Osero was elected Vice Chair of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

18. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENT
College Name
Action by the University Senate

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Senate (105) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

MOTION:

To amend the University Senate Bylaws, Article I, Section 1, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined).

ARTICLE I. UNIVERSITY SENATE MEMBERSHIP, ELECTIONS, AND OFFICERS

1. Voting Units

...

TWIN CITIES (1) Agricultural Experiment Station, (2) Agricultural, Food, & Environmental Sciences, (3) Architecture and Landscape Architecture (4) Biological Sciences, (5) Dentistry, (6) Education & Human Development, (7) General College, (8) Graduate School, (9) Human Ecology, (10) Law, (11) Liberal Arts, (12) Libraries, (13) Management, (14) Medical School, (15) University of Minnesota Extension Service, (16) Natural Resources, (17) Nursing, (18) Pharmacy, (19) Public Affairs, (20) Public Health, (21) Technology, (22) University College College of Continuing Education, (23) Veterinary Medicine

COMMENT:

This amendment adjusts the Bylaws to reflect the changed name of the college.

FRED MORRISON, Chair
BUSINESS AND RULES SUBCOMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 107 in favor and 0 opposed.

APPROVED

19. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENT

**Student Affairs Committee Bylaws Change
Action by the University Senate**

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the Senate Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Senate (105) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

MOTION:

To amend the University Senate Bylaws, Article III, Section 15, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~; language to be added is underlined).

15. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

...

Duties and Responsibilities

...

e. To provide for a Student Services Fee Subcommittee composed of two faculty representatives, five student representatives (one each from Crookston, Duluth, Morris, Twin Cities graduate/professional, and Twin Cities undergraduate), and four voting ex officio staff members (one each from Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Twin Cities with the coordinate campus representatives appointed by the Vice Chancellor of each campus and the Twin Cities representative appointed by the Office of Student Development). The student and faculty membership of the Subcommittee shall be taken from the membership of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs unless there is no representative meeting the designated criteria. In such case, the seat in question shall be filled by a member of the Senate Consultative Committee, or their designee, meeting the designated criteria. The chair of the Student Affairs Committee shall serve as the chair of the Subcommittee and will fill one of the designated seats as appropriate. Staff support for the Subcommittee will be provided by the Senate Office. Duties and Responsibilities of the Subcommittee include:

1. To receive and review an annual report from the Chair of the Student Services Fee Committee operating on each campus, as well as any other reports pertaining to fees such as an annual summary of waivers granted permitted in the Regents Policy.
2. To recommend to the Vice Chancellor or the Office of Student Development (as appropriate), in consultation with the senior administrator of the Student Services Fee process on each campus, any changes in the individual campus policies and/or procedures for the allocation of the Student Services Fee on that campus, as well as to address issues noted in resolutions submitted annually by fees committees on that campus.
3. To review any changes to the Student Services Fee policies and/or procedures on each of the campuses.
4. To recommend to the Student Senate Consultative Committee, changes to the Regents Policy on the Student Services Fee.

e. f. To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

f. g. To submit an annual report to the Senate.

COMMENT:

The Student Services Fees Task Force has recommended the formation of a standing subcommittee within the University Senate structure to serve as the primary consultative body for policy and procedural issues regarding the student services fee. Currently, no consultative body exists to oversee this system-wide student, faculty, and staff process, and there is a clear need for such input and oversight. Given the nature of the services and activities funded by the fee, it was determined that such a subcommittee would most appropriately fall under the auspices of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs.

The proposed bylaw change was developed in consultation with the Senate Committee on Student Affairs and was approved by the Student Senate Consultative Committee. The language of the proposed bylaw change sets the membership so as to ensure system-wide representation as well as appropriate student, faculty, and staff representation. The subcommittee is charged with reviewing and recommending changes to fees policies and procedures on each campus in addition to helping to develop changes in Regent's Policy on the student service fee should the need arise.

JASON REED, Chair
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Jason Reed, Chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), stated that a system-wide Student Service Fees Task Force was created to address issues from last year's Supreme Court ruling on mandatory student service fees. One recommendation of the task force involves amending the charge to the Student Affairs Committee (SCSA).

Paul Enever, Chair of the Student Service Fees Task Force, noted that oversight is needed at a system-wide level. Issues frequently arise, but have been handled through an ad hoc process. This amendment was approved by the SCSA and the SSCC, and calls for a formalized standing subcommittee.

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 109 in favor and 0 opposed.

APPROVED

20. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Nominating Committee
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the Assembly Bylaws, the motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Assembly (91) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Assembly present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

MOTION:

To amend the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws, Article III, Section 2, and Article III, Section 7, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~ and new language is underlined); if approved, the existing bylaw would be renumbered appropriately:

ARTICLE III. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

...

2. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

...

Membership

...

~~A special faculty/academic professional nominating committee, appointed by the Faculty Steering Committee and approved by the faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly, shall nominate twice as many faculty/academic professional candidates for the committee as are to be elected each year. These candidates shall be announced in the Assembly docket for the last meeting of the academic year. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by the petition of 12 faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Assembly the day before the Assembly meeting. At the last Assembly meeting of the year, the faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly shall elect by secret ballot two members of the committee for three-year terms. No faculty/academic professional member is eligible to serve more than two consecutive full terms. In the case of a tie, the chair of the Assembly shall cast the deciding vote.~~

...

ARTICLE III. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

...

7. STEERING COMMITTEES

...

Faculty Steering Committee

Membership

~~A special faculty nominating committee, appointed by the faculty members of the Assembly Committee on Committees and approved by the faculty representatives of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly and those faculty from the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections, shall nominate and certify as available twice as many faculty candidates as are to be elected each year from the Twin Cities campus and from those faculty from the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections to the University Senate Consultative Committee. These candidates shall be announced in the Twin Cities Campus Assembly docket for the first meeting of the spring semester. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculties, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Assembly the day before the Assembly meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Assembly.~~

~~The faculty representatives of the Assembly shall by vote reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected, and shall forward the results to the clerk of the University Senate.~~

...

6. NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee is responsible for identifying candidates for the Committee on Committees and for the Faculty Steering Committee and for overseeing elections to those two committees.

Membership

The Nominating Committee shall consist of seven tenured or tenure-track faculty and two academic professional staff members. Both the faculty and the academic professional members must have served in the Senate within the last ten years and shall serve for three-year terms.

The Faculty Steering Committee shall nominate and certify as available twice as many tenured or tenure-track faculty members as there are faculty seats available seats on the Nominating Committee. The Academic Staff Advisory Committee shall nominate and certify as available twice as many academic professional staff members as there are academic professional seats available on the Nominating Committee. The nominations will be presented at the first Assembly meeting of spring semester. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculty (for faculty members) or 12 voting members of the academic professional staff (for the academic professional members), provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Assembly the day before the Assembly meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Assembly. In the event there are additional nominations, the Assembly shall by vote reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected, and shall forward the results to the clerk of the Assembly.

