

2002-03 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

OCTOBER 31, 2002

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES: No. 2
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the University Senate, Twin Cities Campus Assembly, and Faculty Senate for 2002-03 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, October 31, 2002, at 2:34 p.m., as a joint meeting of the three bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 137 voting faculty/academic professional members, 32 voting student members, and 3 ex officio members. Vice Chair Marti Hope Gonzales presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Chair Marti Hope Gonzales announced that today's musical prelude was performed by Lindsey King, a junior in the School of Music.

2. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 3, 2002
Action

MOTION:

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

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/u_senate/021003sen.html

CAROL WELLS, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

DISCUSSION:

A senator made a motion that the minutes be changed to reflect that in the vote for item 43 on the agenda, the nay vote was not taken. The language should read that the amendment was approved with 137 votes in favor.

The motion was seconded. The amendment was then approved by a majority.

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

APPROVED

3. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY
FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Robert G. Robinson
Professor
Agronomy and Plant Genetics
1920 – 2002

STUDENTS

Alexander J. Galle
College on Continuing Education

Jerrold Hartke
College of Liberal Arts

Tyler A. Jensen
College of Liberal Arts

Justin A. Knebel
University of Minnesota – Crookston

In addition to this list, Vice Chair Marti Hope Gonzales added the following names to the tribute, due to the recent plane crash: Paul Wellstone, Sheila Wellstone, Marcia Wellstone Markuson, Will McLaughlin, Tom Lopic, Richard Conry, and Michael Guess.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

Faculty Senate

Resolution to Eliminate the Waiting Period for the Faculty Retirement Plan

Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 3, 2002

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

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

5. SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY Interpretation of the Policy on Examinations for Credit Information for the University Senate

Interpretation of Policy on Examinations for Credit and Proficiency (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined).

The University of Minnesota offers "proficiency examinations" and "special examinations for credit" to currently registered undergraduate degree-seeking students which are given at the discretion of the appropriate academic department. In addition, the University, with the concurrence of the appropriate academic department, also recognizes and awards credits based on examinations which are taken as a part of the Advanced Placement program, the International Baccalaureate Program, and CLEP program. Once special exam credit has been awarded, the credits will remain on the student's transcript unless the credit was awarded in error.

1. Proficiency Examinations shall be administered by the appropriate academic department, require no fee, and yield no credit or grade but may fulfill prerequisites for advanced courses or satisfy requirements. Proficiency examinations may be taken at any time, and if the student's

work is of passing quality, a notation shall be made on his/her transcript saying "Course X satisfied by proficiency examination." A student may not first take a University of Minnesota course and earn a grade, subsequently take a proficiency exam for that course content, and then request that the original course grade be bracketed from the transcript.

2. Examinations for Credit shall be without fee if taken during the student's first term in residence or the first term after an absence of a year or more, otherwise a fee will be charged. Credits earned by examination shall not count as residence credits. A student may not first take a University of Minnesota course and earn a grade, subsequently take an examination for credit for that course content, and then request that the original course grade be bracketed from the transcript.

A student must do "C-" quality work on an "examination for credit" to earn credit, and a notation shall be placed on the transcript showing the course and credits earned. ~~The department awarding the credit by examination shall determine whether or not a grade is to be assigned.~~ Effective fall 1999, examinations for credit earn the letter "T." These credits will be included in the cumulative credits (but not term credits) but the "T" grade will not be reflected in either the term or cumulative grade point average. If the student fails to do "C-" quality work on the examination, no notation shall be made on the transcript.

The "examination" administered by a department may be typical final examination, an oral test, written papers or projects, or any other combination of work which will satisfy the examiners that the student has adequately achieved the values of the course."

Minimum standards for awarding credits by examination shall be determined by the academic department giving the examination. Minimum standards for awarding credits on nationally-administered examinations shall be established by the appropriate academic department. The national examinations shall be reviewed every five years to determine whether the minimum standards remain appropriate.