The Assembly shall then vote on the slate by secret ballot at the first meeting of spring semester.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. The faculty members of the Nominating Committee shall nominate and certify as available twice as many faculty candidates as are to be elected each year from the Twin Cities campus and from those faculty from the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections to the University Senate Consultative Committee. These candidates shall be announced in the Twin Cities Campus Assembly docket for the first meeting of the spring semester. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculties, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Assembly the day before the Assembly meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Assembly. The faculty representatives of the Assembly shall by vote reduce the slate to twice the number to be elected and shall forward the results to the clerk of the University Senate. Election procedures shall be in accordance with Article III, Section 4, of the University Senate Bylaws.
- b. Both the faculty and academic professional members of the Nominating Committee shall nominate and certify as available twice as many faculty/academic professional candidates for the Committee on Committees as are to be elected each year. These candidates shall be announced in the Assembly docket for the last meeting of the academic year. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculty or academic professional staff eligible to serve in the Assembly, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Assembly the day before the

Assembly meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Assembly. At the last Assembly meeting of the year, the faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly shall elect by secret ballot members of the Committee on Committees for three-year terms. No faculty/academic professional member is eligible to serve more than two consecutive full terms. In the case of a tie, the chair of the Assembly shall cast the deciding vote.

c. To oversee the conduct of the elections of the members of the Committee on Committees and the members of the Faculty Steering Committee.

d. To report to the Faculty Steering Committee any issues or problems it encounters which require the attention of the Assembly.

COMMENT:

Although this looks (and is) complicated, the intent of these amendments to the bylaws actually is to simplify the process by which members of the Committee on Committees and the Steering Committee (the Twin Cities and Duluth members of the Faculty Consultative Committee) are nominated.

At present there are two different processes used to appoint the members of these two committees.

(1) For the Committee on Committees, there is annually an ad hoc committee nominated by the Faculty Steering Committee and approved by the Faculty Assembly. This ad hoc committee identifies candidates to serve on the Committee on Committees for three-year terms and presents a slate to the Faculty Assembly in the spring. The Faculty Assembly then votes on the slate. The ad hoc committee then dissolves. (The reason this process was devised was because it was thought inappropriate for the Committee on Committees to nominate its own members.)

(2) For the Faculty Steering Committee (this is even more complicated), the faculty members of the Committee on Committees nominate a special nominating committee (to be approved by the Faculty Assembly), which in turn develops a slate of candidates for the Faculty Steering Committee and presents it to the Assembly for approval. Once the Assembly has approved the slate, the Twin Cities and Duluth faculty vote to elect new Faculty Steering (FCC) members.

What these amendments do is abolish the two foregoing processes and establish a standing Nominating Committee that will nominate members for both the Committee on Committees and the Faculty Steering Committee (FCC). Twin Cities faculty and eligible P&A staff will nominate Committee on Committees members; the faculty subset of the Nominating Committee will nominate Steering (FCC) members. The actual election process for the Twin Cities FCC members would be unaffected and is prescribed by the University Senate.

The members of the Nominating Committee will be nominated to the Assembly: the faculty by the Faculty Steering Committee, the P&A staff by the Academic Staff Advisory Committee. The Assembly then votes on the nominees; the bylaws provide for additional nominees.

FRED MORRISON, Chair
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 92 in favor and 0 opposed.

APPROVED

**21. UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
Student Term Limits in the Senate
Action by the University Senate**

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the Constitution, this motion requires a 2/3 majority of all voting members (140) at this meeting for approval, or a majority (105) of all members at two successive meetings. This motion received 119 votes when it was presented at the February 22, 2001, meeting and this is the second meeting at which this motion is being presented.

MOTION:

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

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE

4. Election of University Senate Members

...
e.
...

All student representatives shall be elected for one-year terms and may be re-elected. No student representative may serve more than ~~three~~ four consecutive one-year terms, or any part thereof, in any six year period.

...

Footnote: ^{*} ~~The Senate Parliamentarian ruled in April, 2000, that any student who has served three consecutive terms, or any part thereof, in the Senate must sit out for an academic year before being eligible for re-election to the Senate.~~

COMMENT:

The Student Senate Consultative Committee has recently reviewed current student senator term limits. We believe balancing adequate student representation with turnover is a necessary step towards ensuring the future of student involvement in the University Senate and the Student Senate.

**JASON REED, Chair
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 107 in favor and 0 opposed.

22. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Yudof noted that the House and Senate have set their budget targets for MnSCU, financial aid, and the University. The House has recommended \$165 million and the Senate has recommended \$233 million in recurring funding and \$50 million in one-time investments. Conference committees will begin the first week of May to reach an agreement. The House figure is an improvement over the Governor's budget, but it still inadequate. The Senate figure is more positive, and closer to where the final amount should be.

He noted that the University has been successful in influencing legislators because of the continuous show of support by students, faculty, staff, alumni, and two former governors. Announcements and advertisements to support the University from business leaders will also appear in the next few weeks. A 20,000 person mailing is planned and phone-a-thon by the Alumni Association continues.

23. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: A continuing challenge is presented to faculty in University units that depend on partnerships with the private sector for core academic programming. This challenge is intensified when the economy creates financial pressures for the private sector partner. As you are well aware, this issue is particularly acute in the Medical School which has affiliation agreements with corporate entities that permit faculty to practice medicine and students to study/apprentice at their facilities. What mechanisms are in place to ensure that the University's interests under existing affiliation contracts are being honored? What dispute resolution mechanisms are/should be triggered when a faculty member or student believes a violation of the agreement is occurring that threatens or actually impedes the academic mission? Please frame your answer recognizing the budgetary stresses faced by department heads and deans which create strong financial incentives not to confront corporate partners on the premise that half a loaf is better than no loaf at all - a real problem for faculty and students whose academic activity is in the wrong half. Thank you

A: Dr. Frank Cerra, Senior Vice President for the Academic Health Center, said that the Academic Health Center has partnerships with the private sector for all core academic programs, of which the Medical School has the most. There are currently 350 affiliations across the state with hospitals, clinics, and private practices. These are educational performance sites with academic and clinical faculty present.

The University has 6500 professional students, which is 70% of the health professionals in the state. There are three reasons for these alternate sites. One is that while learning starts in the classroom, experience in the field is greatly needed. The second reason is that the University does not own enough sites to train all these students with its own regular faculty. These sites also contribute \$50 million per year in cash and \$65 million per year in pro bono support of the education program. The University then contributes \$230 million per year for training. \$3 million per year is also paid to sites for training. The third reason is that clinical training has to occur in a variety of settings in order that students learn about the roles of cultural diversity and have exposure to different care delivery systems.

Quality at these sites is by an affiliation agreement with the University which undergoes periodic review. There are also accreditation standards which must be met, many times by external reviews. Each program has a faculty program director and each site has faculty and staff to support the educational program. Students also perform evaluations on each site for program

review. Complaints are directed to the college for appropriate action. Lastly, Dr. Cerra is involved in all stages.

There are four major challenges to training health professionals. The first is that managed care and recent government acts have made funding for health professional education a challenge. Second, managed care makes it difficult to find performance sites which actually want to teach because of productivity criteria. Third, this distributed system makes quality control a challenge. Fourth, each site has its own negotiated contract which requires time and resources to complete.

Q: People are feeling financial pressure in the core programming areas by these affiliations. How is this managed when the University cannot walk away? Is there a dispute resolution mechanism for this?

A: These types of problems, both financial and ethical, have been seen more this year than any year in the past. The University does not have all the answers, but it does have communication pathways to identify these problems and find solutions. As time passes, the University will likely see these problems increase, which may prompt new structures to deal with them.

24. STADIUM DISCUSSION

The following resolution, approved by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) on March 22, is included for information.