No department shall be required to give examinations for credit or to offer credits for nationally-recognized tests.

Credits may be awarded for a particular course if the academic department reviewing the national examination determines that the material in the test is substantially similar to that of an existing course; if the material is judged to be of college level but not substantially similar to an existing course, general departmental credits are assigned.

3. Procedures for handling examinations shall be established by the Office of the Registrar.

FOR INFORMATION:

The procedures that will be used by the Registrar (but are not part of the policy) are these:

Procedures for proficiency exams: Proficiency exams will be noted via a student group in PeopleSoft. This will not appear on the transcript. Proficiency exams other than for second languages must be entered as an exception in the degree audit system in order for the credit to be included in the degree audit. Waiver or exemption from a course must be entered in the degree audit system and will not display on the transcript.

Procedures for exams for credit: Special examinations for credit do not count toward the University residence requirement. The academic record will show the following:

--Effective fall 1999, special examinations will be recorded in PeopleSoft as test credits. These test credits will be included in the cumulative credits (but not term credits), and will carry a grade of "T"--this grade will not be reflected in either the term or cumulative grade point average.

--For examinations that were taken prior to fall 1999, special examinations with grades other than a "T" grade will be recorded on a student's transcript with a special examination notation. Letter grades from special examinations will not be included in the term or cumulative grade point average.

--For examinations that were taken prior to fall 1999, those examinations with no grades will be recorded in PeopleSoft as test credits. These credits will carry a grade of "T" that will not be included in the term or cumulative grade point average.

COMMENT:

The Committee on Educational Policy was informed by the Office of the Registrar that there were minor problems with the Senate's policy on examinations for proficiency and for credit. A number of proposed changes were suggested; the Committee itself made other changes. The Council of Undergraduate Deans, the Registrar's Advisory Committee, and representatives of the coordinate campus registrars have all approved the changes; the Committee on Educational Policy concurs. After reviewing and discussing them, the Committee unanimously approved the changes as an Interpretation of the policy and reports them to the Senate for information.

The first change, requiring that students be currently registered, is because non-degree-seeking students enroll just to obtain the credits, which they then transfer to another institution. The colleges do not want this.

The second change is proposed because sometimes advisors want to remove special exam credit from a student's transcript because the student is approaching the maximum number of credits he or she may take and still receive financial aid (184 semester credits).

There have been cases when a student fails a course, subsequently takes a special examination to pass the course (or could take an examination for credit to achieve a better grade), and then asks that the F (or lower grade) be bracketed. This change would not allow that to occur.

Eliminating the option of awarding a grade for an examination for credit is an attempt to ensure consistency across the colleges and campuses. This has been the practice for the last three years.

Finally, the policy will not allow students to take a course and receive an F, other low grade, or an I, and then use either a proficiency examination or examination for credit as a way to have the first grade bracketed.

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

**6. SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Interpretation of the Awards for Outstanding Contributions to Education Policy
Information for the University Senate**

Interpretation of the Awards for Outstanding Contributions to Education Policy (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined)

III. Policy

1. The Committee on Educational Policy shall annually appoint two nominating committees: one shall review nominees for the Morse-Alumni award and recommend to the Committee on Educational Policy those individuals whom should receive the award, and the other shall review nominees for the Graduate/Professional award and recommend to the Committee on Educational Policy those individuals who should receive the award. In both instances, the number of recipients will be dependent on the funding available.
2. No individual may receive the Graduate/Professional award and the Horace T. Morse-Alumni Association award in the same year.
3. Each recipient of each award shall receive a continuous augmentation in their salary, the amount to be recommended by the Committee on Educational Policy and approved by the President.
4. The department of each recipient of either award shall be provided non-recurring funding for three years for the use of the award recipient for the development of teaching materials and training in order to promote excellence in teaching among all of the faculty, the amount and duration to be recommended by the Committee on Educational Policy and approved by the President.
5. The winners of each award shall, ~~for a period of five years beginning the academic year after they received the award,~~ serve as members of the Academy of Distinguished Teachers.
6. The Committee on Educational Policy shall have the authority to establish operational details associated with the granting of the Morse-Alumni awards and shall report annually on those details to the Senate for information.