STATEMENT ON THE STADIUM PROPOSAL

1. The Minnesota Vikings announced today a proposal for a joint Vikings-Gophers stadium on the University campus. Many Minnesotans, including many faculty members, would like the Vikings to stay in Minnesota. In considering its potential role in such a venture, the University should focus on its own primary mission—education.
2. Financial resources provided to us by students and taxpayers must be directed toward education. The governor and legislature are calling upon us to focus on priorities. A stadium is not currently on the list of University priorities.
3. Although the present Gopher football facilities at the Metrodome may be less than ideal, they are adequate for immediate needs. The University cannot now afford to divert resources or fund-raising activities to a new stadium.
4. In reviewing this proposal, the University should consider the relationship of this proposal to its priorities. If those priorities are met, the University should consider the following factors in evaluating the stadium proposal:
 - No University direct or indirect contribution to capital or infrastructure costs.
 - No increase in operating costs over present Metrodome rents.
 - Stadium activities must be compatible with University operations and values.
 - The University must be insulated from future liabilities and responsibilities.
5. There must be appropriate consultation with the University community. We would welcome an opportunity to review the proposal.
6. Our educational mission of teaching, research, and service must remain our primary commitment.

DISCUSSION:

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), stated that there was publicity in March about a potential stadium being built. Since the Senate was not meeting, the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) considered the issue and passed this statement. The Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) passed a similar statement at the same time.

The Regents considered this matter in April. The President made a cautious statement, warning against endorsing anything besides educational matters. The Vikings made a presentation, which was followed by presentation of the FCC and SSCC statements. Several Regents then noted that it was not appropriate to be considering building a stadium at this time.

The filing date for a stadium bill at the state has passed. There is a bill to study stadium financing, although its status is questionable.

Q: How did the FCC determine that the current facility is inadequate?

A: The opinion from the athletic department is that it serves the purpose, but that it is not what they would prefer.

25. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly approve the following slate of nominees to fill two 2001-04 Twin Cities faculty/academic professional vacancies on the Committee on Committees. A simple majority is required for approval.

ELLEN BERSCHIED: Regents' Professor of Psychology, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1996-2000. Committee participation (past and present): All University Honors, 1991-94 (Chair: 1992-94); Committee on Committees, 1989-90; Consultative, 1985-88 (Chair: 1986-87); Faculty Affairs, 1981-84.

EDWIN FOGELMAN: Professor of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1992-95. Committee participation (past and present): Judicial, 1994-99 (Chair: 1995-99).

RICHARD POPPELE: Professor of Physiology, Medical School. University Senate member: 1981-84, 1988-91. Committee participation (past and present): Judicial, 1980-83 (Chair: 1982-83); Research 1998-01.

SUSAN ROSE: Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development. University Senate member: 1993-96. Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, February 2001-June 2001; Disabilities Issues, 1986-89 (Chair: 1988-89); Intercollegiate Athletics, 1993-96; University College Assembly, 1995-96.

INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Assembly shall elect by written ballot at its spring semester meeting faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Assembly Committee on Committees from a slate of candidates provided by a special

nominating committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Assembly. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the slate must be in the hands of the Clerk of the Assembly on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted. The elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2001-02 are:

Carl Adams, Carlson School of Management
Catherine French, Institute of Technology
Francisco Ocampo, College of Liberal Arts

DEAN STUTHMAN, Chair
MARTIN DWORKIN
SHIRLEY GARNER
JO-IDA HANSEN
MOSTAFA KAVEH
NORMA RAMSEY

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved. Ballots were then distributed for voting. Regents' Professor Ellen Berscheid and Professor Richard Poppele were elected for three-year terms.

APPROVED

26. HEALTH BENEFITS ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Health Benefits Advisory Committee (HBAC), said that the HBAC is proposing plans to introduce co-pays and possibly premiums for some coverages. This is in response to the projected 15 – 18% increase in health insurance costs. In response to the RFP, eight proposals were received, of which six dealt with the general health plans and two with specific aspects of it. A selection committee is reviewing these proposals and will issue a report to the Faculty Senate on May 31. The HBAC also continues to review the option of staying with the state if SEGIP can be modified comparable to the plans through the RFP. The timetable is tight, with a decision by early June to be prepared for open enrollment in the Fall.

Q: Was self-insurance considered the only alternative?

A: Today's paper includes a story on the state of California personnel system increasing co-pays for all public employees. This is a pattern across the country, with 56% of 30 universities like the University already being self-insured. Insurance through the state is also self-insured at this time.

A senator commented that any faculty raise will be obliterated by a health care change to co-pays and increased premiums.

Professor Morrison noted that there is a concern about the impact of this change on low-paid employees. The HBAC is considering ways to minimize this impact.

Another senator commented that there is a rumor that the Bush administration is close to establishing a national health insurance because the health system is broken and drives business prices up.

27. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

28. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

29. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
APRIL 19, 2001**

The fourth meeting of the Faculty Senate for 2000-01 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 19, 2001, at 2:34 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 102 voting faculty/academic professional members and 6 ex officio members. President Yudof presided.

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

There will be a meeting of the Faculty Senate on Thursday, May 31, 2001, starting at 2:30 p.m.

**2. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 22, 2001
Action
(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/010222sen.html
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/faculty_senate/010222fac.html
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/010222tcca.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* (Sections 5.3 and 11)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents March 9, 2001

Interpretation of *Faculty Tenure* (Section 15)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents March 9, 2001

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure (Addition to Rule 2b: Vice Chair)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents March 9, 2001

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure (Revision of 6b: Attorney)

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 20, 1999
Administration June 13, 2000
Board of Regents March 9, 2001

Amendments to the Administrative Procedures for the Interim Regents Policy on Faculty Development Leaves

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 22, 2001
Administration March 29, 2001
Board of Regents - no action required

Declaration on Faculty Salaries

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 22, 2001
Administration - *See Response
Board of Regents - no action required

* The Administration has publicly stated that University of Minnesota faculty salaries are not yet competitive. The administration continually voices public and private support for increased faculty salaries for the reasons stated in the resolution, among others. The President has clearly noted that it is a priority objective to increase faculty salaries on the Twin Cities campus at a rate above the level of inflation with decisions on use of funding related to salaried to be based on market and merit. This institutional commitment also extends to the coordinate campuses as appropriate. The Administration agrees that the Legislature and the Governor must be made aware that addressing the issue of competitive faculty salaried is of the utmost importance to the long-term economic health of the state. It must be noted that the need for additional state support for faculty compensation is a critical component of our biennial budget submitted to the State of Minnesota. In our effort to promote that importance of the state's support of the institutional biennial budget we have enlisted the aid of key business and community leaders, previous government officials (in particular, Governors Anderson and Carlson), alumni, and current students and employees to take our message to citizens and legislator. The faculty's strong support for the total biennial budget is needed and appreciated.

**4. CLERK OF THE SENATE/ASSEMBLY REPORT
Assembly Steering/Senate Consultative Committee Election Results
Information for the Faculty Senate
(Senate Agenda Item 5)**

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill vacancies on the Assembly Steering/Senate Consultative Committee, Professors Arthur Erdman, Candace Kruttschnitt, and Judith Martin were elected to three-year terms (July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2004). The Faculty Consultative Committee membership for 2001-02 will be:

Muriel Bebeau, School of Dentistry
Susan Brorson, University of Minnesota - Crookston
Arthur Erdman, Institute of Technology
Daniel Feeney, College of Veterinary Medicine
Candace Kruttschnitt, College of Liberal Arts
Judith Martin, College of Liberal Arts
Joseph Massey, College of Natural Resources
Paula Rabinowitz, College of Liberal Arts
Jeff Ratliff-Crain, University of Minnesota - Morris
Billie Wahlstrom, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences

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

5. STADIUM DISCUSSION (Senate Agenda Item 24)

The following resolution, approved by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) on March 22, is included for information.