FOR INFORMATION:

Operational Guidelines

1. The salary of each award winner shall be increased by a continuous augmentation of \$3,000.
2. The annual award ceremony shall be a large public event to which the students and colleagues of the winners will be invited. This event would be in addition to a smaller event with the President and the Alumni.
3. Each award shall include, for each winner, an appropriate, well-publicized lecture, seminar, or exhibition in the individual's specialty.
4. All faculty who have been awarded Morse-Amoco or Morse-Alumni, or the Graduate/Professional, teaching awards shall be designated throughout their careers at the University of Minnesota as "Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor of [field]" or "Graduate/Professional Distinguished Teaching Professor of [field]," as appropriate. This title can be used in correspondence, on business cards, and wherever else appropriate.
5. Any faculty member who has received either award shall be designated by an asterisk and accompanying footnote in the appropriate college catalogues and bulletins for the duration of the recipient's academic career at the University of Minnesota.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) was recently asked by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost to make minor changes in the policy governing teaching awards. Several were approved by the Committee as a matter of interpretation:

--The actual duration of the funds for the department, to be used by the award-winner, has been five years, not three. The Committee concluded that it would be best not to stipulate any particular period but to consult with the Office of the Executive Vice President each year if any change is warranted. The Committee was assured by Vice Provost Craig Swan that no changes in the five-year provision are contemplated and that any change would be brought to the Committee for consultation before being adopted. These funds are non-recurring.

--Although initially it was thought that award winners would only serve in the Academy of Distinguished Teachers for five years, the decision was later made that they would be members for as long as they remain at the University, with participation dependent on level of interest.

MARTIN SAMPSON, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

7. SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Interpretation of the Degrees with Distinction and Degrees with Honors Policy
Information for the University Senate

Interpretation of Degrees with Distinction and Degrees with Honors Policy (new language is underlined)

I. Degrees with Distinction

a) The initiative in establishing degrees with distinction shall lie with the colleges and campuses concerned and must be approved by the chief academic officer on the campus.

b) To graduate "with distinction," a student must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.750 or higher at the time the student graduates. To graduate "with high distinction," a student must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.900 or higher.

...

II. Degrees with Honors

...

4. The minimum grade point average in upper division (i.e. after the completion of 60 semester credits) required for achievement of a degree "cum laude" shall be 3.500, that for a degree "magna cum laude" shall be 3.666, and that for a degree "summa cum laude" shall be 3.750.

COMMENT:

On recommendation from the Office of the Registrar, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy has approved a change in the Degrees with Distinction and Degrees with Honors Policy that adds digits to the requirements for the degrees in order that the requirements in the policy conform to the calculations of student grade-point averages performed by PeopleSoft. This avoids any ambiguity that might arise as a result of rounding numbers from three digits to the numbers set forth in the policy.

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

**8. INTRODUCTION OF INTERIM CHIEF OF STAFF,
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST, UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN**

Vice Chair Marti Hope Gonzales made the following introductions to the University Senate: Christine Maziar as the new Executive Vice President and Provost, and Wendy Lougee as the new University Librarian. They were given a round of applause by the senators. Vice Chair Marti Hope Gonzales then noted that Kathryn Brown, the Interim Chief of Staff, was unable to attend today's meeting.

9. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Daniel Feeney, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), asked senators for their feedback on the administrative introductions conducted at today's meeting. He noted that many people do not know who the administrators are since their only contact is through letters and emails.

He said that the FCC has been busy with several issues, one of which is the legislative effort. Another is an academic governance document which will be presented to many governance groups on campus. The document is relatively controversial. The goal is to bring the document to the Faculty Senate in February for approval.