STATEMENT ON THE STADIUM PROPOSAL

1. The Minnesota Vikings announced today a proposal for a joint Vikings-Gophers stadium on the University campus. Many Minnesotans, including many faculty members, would like the Vikings to stay in Minnesota. In considering its potential role in such a venture, the University should focus on its own primary mission—education.
2. Financial resources provided to us by students and taxpayers must be directed toward education. The governor and legislature are calling upon us to focus on priorities. A stadium is not currently on the list of University priorities.
3. Although the present Gopher football facilities at the Metrodome may be less than ideal, they are adequate for immediate needs. The University cannot now afford to divert resources or fund-raising activities to a new stadium.
4. In reviewing this proposal, the University should consider the relationship of this proposal to its priorities. If those priorities are met, the University should consider the following factors in evaluating the stadium proposal:
 - No University direct or indirect contribution to capital or infrastructure costs.
 - No increase in operating costs over present Metrodome rents.
 - Stadium activities must be compatible with University operations and values.
 - The University must be insulated from future liabilities and responsibilities.
5. There must be appropriate consultation with the University community. We would welcome an opportunity to review the proposal.
6. Our educational mission of teaching, research, and service must remain our primary commitment.

DISCUSSION:

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), stated that there was publicity in March about a potential stadium being built. Since the Senate was not meeting, the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) considered the issue and passed this statement. The Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) passed a similar statement at the same time.

The Regents considered this matter in April. The President made a cautious statement, warning against endorsing anything besides educational matters. The Vikings made a presentation, which was followed by presentation of the FCC and SSCC statements. Several Regents then noted that it was not appropriate to be considering building a stadium at this time.

The filing date for a stadium bill at the state has passed. There is a bill to study stadium financing, although its status is questionable.

Q: How did the FCC determine that the current facility is inadequate?

A: The opinion from the athletic department is that it serves the purpose, but that it is not what they would prefer.

**6. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION
Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members
(Senate Agenda Item 25)**

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly approve the following slate of nominees to fill two 2001-04 Twin Cities faculty/academic professional vacancies on the Committee on Committees. A simple majority is required for approval.

ELLEN BERSCHIED: Regents' Professor of Psychology, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1996-2000. Committee participation (past and present): All University Honors, 1991-94 (Chair: 1992-94); Committee on Committees, 1989-90; Consultative, 1985-88 (Chair: 1986-87); Faculty Affairs, 1981-84.

EDWIN FOGELMAN: Professor of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1992-95. Committee participation (past and present): Judicial, 1994-99 (Chair: 1995-99).

RICHARD POPPELE: Professor of Physiology, Medical School. University Senate member: 1981-84, 1988-91. Committee participation (past and present): Judicial, 1980-83 (Chair: 1982-83); Research 1998-01.

SUSAN ROSE: Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development. University Senate member: 1993-96. Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, February 2001-June 2001; Disabilities Issues, 1986-89 (Chair: 1988-89); Intercollegiate Athletics, 1993-96; University College Assembly, 1995-96.

INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Assembly shall elect by written ballot at its spring semester meeting faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Assembly Committee on Committees from a slate of candidates provided by a special nominating committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the

Assembly. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the slate must be in the hands of the Clerk of the Assembly on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted. The elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional members of the committee whose term continue at least through 2001-02 are:

Carl Adams, Carlson School of Management
Catherine French, Institute of Technology
Francisco Ocampo, College of Liberal Arts

DEAN STUTHMAN, Chair
MARTIN DWORKIN
SHIRLEY GARNER
JO-IDA HANSEN
MOSTAFA KAVEH
NORMA RAMSEY

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved. Ballots were then distributed for voting. Regents' Professor Ellen Berscheid and Professor Richard Poppele were elected for three-year terms.

APPROVED

7. HEALTH BENEFITS ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT (Senate Agenda Item 26)

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Health Benefits Advisory Committee (HBAC), said that the HBAC is proposing plans to introduce co-pays and possibly premiums for some coverages. This is in response to the projected 15 – 18% increase in health insurance costs. In response to the RFP, eight proposals were received, of which six dealt with the general health plans and two with specific aspects of it. A selection committee is reviewing these proposals and will issue a report to the Faculty Senate on May 31. The HBAC also continues to review the option of staying with the state if SEGIP can be modified comparable to the plans through the RFP. The timetable is tight, with a decision by early June to be prepared for open enrollment in the Fall.

Q: Was self-insurance considered the only alternative?

A: Today's paper includes a story on the state of California personnel system increasing co-pays for all public employees. This is a pattern across the country, with 56% of 30 universities like the University already being self-insured. Insurance through the state is also self-insured at this time.

A senator commented that any faculty raise will be obliterated by a health care change to co-pays and increased premiums.

Professor Morrison noted that there is a concern about the impact of this change on low-paid employees. The HBAC is considering ways to minimize this impact.

Another senator commented that there is a rumor that the Bush administration is close to establishing a national health insurance because the health system is broken and drives business prices up.

8. OLD BUSINESS
(Senate Agenda Item 27)

NONE

9. NEW BUSINESS
(Senate Agenda Item 28)

NONE

10. ADJOURNMENT
(Senate Agenda Item 29)

The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor

**STUDENT SENATE MINUTES
APRIL 19, 2001**

The fourth meeting of the Student Senate for 2000-01 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 19, 2001, at 11:31 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 22 voting student members. Mr. Percy Chaby presided.

**1. STADIUM DISCUSSION WITH ERIC KRUSE
Discussion**

Eric Kruse, Vice President for University Services on the Twin Cities Campus, provided a history of the stadium issue. He noted that the University was approached by the Sports Facilities Commission, who is the landlord of the Metrodome, and the Vikings this last fall to support their stadium proposals before the legislature. One proposal was to renovate the Metrodome and the other was to build a new facility.

The University then examined what it would need to have a successful Division 1A football program, from which criteria were created to review each proposal. The Sports Facilities Commission was notified that the renovated Metrodome plan does not meet the needs of the University, but that it will honor its obligation through 2011.

The Vikings would like to work with the University on a joint-use stadium. The University has noted that the following conditions would need to be met: on-campus, collegiate look and feel, provide revenue, involve no University debt service, and cost no more than the Metrodome currently does, which is 10% of ticket revenue.

The current proposal in the legislature is for a \$500 million facility, of which \$150 million would be covered by the Vikings and the NFL. The stadium itself is in the conceptual stage and no long term plans have been made or agreed upon. There is a bill in the tax committee to form a commission to deal with financing a new stadium. This commission would have 3 House members, 3 Senate members, 5 members appointed by the Governor, 2 members from labor, 2 members from business, and 2 members appointed by the Regents. The bill asks for the members to be appointed by June 15, with a meeting by July 1, and a final report by October 31.

Q: What is the proposed location?

A: The preferred site is in the Huron Boulevard parking lots.

Q: With the addition of a stadium on campus, how will parking and crime be handled?

A: If the Huron Boulevard parking lots are used, 2500 surface spots will be lost. The University has informed the Vikings that before any stadium construction begins, these spots must be replaced. The proposal is to create 2 parking ramps, with 4000 spaces, adjacent to the stadium. The Vikings would receive parking revenue during their 10 home games while the University would receive the revenue during the rest of the year.

In terms of the influx of people on campus, the Vikings play a maximum of 13 home games per year, including post-season play. The Gophers play a maximum of 7 home games per year. These games are mainly on Saturdays and Sundays. Discussions would need to be held before a Monday or Thursday night game would be scheduled. Additionally, the Metrodome holds 4 – 5

other major events, such as concerts, and many minor events, such as high school football or baseball. Security and safety will need to be built into the stadium design, but this specific issue has not been addressed yet.

Q: Will there be student representation on the financial study commission?

A: The Regents will be allowed 2 representatives, of which they could choose to appoint a student.

Q: If a stadium close to student housing will not improve the surrounding area, have other locations been considered?