A joint administrative-faculty committee has been established on the accountability of service units. The committee is co-chaired by Vice President Kathleen O'Brien and Professor Tom Clayton.

Some faculty have expressed concerns with the animal care group and the Institution Review Board (IRB). FCC has had discussions with administrators to foster ease and user-friendliness within the system.

Other FCC items appear on today's agenda, including a discussion of the proposed stadium and housekeeping matters in the Senate Constitution.

**10. SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
2004-05 and 2005-06 Morris Calendar Changes
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the 2004-05 and 2005-06 Morris calendars as follows (new language is underlined, language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~).

Morris 2004-2005

Fall Semester 2004 (74 class days)

December 16 <u>15</u>	Thursday <u>Wednesday</u>	Last day of instruction
December 17 <u>16</u>	Friday <u>Thursday</u>	Study day

December 20-23 <u>17-18, 20-21</u>	Mon.—Thurs. <u>Fri.-Sat., Mon.-Tues.</u>	Final examinations
December <u>23-27</u>	<u>Thurs.-Mon.</u>	Christmas holiday
December <u>31</u>	<u>Friday</u>	New Year's Holiday

Spring Semester 2005 (74 class days)

March 14-18	Mon. - Fri.	Spring Break
March 18	Friday	<u>Floating Holiday</u>

Summer Session 2005

May 23-July 29		Term 3 Summer session (48 class days)
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
July 4	Monday	<u>Independence Day holiday</u>

Morris 2005-06

Fall Semester 2005 (74 class days)

December <u>23-26</u>	<u>Fri.-Mon.</u>	<u>Christmas holiday</u>
December <u>30-Jan. 2</u>	<u>Fri.-Mon.</u>	<u>New Year's holiday</u>

Spring Semester 2006 (74 class days)

March 6-10	Mon. - Fri.	Spring Break
March 10	Friday	<u>Floating holiday</u>

May Session 2006 (14 class days)

May 8 <u>15</u>	Monday	May session begins
<u>May 29</u>	Friday	<u>Memorial Day holiday</u>
May 26 <u>June 2</u>	Friday	May session ends

Summer Session 2006

May 15 June 16 <u>May 22-June 23</u>		Term 1 Summer session (24 class days)
May 29	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 19 July 21 <u>June 26-July 28</u>		Term 2 Summer session (24 class days)
July 4	Tuesday	Independence Day holiday
May 15 July 21 <u>May 22-July 28</u>		Term 3 Summer session (48 class days)
May 29	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
July 4	<u>Tuesday</u>	<u>Independence Day holiday</u>

**MARTIN SAMPSON, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

11. SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**2004-05 and 2005-06 Twin Cities Calendars
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the 2004-05 and 2005-06 Twin Cities Campus calendars.

Twin Cities 2004-2005

Fall Semester 2004 (70 class days)

September 6	Monday	Labor Day holiday
September 7	Tuesday	Classes begin
November 25-26	Thurs. -Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 15	Wednesday	Last day of instruction
December 16,17,18 & 20-22	Th,F,Sat, M-W	Final examinations
December 22	Wednesday	End of the term

(MWF class days - 42 TTh class days – 28)

Spring Semester 2005 (74 class days)

January 17	Monday	MLK holiday
January 18	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 14-18	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 6	Friday	Last day of instruction
May 9-14	Mon.-Sat.	Final examinations

(MWF class days – 44 TTh class days – 30)

May Session 2005 (14 class days)

May 23	Monday	May session begins
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 10	Friday	Last day of class

Summer Session 2005 (39 class days)

June 13	Monday	Classes begin
July 4	Monday	Independence Day holiday
August 5	Friday	8-wk summer session ends

Twin Cities 2005-2006

Fall Semester 2005 (70 class days)

September 5	Monday	Labor Day holiday
September 6	Tuesday	Classes begin
November 24-25	Thurs. -Fri.	Thanksgiving holiday
December 14	Wednesday	Last day of instruction
December 15, 16,17, & 19-21	Th,F,Sat, M-W	Final examinations
December 21	Wednesday	End of the term

Spring Semester 2006 (74 class days)

January 16	Monday	MLK holiday
January 17	Tuesday	Classes begin
March 13-17	Mon.-Fri.	Spring Break
May 5	Friday	Last day of instruction

May 8-13	Mon.-Sat.	Final examinations
<u>May Session 2006 (14 class days)</u>		
May 22	Monday	May session begins
May 29	Monday	Memorial Day holiday
June 9	Friday	Last day of class
<u>Summer Session 2006 (39 class days)</u>		
June 12	Monday	Classes begin
July 4	Tuesday	Independence Day holiday
August 4	Friday	8-wk summer session ends

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy debated over several meetings about the calendar for the Twin Cities campus. As Senators who have served for a number of years will know, this has been a thorny issue ever since the change to semesters.

The State Fair is an intractable factor in setting the calendar; our colleagues on the St. Paul campus assure us that it would be impossible for them to conduct business during the Fair; the Minneapolis campus is also affected because a number of the University's parking lots, and the transitway, are leased to the Fair.

At the same time, the Committee was gravely concerned about the implications of scheduling a final examination period that does not end until December 22 or 23 in years when Labor Day (the last day of the State Fair) is late. The Committee was concerned that many instructors would choose not to have a final examination.

As a result, the Committee has voted to approve, as standard practice, 70-day semesters in the fall and 74-day semesters in the spring. Although this may make for some awkwardness when the same course is offered both semesters, it appears to be a compromise that we can live with. It does not completely obviate the problem of final examinations running late into December but it does mitigate it somewhat.

The only other choice the Committee believed it had was to adopt semesters shorter than 70 days (which only one Big Ten university has). This was even less palatable, so the Committee adopted the 70-day rule for fall semester and thus recommends the calendars presented in the docket.

**MARTIN SAMPSON, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Professor Martin Sampson, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that SCEP heard concerns from faculty about a final exam week that did not end until December 22 or 23. SCEP finally decided to limit Fall Semester to only 70 class days each year, while Spring Semester will remain at 74 class days.

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

APPROVED

12. SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Amendment to the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To amend the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy as follows (new language is underlined):

III. OTHER TRANSCRIPT SYMBOLS

1. There shall be a temporary symbol I, incomplete, awarded to indicate that the work of the course has not been completed.

The I shall be assigned at the discretion of the instructor when, due to extraordinary circumstances, the student was prevented from completing the work of the course on time. The assignment of an I requires a written agreement between the instructor and student specifying the time and manner in which the student will complete the course requirements. In no event may any such written agreement allow a period of longer than one year to complete the course requirements.

For graduate and professional students, an I is to remain on the transcript until changed by the instructor or department.. For all other students, work to make up an I must be submitted within one year of the last day of final examinations of the term in which the I was given; if not submitted by that time, the I will automatically change to an F (if the student was registered on the A-F system) or an N (if the student was registered on the S-N system) for the course.

When an I is changed to another symbol, the I is removed from the record. Once an I has become an F or an N, under the provisions of the preceding paragraph, it may subsequently be converted to any other grade, upon petition by the instructor (or the department if the instructor is unavailable) to the college.

A student does not need to be registered at the University in order to complete the work necessary to convert an I to a grade with credit in the time and manner previously agreed upon between the student and the instructor. The instructor is expected to turn in the new grade within four weeks of the date the work was submitted by the student.

If a student graduates with an I on the transcript, the I will remain permanently an I. A student may petition his or her college, within a year of graduation, to complete the work in the course and receive a grade. The degree GPA would be frozen upon graduation but the cumulative GPA would reflect the change in GPA if a student chooses to complete the work and change I to a grade within a year of graduation.

COMMENT:

The Committee on Educational Policy was informed by the Office of the Registrar that there are a few cases when a student graduates with an I on his or her transcript (for a course that was not required for graduation, obviously). After a year, the I converts automatically to an F. The question is whether that should occur; if it does, the degree GPA is unaffected (because it is "frozen" at the time a student graduates), but the cumulative GPA would change.