A: If the University wants football to return to campus, this is the only location on the Minneapolis campus big enough to fit a stadium. Sports arenas can spur development and redevelopment in the surrounding area for dramatic improvements. A new stadium would create a unique partnership between the University and the Vikings that does not exist anywhere else.

Q: Why did the University reject the Metrodome renovation proposal?

A: The University felt that the Metrodome is a sterile, urban environment without a collegiate feel. It is not on campus so there is no tie to students and alumni and other campus events cannot be coordinated with the stadium. The Metrodome proposal was to wrap the outside of the stadium in electronic boards to identify the event inside. This change would take place during three football seasons, which would compromise the environment during construction. The stadium also has a lifespan of 20 years, so there are only 5 – 10 years of use left. University construction, though, is made to withstand 75 years of use.

Q: There are two concerns that need to be addressed: parking cost and availability, and how cost overruns will be addressed during construction. Have these issues been discussed?

A: Because the stadium will be on University land, which the University will not sell, the University will control construction, design, and use. Any costs beyond what is provided must be paid by the Vikings.

With no further questions, the Student Senate thanked Vice President Kruse for attending.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

NONE

3. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 22, 2001 Action

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URLs. A simple majority is required for approval.

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/student_senate/010222stu.html

ROBERTA HUMPHREYS, Clerk
UNIVERSITY SENATE/TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO STUDENT SENATE ACTIONS
Information

Resolution on Classroom Upgrades

Approved by the: Student Senate February 22, 2001
 Administration See Comment*
 Board of Regents - no action required

* The administration has reviewed this resolution and agrees with the Senate that it is in the best interest of the University to move as quickly as possible to full implementation of the Twin Cities Classroom Technology Upgrade Plan developed by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. The resolution is gratefully accepted with the understanding that the Plan can only be accelerated if sufficient funds are provided by the Legislature and/or are available from other non-centrally budgeted funds. Classroom technology needs are highlighted in the current biennial budget request submitted to the State. The administration wishes to note that the Twin Cities collegiate units have already committed funding to accelerate the Plan at a pace greater than called for in the original schedule.

Amendments to the Regents Policy on Student Employment at the University

Approved by the: Student Senate February 22, 2001
 Administration March 29, 2001
 Board of Regents - PENDING APPROVAL at May 11, 2001 meeting

5. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Student Affairs Committee Bylaw Amendment
Information for the Student Senate
(See Item 19 on the University Senate docket)

6. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT

Percy Chaby, Student Senate Chair, reported that he has been working with the Safety Committee on Campus to have a lighting implementation plan created.

A new item, to be dealt with more fully next year, is a proposal to allow students to pay for tuition with credit cards. Visa has approached the University to start this process. There are many benefits to using credit cards, but there are also many drawbacks which the Student Senate will need to review.

7. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Jason Reed, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that SSCC will be appointing students to two search committees that are forming. The search committees are for the Vice President of Multicultural Affairs, currently held by Rusty Barcelo, and for the Director of University Libraries, currently held by Thomas Shaughnessy.

Another issue has been financial aid. An event will be held on April 27 when the U.S. Department of Education is on campus to announce that the University is the first school to use e-signatures to process financial aid applications. Others in attendance will be Senator Paul Wellstone, Representative Betty McCullum, President Yudof, and members of the Regents. An e-mail has been sent to students asking for escorts for the event. Please see Jason Reed if you are interested in serving as an escort.

SSCC has also reviewed the request from the Student Service Fees Task Force to create a permanent subcommittee of the Student Affairs Committee to deal with student service fees issues on a continual basis.

A fourth item is a statement on the proposed Vikings-Gophers football stadium. This statement was presented to the Regents on April 5.

Lastly, the amendment to the Regents Policy on Student Employment, which the Student Senate approved in February, has been approved by the President and will now be presented to the Regents for final approval.

8. CAMPUS REPORTS

Crookston – Matt McBlair stated that elections have been completed. Steve Brandt was elected President, Brent Massmann was elected Vice Chair, and Matt McBlair will continue as the SSCC representative. A transition banquet will be held next week.

Duluth - Amber Benning reported that she will serve as the Legislative Affairs Chair next year and that Kari Amstutz will continue as UMDSA President.

Morris - Tim Dunn said that elections have been completed, except for MCSA President since neither candidate received 50% of the votes. A run-off will be held next week.

Graduate and Professional Student Association – Paul Enever noted that GAPSA's elections are completed and Phillip Cole was elected as President and Trevor Ewanochko will serve as the SSCC representative.

Minnesota Student Association – Jason Reed said that Dan Kelly has been elected MSA President and Nick Dehnert will serve as the Vice President. SSCC elections will occur on April 24.

9. STUDENT SERVICE FEES TASK FORCE UPDATE

Paul Enever, Student Senate Chair, reported that the initial recommendations were released Monday and public hearings will be held next week. The report is also available on-line. The recommendations are from a system-wide task force as a result of the Supreme Court ruling that student service fees are constitutional as long as they are distributed in a viewpoint neutral manner. The task force determined that the University systems fits the viewpoint neutral definition as long as decisions are based on clear and objective criteria that are uniformly enforced.

The first recommendation is for each campus to review their criteria for funding decisions. The second recommendation is a subcommittee of the Student Affairs Committee to provide input and oversight on a continuing basis. The subcommittee would be a standing, versus ad hoc, body which would have the authority to review the fees process on a system-wide basis and ensure that student, faculty, and staff input is being heard.

For the Twin Cities Campus, the administrative units will be separated from the student groups, with each having a separate fees process. Also, a granting body will be created for non-fees-receiving organizations. Benefits of this include a less difficult process to receive fees while encouraging campus programming.

10. STUDENT LEGISLATIVE COALITION UPDATE

Percy Chaby, Student Legislative Coalition (SLC) President, reported that SLC has been contacting legislators at the capitol and preparing for the transition meeting tomorrow. He noted that whoever is elected Student Senate Chair will be expected to attend this meeting.

11. ELECTION OF 2001-02 STUDENT SENATE CHAIR Election by 2001-02 Senators Only

Matthew Wohlman, a student senator from the College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences, was elected Student Senate Chair.

12. ELECTION OF 2001-02 STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR Election by 2001-02 Senators Only

Shawn Lavelle, a student senator from the College of Science and Engineering at the University of Minnesota Duluth, was elected Student Senate/Student Senate Consultative Committee Vice Chair.

13. STATEMENT ON PROPOSED STADIUM Action by the Student Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following statement.

STATEMENT ON THE VIKINGS/GOPHERS STADIUM PROPOSAL

By the Student Senate Consultative Committee of the University of Minnesota Student Senate

1. Although much of the student body would like the Minnesota Vikings to stay in Minnesota, the University of Minnesota should focus on its primary mission: education. A new Vikings/Gophers stadium is not the top priority of the student body.
2. Financial resources provided to University by students and taxpayers must be directed toward our primary mission: education.

3. There must be appropriate consultation with the University community. The Student Senate Consultative Committee and appropriate campus student assemblies should be consulted during this process.
4. In reviewing this proposal, the University should consider the relationship of this proposal to its priorities. If those priorities are met, then the University should consider the following factors in evaluating the stadium proposal:
 2. Impact on the campus life of students and how 50,000 or more additional people on campus will affect the daily lives of students and the community of which we are a part.
 3. No student services fees money should be used in connection with a new stadium
 4. Replacement of current surface lot parking must occur BEFORE current parking is lost due to a stadium.
 5. Parking in newly created ramps should be all-day commuter spots as currently in place in surface lots.
 6. Parking rates in these ramps should be affordable for students and not greatly increased above surface lot rates.
 7. Campus safety issues surrounding large events like football games.
 8. The impact a new stadium will have on the leases of buildings, within the area, that University departments and student organizations currently reside in.
 9. No University direct or indirect contribution to capital or infrastructure costs.
 10. Stadium activities must be compatible with University operations and values.