The Committee deliberated several options and concluded that simply freezing the transcript at the time of graduation is the simplest solution. A student may, within a year of graduation, petition to change the I to a grade. After that one-year option period passes, the I remains on the transcript forever.

MARTIN SAMPSON, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**13. INTRODUCTION OF ATHLETIC DIRECTOR,
VICE PRESIDENT FOR UNIVERSITY SERVICES,
INTERIM VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH,
INTERIM DEAN GRADUATE SCHOOL**

Vice Chair Marti Hope Gonzales made the following introductions to the University Senate: Joel Maturi as the new Athletics Director, Kathleen O'Brien as the new Vice President for University Services, David Hamilton as the Interim Vice President for Research, and Victor Bloomfield as the Interim Dean of the Graduate School. They were given a round of applause by the senators.

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

COMMENT:

Agenda Items 14. through 21. are offered as a one motion to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator.

As an amendment to the Senate Constitution, a motion requires either a two-thirds majority of all voting members of the Senate (154) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Senate (116) at each of two meetings.

As an amendment to the Assembly Constitution, a motion requires either a two-thirds majority of all voting members of the Assembly (133) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Senate (100) at each of two meetings.

As an amendment to the Senate Bylaws, a motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Senate (116) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Senate present and voting at each of two meetings.

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

As an amendment to the Senate/Assembly Rules, a motion requires a simple majority.

14. UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT
Ex Officio Representation
Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 2 of the University Senate Rules as follows (new language is underlined).

ARTICLE III. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

...

2. Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees

...

- **Faculty Consultative**--Vice chair of the Faculty Senate (voting); Chairs of the Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee (or his or her designee), Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, Finance and Planning, and Research Committees (if a non-faculty member is appointed as chair of one of the four committees, then the faculty members of that committee shall elect from among themselves a representative); elected representative from the Duluth faculty eligible to vote in Senate elections; Faculty Legislative Liaison

COMMENT:

With the position of Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee (AHC-FCC) chair there comes an ex officio seat on the University Senate FCC. There are times when the chair of the AHC-FCC, because of research or teaching commitments, for example, is unable to attend the meetings of the University Senate Faculty Consultative Committee.

The goal, in creating this ex officio membership, was communication and cross-fertilization. Similarly, the chair of the AHC Finance and Planning Committee can send a "representative" to the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning to be sure that it is abreast of the AHC Finance and Planning issues. There were a number of reasons for including this ex officio representation: the sheer size of the AHC, the "canary in the mine" phenomenon (i.e., the AHC is often the first affected with problems that will later show up on the rest of the campus), and the need for communication across Washington Avenue.

To the extent those reasons remain valid--and we believe they do--then the AHC FCC chair should be able to send a representative in his or her stead to the University FCC meetings. Barring an explicit provision in the Rules allowing the practice, however, it is not permitted. This change would permit it.

**DAN FEENEY , CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**15. UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT
Removal of Committee Chairs and Members
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend Article II of the University Senate Bylaws by adding a new Section 10 as follows (all language is new).

10. Removal of Committee Chairs and Committee members

a. Committee chairs (faculty, P&A, civil service, or alumni) may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Committee chairs (students) may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the Student Senate Consultative Committee.

Committee chairs may be removed from their position only on the grounds that they have failed to perform the duties required of a committee chair, they have obstructed the business of the Senate and its committees, they have violated the Board of Regents Code of Conduct or the University's Policy on Academic Misconduct (or, in the case of students, because they have violated the Student Conduct Code), or their continued service would cast doubt on the integrity and credibility of the work of the committee. Anyone removed as committee chair is automatically removed from membership on the committee.

b. Committee members (faculty, P&A, civil service, or alumni) may be removed from a committee by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Consultative Committee. Committee members (students) may be removed from a committee by a two-thirds vote of the Student Senate Consultative Committee.

Committee members may be removed from a committee only on the grounds that they have prevented the committee from conducting its business, if they have violated the Board of Regents Code of Conduct or the University's Policy on Academic Misconduct (or, in the case of students, because they have violated the Student Conduct Code), or their continued service would cast doubt on the integrity and credibility of the work of the committee.

c. If the committee chair or committee member to be removed is a P&A staff member, the Faculty Consultative Committee will consult with the Executive Committee of the Council of Academic and Professional Administrators before voting on removal. If the committee chair or committee member is a civil service staff member, the Faculty Consultative Committee will consult with the Civil Service Committee before voting on removal. If the committee chair or committee member is an alumni representative, the Faculty Consultative Committee will consult with the President and the Director of the Alumni Association before voting on removal.

d. The Faculty Consultative Committee shall have the authority, by a two-thirds majority vote, to remove its chair. The Faculty Consultative Committee shall also have the authority, by a two-thirds majority vote, to remove one of its members. The Student Senate Consultative Committees shall have the authority, by a two-thirds majority vote, to remove its chair. The Student Senate Consultative Committee shall also have the authority, by a two-thirds majority vote, to remove one of its members.

e. The provisions of this Section 10 (a), (b), (c), and (d) may not be used to infringe on the academic freedom of committee chairs and committee members. Neither committee chairs nor committee members may be removed from their position because they express unpopular views.

f. Any committee member or chair who is to be the subject of a vote on removal may submit a statement to the Faculty/Student Senate Consultative Committee, as appropriate, before a vote on removal is taken. There is no appeal from the decision of the Faculty/Student Senate Consultative Committee. Nothing in this section bars anyone from making use of the University's normal grievance processes for employees or students.

g. Nothing in this section 10 shall affect the operation of Senate Rule III(3), which provides for replacement of committee members who are repeatedly absent from meetings of their committees.

h. In all cases, the majorities required in this section 10 are two-thirds majorities of the full voting membership of the committee, not two-thirds of those present and voting.

COMMENT:

There is at present no mechanism for removing committee chairs or committee members. (Nor is there any present difficulty that causes this motion to be made at this time.) There are or may be a few rare occasions when, to protect the effective functioning of the governance system, it may be necessary to remove a committee chair or committee member. The Faculty Consultative Committee asked the Faculty Committee on Committees for a recommendation; the Committee on Committees (both the faculty/academic professional and student members) forwarded to the Senate Consultative Committee these proposed amendments to the bylaws.

We note that the Committee on Committees recommended that the body with authority to remove (1) non-student committee members and chairs be the Faculty Consultative Committee/Faculty Steering Committee (the latter, the Twin Cities members of the Faculty Consultative Committee, for Twin Cities Assembly Committees) and (2) student committee members and chairs be the Student Senate Consultative Committee/Student Steering Committee (again, the latter for Twin Cities Assembly committees). The Committee on Committees reasoned that while it has the nominating authority, the Consultative/Steering Committees are the executive and steering bodies responsible for the conduct of Senate and Assembly business, they are the groups that receive reports and actions from other committees, and it is those committees that are in the best position to know if there are difficulties with committee chairs or committee members. The Committee on Committees, in contrast, would have no way of knowing if difficulties had arisen. Its role is to select willing and reasonably representative individuals for Senate and Assembly committees, not to review or evaluate performance.

Examples of the circumstances that might lead to removal include a faculty member of the Senate Research Committee being found to have committed research fraud, a student member of the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning being found to have defrauded the University, a faculty member of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs who has been convicted of a felony related to retirement funds, or a committee member disrupting meetings and thereby preventing the committee from conducting its business. One hopes that these individuals would resign from a committee when asked quietly to do so by the committee chair or the chair of the appropriate Consultative/Steering Committee, and such a request would be made before formal action for removal. In the event that the individual refused to resign, however, the Consultative Committee believes there should be a mechanism to remove individuals from a chair position or a committee if a failure to do so would damage the governance system.