COMMENT:

This statement was approved by the Student Senate Consultative Committee on Thursday, April 5, 2001, and was then presented at the Board of Regents meeting on the same date.

JASON REED, Chair
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

14. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

15. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

16. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor

APPENDIX A

Robert L. Borg

The School of Music, and the cause of music in Minnesota, has lost a friend, colleague and gentle soul in the passing of Robert Borg. Bob came to Minnesota in 1959 as the first professor of music education who specialized in elementary music. His work, for 37 years, helped create one of America's most vibrant and respected corps of elementary music teachers, respected nationally for its depth and excellence. Bob provided a legacy of many new generations teachers and students who have valued music and made it an indispensable part of the educational and cultural fabric of life in Minnesota schools, homes and communities. His gentle personality, wit, sensitivity and deep concern and commitment to the University, the School of Music, and music teaching in Minnesota typify a generation of faculty professionals we will be difficult to replicate in the future. Along the way Bob stopped to love his family, friends and his home, cherish his relationships at his church, and play a mean hand of bridge. We will miss him, as will Minnesota.

Thomas R. Hamilton

Thomas R. Hamilton, Emeritus Professor and Head, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Medical School Duluth, died March 3, 2001 at the age of 90.

He was born in Kansas City Missouri and was educated at the University of Missouri receiving an AB degree in 1932 and an MD in 1935. After an internship at Univ. Hospital, University of Iowa, he completed a residency at St. Joseph Hospital in Kansas City Missouri. The MS degree was completed in 1941. He was certified in anatomical pathology and clinical microbiology by the American Board of Pathology.

In World War 2, he served for 3 years in North Africa, Sicily and France with the 77th Evacuation Hospital and the Harvard Red Cross Unit.

After the war, he returned to his position as Professor of Pathology at the University of Kansas Medical School. In 1948 he began a sabbatical with Professor J.T. Syverton in the Department of Microbiology, University of Minnesota. His research interests involved the pathogenesis and prophylaxis of rheumatic fever and granulomatous diseases.

He served as a member of the Training Grant Committee, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and was a consultant to the Children's' Cardiac Center and Mercy Hospital, Kansas City Missouri. He was a member of the American Society for Microbiology, American Society of Clinical Pathology, Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine and the American Association of Pathology.

When the Medical School in Duluth was established, he was appointed Professor and Head of the Department of Microbiology and Immunology. His appointment assisted greatly in obtaining the Medical School's accreditation. After his retirement, he returned to his native Missouri where with his wife Bette's professional assistance continued his first love, teaching microbiology and immunology to medical students at the University of Missouri Medical School. The course was very popular as manifest by his selection as the outstanding teacher of the year both by his colleagues and medical students. Last year he was invited to be Marshal by the students at their graduation. Because of his illness he was not able to attend.

He is survived by his wife Bette, a daughter Anne, a son Tim and six grandchildren. His eldest son Tom died of a heart attack in December, 2000.

Tom will be deeply missed by his family and especially by his many students and colleagues.

Kerry R. Kelts

The N.H. Winchell School of Earth Sciences lost a colleague and friend when Kerry R. Kelts passed away on February 8, 2001 at the age of 54, after a long and courageous battle with Hodgkin's disease. Kerry joined the Department of Geology and Geophysics at the University of Minnesota as a professor in 1990, and was also the director of the Limnological Research Center from 1990-1999.

Kerry received his PhD in 1978 from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich (ETH). He was a post-doctoral scholar with the Deep-sea Drilling Project at Scripps Institution of Oceanography from 1978-1980, a lecturer at ETH-Zurich from 1980-1985, the director of the geology group at the Swiss Federal Institute of Water Resources (1985-1988), and the director of the Swiss Institute of Climate and Global Change (1988-1990). During the 1980s Kerry initiated what was to be one of his scientific passions: the global study of modern and ancient lake basins. His research interests lead to the development of the new field of "limnogeology." Kerry was a founder and first president of the International Association of Limnogeology (IAL), and one of the conveners of the first International Limnology Congress, held in Copenhagen in August 1995. Kerry received the first IAL medal in recognition of his pioneering role in defining and promoting the science of limnogeology.

Kerry was a strong supporter of the Past Global Changes (PAGES) Project which was created by the international geoscience community in response to the critical demand for information on how the Earth's natural systems have functioned in the past. He was the co-founder of the International Decade for the East African Lakes (IDEAL), a program dedicated to the retrieval of a long, high resolution record of climate change in tropical East Africa, and the establishment of a comprehensive training program for African students and scientists in a research partnership between African and northern hemisphere scientists.

Kerry authored more than 80 publications and co-edited *Lacustrine Petroleum Source Rocks* (1988), *The Phanerozoic Record of Lacustrine Basins and their Environmental Signals* (1989) and *Lake Basins through Space and Time* (2000). His enthusiasm for science was infectious and inspired students and colleagues to think globally in pursuit of their professions.

Kerry is survived by his wife Johanna who resides in Kilchberg, Switzerland, two brothers, Donald I. Kelts and David W. Kelts, and his mother, Beverly O. Kelts. The family has established a memorial fund in Kerry's name that will be used to support the attendance of graduate students at professional meetings. Kerry felt it was very important for students to go out and present their results and develop broad collegial contacts at an early stage in their careers.

Morris E. Nicholson

Professor Emeritus Morris E. Nicholson passed away January 30, 2001 at the age of 84.

Morris E. Nicholson served as a Professor of Metallurgical Engineering and Materials Science at the University of Minnesota from 1956 to 1985. He received his S.B. degree in Metallurgy in 1939 and his Sc.D. in Physical Metallurgy in 1947 from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He worked three years for Standard Oil Co. in Indiana from 1947-50. He was an Assistant Professor at the Institute for the Study of Metals at the University of Chicago from 1950-55. He joined the University of Minnesota as Head of the Physical Metallurgy Department

in 1955. In 1962 he returned to full time teaching and research. He became the Director of the UNITE (University-Industry Television for Education) for the Institute of Technology in 1971. He was active in several professional societies: the ASM INTERNATIONAL, The Metallurgical Society (TMS), NACE and the Continuing Professional Development Division of ASEE. In 1981 he was awarded the Distinguished Service Award by the Division.

In addition to his professional work, Dr. Nicholson was involved with the Boy Scouts of America.

Professor Nicholson is survived by his wife, Norma and his 3 sons, Morris E. Nicholson III, Robert A. Nicholson and Richard A. Nicholson, 8 grandchildren and 7 great-grandchildren.

The faculty of the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science expresses their deep appreciation for Professor Emeritus Morris E. Nicholson is 29 years of dedicated service to the University of Minnesota.

R. John Rath

R. John Rath died on 18 February 2001 at the age of ninety. In his youth he served in the Army in World War II and with UNRRA in 1945-1946 in Germany and Austria. He taught at the Universities of Colorado and Texas and Rice University before he spent the twilight of his distinguished career here at the University of Minnesota after he retired as emeritus Mary Gibbs Jones Professor of History at Rice University in 1980. He was rightly called the doyen of American scholars in the field of Austrian history. John produced two of the three strongest elements in the invigoration of Austrian studies in North America: he founded and edited the Austrian History Yearbook, the forum for the field, during its first twenty years; and he brought together the now-legendary Conference on Nationalism in Central Europe in 1966, which galvanized scholarship in the field.

In 1980 he joined the Yearbook to the third pillar of Austrian studies in the United States, our own Center for Austrian Studies, when he came to continue publishing it here and to serve as a member of the faculty of the Department of History. Of his many publications, *The Viennese Revolution of 1848* stands out as one of the best published in English on the subject. Graduate students in his seminars enjoyed his near-paternal attention and were inspired to meet his demanding standards of scholarship.

John was twice decorated by the Austrian government for service to scholarship and to the Republic and was a corresponding member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

Even though he came late to our university, he brought us much. His professional distinction enhanced us; his embracing and generous friendship brightened our lives. And, finally, he left a legacy, an endowment for a prize to be awarded to the author of the best article to appear in the Austrian History Yearbook each year, that will endure along with our bright and grateful memories of him.

John was preceded in death by his lovely wife, Isabel, in 1999. He is survived by his daughter, Isabel, and her husband William Stensland, of Austin, Texas, his sister, Clara Lillich of Beatrice, Nebraska, and a host of students, colleagues, and friends whose lives were much enriched for having known him.

Archie S. Wilson

Archie S. Wilson was born in Tekoa, Washington on January 19, 1921, the son of Andrew Hamilton Wilson and Viola Sledge Wilson. Both of his parents' parents had homesteaded land in central Washington east of the Columbia River near Ephrata. At the time of Archie's birth, however, his father was a wheat farmer near Farmington (south of Tekoa), in extreme eastern Washington near the Idaho state line, south of Spokane and north of Pullman. His older brother Andy (Andrew) was born in Ephrata in 1918 before the move to Farmington. After the wheat market collapsed in 1921, their father sold the ranch in Farmington and moved to Portland, Oregon to attend chiropractic school, putting himself through school as a salesman. Archie's younger brother, Milton, was born in Portland in 1923. After completing his Doctor of Chiropractic degree, their father moved the family to Forest Grove, Oregon, a town west of Portland, to start a practice. Archie began first grade in Forest Grove, but signs of the Depression were developing and people did not pay their bills (and there was no health insurance in those days), so Archie's father closed his practice and the family moved briefly back east to Spokane, Washington, where Archie's maternal grandparents managed an apartment house, the Blackstone. His father found some jobs selling cars. Archie finished the first half of second grade in Spokane, and then the family moved back to Portland, where Archie finished second grade at a school in southeast Portland. The family then moved to 49th Street off Prescott in the Beaumont school district. After two more moves, Archie graduated from Beaumont and, ultimately, from U.S. Grant High School, in January 1939. Since his family always rented, he lived in at least 12 houses during this stay in Portland, usually in the northeast part.

During the remainder of the 1939 academic year, Archie enrolled at Washington High School to fill out some math requirements for college entrance in advanced algebra and trigonometry. He had to drop out because he came down with tularemia ("rabbit fever"), which almost did him in, but was diagnosed in time and the antidote administered so that he recovered and was able to start college in the fall of 1939. His Aunt Grace, whose husband was a faculty member, invited him to go to Iowa State College (now University) in Ames and stay with them, which he did. He enrolled in the chemical technician curriculum. He stayed at Iowa State during the summer of 1940, finishing the math requirements for entrance. The summers of the war years of 1941 and 1942 were spent in Portland with his mother. During the summer of 1942 he worked as an assistant welder on a machine welding bottoms, decks, and bulkheads of ships at the Albina Kaiser shipyard. In January 1943 Archie joined the Manhattan Project at the Ames Iowa Laboratory, as a Research Associate, in X-ray diffraction studies of solid structures, and as an assistant to Prof. Robert E. Rundle, a well-known crystallographer. He worked on the crystal structures of uranium, thorium, and their alloys, hydrides, carbides, nitrides, and oxides. The work was initially classified; Archie was a coauthor of four reports, which led to his becoming a coauthor of four journal articles (during 1948-50) after the war was over. The project ended when the atomic bomb was dropped, but Archie was allowed to stay on until he could resume and finish his B.S. degree in Chemistry at Iowa State, in August 1946.

Archie met Ivon Marie Teeter, a Home Economics student at Iowa State, in the fall of 1941, and they became engaged in 1943 and were married on June 11, 1944 in Ames, Iowa. In 1946 Archie was selected as a winner in a nationwide competition in which the awardees attended one of three graduate schools at U.S. Army expense, while on active duty. As a result, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army Quartermaster Corps and entered graduate school at the University of Chicago in the fall of 1946. His daughter, Andrea, was born November 25, 1946. His wife Ivon contracted poliomyelitis in July 1948, during her pregnancy with Ronald, their oldest son. In the same week, Archie passed his written preliminary exams (and his oral exams two weeks later). Fortunately, Ronald was born without complications, on November 12, 1948. Ivon took a while to recover, however, as the polio affected her legs, hip, and back muscles. Archie served daily as her physical therapist, while starting his Ph.D. research. Fortunately, his mother-in-law, Agnes Louise Baird Teeter, came to Chicago and took care of the whole family during the recovery period. Ivon was eventually able to lay aside her crutches and walk some little distance before tiring, but could never run again. Unfortunately, forty years

later the post-polio syndrome appeared, the weakness returned, and she now uses a walker for assistance in walking. Archie received his M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in 1950 and June 1951, respectively, under the direction of Prof. Henry Taube, who later moved to Stanford and received a Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1983. Archie's Ph.D. thesis, in the field of physical inorganic chemistry, was entitled "The Stabilities of Chromic Fluoride and Gallium Halide Complexes in Aqueous Solutions." The work was subsequently published with Henry Taube (*J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **74**, 3509 (1952)). Archie was an Instructor in Chemistry at the University of Nebraska from 1950 to 1951.

Upon receiving his Ph.D. degree in June 1951, Archie took a position as a research Chemist and later became a Senior Scientist at the Hanford Laboratories of the Hanford Works of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, administered by the General Electric Company, in Richland, Washington. The Hanford Works are on the Columbia River in south central Washington just north of where the Yakima River joins the Columbia from the west. A little further downstream, just below Pasco (northeast bank) and Kennewick (southwest bank), the Snake River joins the Columbia from the northeast, so the Tri-Cities Region is a region of confluence of major rivers. On August 30, 1952, his youngest son, Steve, was born. Archie remained at the Hanford Laboratories for 20 years. In January 1965, the administration of the Hanford Works changed and the laboratory became the Pacific Northwest Laboratories of Battelle Memorial Institute and Archie's title became Research Associate in the Applied Chemistry Section, but his duties remained the same. He specialized in the inorganic chemistry of nuclear fission products, mainly ruthenium, and the actinide elements, especially plutonium and uranium, and in computer techniques for indexing X-ray powder patterns. His work involved aqueous complex ion chemistry, ruthenium chemistry, solvent extraction processes for nuclear fuels, plutonium fuel reprocessing, and amine extraction of anions. Most of the work was classified and applied and was reported in 16 HW (Hanford Works) reports and, later, in 3 BNWL (Battelle Northwest Laboratories) reports. Part of the work was published subsequently, however, in 13 journal articles (including 2 crystallographic papers from Minnesota, one in 1978 and one in 1982), 4 U.S. patents, 9 papers at American Chemical Society Northwest Regional Meetings, 3 papers at international meetings, and 2 invited lectures.

During his time at Hanford, Archie served the American Chemical Society, of which he had been a member since 1950, as Secretary, 1953, and Chairman-elect, 1969, of the Richland, Washington Section and Program Chairman of the 1960 Pacific Northwest Regional Meeting. He served as a Lecturer in Inorganic Chemistry at the Joint Center for Graduate Studies in Richland, from 1954-71, and was elected to the Faculty Executive Committee in 1968-70. He was a Scientific Adviser (as well as a speaker) at the 2nd International Conference on the Peaceful uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva, Switzerland in 1958 and a Member of the U.S. Delegation to the Joint U.S./U.K. Conference on Ruthenium Chemistry, Harwell, England, also in 1958. He taught Advanced Inorganic Chemistry for one semester as a Visiting Lecturer at Washington State University in Pullman in 1964. He was a Guest Associate at the Oregon Graduate Center in Beaverton (Portland) on a Battelle-Northwest Staff-Exchange Leave, March-December 1970. Archie was appointed by the Governor as a trustee for Central Washington State College in Ellensburg, beginning in 1959, reappointed in 1963, and continued into 1969. Ellensburg is a city on the Yakima River upstream from the city of Yakima and northwest of Richland. As a trustee, Archie immersed himself in academic administration, serving as Chairman of the Board, 1964-65, 1968-69; Presidential Search Secretary, 1960; Chairman, Joint Board of Trustees, 1964; and Member of the Personnel Board, elected 1960, Chairman 1965-69. Archie was also very active in community affairs, serving as a member of the City of Richland Ethics Committee, Vice Chairman, 1967-68, and the Public Law 221 Committee on Expenditure and Projections; P.T.A., President, Jason Lee School, 1955; City P.T.A. Council, Vice-President, 1956; Boy Scouts of America, various offices 1944-67; American Association for the United Nations, Tri-Cities Chapter, President, 1963-64; Washington Environmental Council; Yakima Conservancy; the American Civil Liberties Union, Benton-Franklin Counties Chapter,

President, 1962, Board Member 1963-64, 1966-67, and the Richland Sword and Mask Club. Archie considered himself a life-long Democrat and was active in support of Democratic party candidates wherever he lived. In Richland he was a Democratic Precinct Committeeman, 1954-70, Delegate to the State Convention 1954-60, 1962, 1964, 1968, and held numerous other committee offices and functions.

In June 1971 Archie accepted a position as Professor of Chemistry and Associate Chairman in the Department of Chemistry at the University of Minnesota. In this capacity, he worked closely with Professor Robert M. Hexter, who had come from Carnegie-Mellon University to become Chairman of the Chemistry Department in 1969. Archie served as a very hardworking administrator of the department and taught beginning (general) chemistry. In his administrative capacity, Archie pioneered, with the help of the Civil Service staff, a departmental computerized accounting system which worked, when previously there had been none. At the end of 1977 Archie relinquished his administrative duties and began full-time teaching and research. Working under an extremely heavy teaching load in general chemistry, teaching partly on the St. Paul Campus, Archie was much beloved by his students, who appreciated his down-to-earth practical style of teaching. He worked actively with the Area Chemistry Teachers group and the National Science Teachers Association. His research at Minnesota was directed primarily toward the teaching of chemistry and especially the nature of examinations and their interpretation, where he collaborated with Prof. Paul W. Fox, Professor of Psychology, in publishing two papers on these topics in *J. Chem. Ed.*, **59**, 576, 857 (with David Alden) (1982). He also published papers with Vernon R. Petersen (a Lecture Demonstrator in the Department of Chemistry) on "The Bakelite Demonstration: A Safer Procedure" in *J. Chem. Ed.*, **55**, 652 (1978) and with James W. Long on "A Visual Demonstration of Raoult's Law" in *J. Chem. Ed.*, **67**, 598 (1990).. He gave popular talks on chemistry such as "Plutonium-Friend or Foe," before 140 people at the Adult Forum of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis on October 29, 1978. He was a much-valued and utilized consultant on chemical questions from the public within the Department of Chemistry and by the "Mr. Fixit" column of the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*. On January 18, 1989 Archie was elected as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The citation read "For research in the chemistry of the constituents of irradiated nuclear fuels, for teaching, and for academic administration." During the Minnesota years, Archie and Ivon lived in St. Paul, at 866 West Larpenteur Avenue, just east of North Victoria Street, and, facing, to the north, Roselawn cemetery in the suburb of Roseville. Archie retired from the University of Minnesota on June 15, 1989, and became Professor Emeritus.

Following his retirement, Archie and Ivon moved to Snohomish County, Washington, in his native state, overlooking Puget Sound just north of Edmonds, a northern suburb of Seattle. All three of their children live in the state of Washington, two of them in the Seattle area. He maintained an active correspondence by E-mail with some of his former colleagues and enjoyed visits from those who made it out his way, including Rufus Lumry (who has two sons in the Seattle area) and Barb Edgar, a colleague in General Chemistry. He remained active in the affairs of the Democratic party, this time in the 1st Congressional District of Washington.

Archie was a lover of the outdoors and an avid environmentalist. As a youth and young man, he enjoyed hiking and camping in the woods and mountains of Oregon and Washington. While in Minnesota, he learned sailing and cross-country skiing. I remember with pleasure a mushroom and fungus identifying (not picking) expedition I took with him and other friends in the wet woods by Twin Lake in Minneapolis' Theodore Wirth Park in Golden Valley. The "puff balls" were really impressive.

In 1953 Archie was diagnosed with sarcoidosis of the lungs. He was a non-smoker. It can be speculated that the sarcoid might have been caused by occupational exposure to ruthenium, which resembles osmium when heated in air, evolving fumes which are injurious to the eyes and

lungs. While it caused the radiologists some excitement, it was not a serious health problem for Archie until about 1997, when the reduced surface area in the lungs caused an oxygen deficiency which put a strain on the heart, leading to pulmonary hypertension. This limited his physical activity and required that he be tethered to an oxygen source. Archie died on June 6, 2000 from pulmonary hypertension. A memorial ceremony to celebrate his life was held on June 17 at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Kinney in Edmonds. He was cremated and his ashes were scattered over the meadow in Paradise Park at Mount Rainier National Park.

He is survived by his devoted wife of just 5 days short of 56 years, Ivon, of Edmonds; his daughter Andrea and son-in-law, Chris Larson, and grandson, Geoffrey Larson, of Seattle; his older son, Ronald, daughter-in-law, Karen, and granddaughter, Arika Wilson, of Vancouver, Washington; his younger son, Steve, of Seattle; two brothers, Andrew Wilson and sister-in-law, Betty, Vancouver, Washington, and Milton Wilson, Portland, Oregon, and sister-in-law, Mariol Wilson, Forest Grove, Oregon; and six nieces and nephews. At his request, charitable contributions may be made to the Nature Conservancy, 4245 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 100, Arlington, VA 22203. There are many happy memories of Archie's broad interests, cheerful and perky demeanor, and willingness to discuss a wide variety of subjects, including chemistry. Archie Wilson was a warm friend to many of us, "one of the nicest people you will ever meet."

E.W. Ziebarth

E.W. Ziebarth, CLA dean from 1963 to 1973 and interim University president in 1974, died February 28 at age 90. By all accounts, "E.Z.," or "Easy," as he preferred to be addressed, presided over the college in those tumultuous times with exceptional dignity, grace, and, in the words of one faculty member, "real class."

A graduate of the University's speech-communication program, Ziebarth was an award-winning news editor, foreign correspondent, and CBS broadcaster as well as a 40-year member of CLA's faculty, teaching international and intercultural communication. He co-hosted the series "This I Believe" with Edward R. Murrow and won two Peabody Awards, in 1948 and 1972, for his pioneering documentaries.

Impeccable in appearance with integrity to match, Ziebarth championed a liberal arts curriculum that paid homage to the classics while remaining in touch with the times. Described by many who knew him as a true "gentleman," he also approached his leadership role in a truly egalitarian spirit. A former staff member recalls that "he would come around the corner and tip his hat, no matter who was around that corner. He valued everyone who worked for him as a colleague. He was an amazing human being."