The proposed bylaw change provides that there is no appeal from the decision by the faculty or student consultative/steering committees. It was the judgment of the Committee on Committees, with which we concur, that removal from a committee position should not entail full-blown quasi-judicial proceedings with hearings and witnesses and so on because these positions are not an entitlement and removal has no effect on continued appointment or attendance (in the case of students) at the University.

The Committee notes that there is already a provision in the Rules for removal of committee members who are absent for three consecutive meetings; this language would not affect that provision.

**DAN FEENEY, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

16. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY RULES AMENDMENT
Removal of Committee Chairs and Members
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly

MOTION:

To amend Article II of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws by adding a new Section 10 as follows (all language is new).

10. Removal of Committee Chairs and Committee members

a. Committee chairs (faculty, P&A, civil service, or alumni) may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Steering Committee. Committee chairs (students) may be removed by a two-thirds vote of the Student Steering Committee.

Committee chairs may be removed from their position only on the grounds that they have failed to perform the duties required of a committee chair, they have obstructed the business of the Assembly and its committees, they have violated the Board of Regents Code of Conduct or the University's Policy on Academic Misconduct (or, in the case of students, because they have violated the Student Conduct Code), or their continued service would cast doubt on the integrity and credibility of the work of the committee. Anyone removed as committee chair is automatically removed from membership on the committee.

b. Committee members (faculty, P&A, civil service, or alumni) may be removed from a committee by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Steering Committee. Committee members (students) may be removed from a committee by a two-thirds vote of the Student Steering Committee.

Committee members may be removed from a committee only on the grounds that they have prevented the committee from conducting its business or if they have violated the Board of Regents Code of Conduct or the University's Policy on Academic Misconduct (or, in the case of students, because they have violated the Student Conduct Code), or their continued service would cast doubt on the integrity and credibility of the work of the committee.

c. If the committee chair or committee member to be removed is a P&A staff member, the Faculty Steering Committee will consult with the Executive Committee of the Council of Academic and Professional Administrators before voting on removal. If the committee chair or committee member is a civil service staff member, the Faculty Steering Committee will consult with the Civil Service Committee before voting on removal. If the committee chair or committee member is an alumni representative, the Faculty Steering Committee will consult with the President and the Director of the Alumni Association before voting on removal.

d. The Faculty Steering Committee shall have the authority, by a two-thirds majority vote, to remove its chair. The Faculty Steering Committee shall also have the authority, by a two-thirds majority vote, to remove one of its members. The Student Steering Committee shall have the authority, by a two-thirds majority vote, to remove its chair. The Student Steering Committee shall also have the authority, by a two-thirds majority vote, to remove one of its members.

e. The provisions of this Section 10 (a), (b), (c), and (d) may not be used to infringe on the academic freedom of committee chairs and committee members. Neither committee chairs nor committee members may be removed from their position because they express unpopular views.

f. Any committee member or chair who is to be the subject of a vote on removal may submit a statement to the Faculty Steering Committee/Student Steering Committee, as appropriate, before

a vote on removal is taken. There is no appeal from the decision of the committees. Nothing in this section bars anyone from making use of the University's normal grievance processes for employees or students.

g. Nothing in this section 10 shall affect the operation of Senate Rule III(3), which provides for replacement of committee members who are repeatedly absent from meetings of their committees.

h. In all cases, the majorities required in this section 10 are two-thirds majorities of the full voting membership of the committee, not two-thirds of those present and voting.

COMMENT:

See the comment to the previous motion.

**DAN FEENEY, CHAIR
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE**

**17. UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT
University Senate Officers
Action by the University Senate**

COMMENT:

This is the second meeting at which this motion is being presented. The motion received 143 votes in favor at the October 3, 2002, meeting.

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 6 of the University Senate Constitution as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~).

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE

...

6. University Senate and Student Senate Officers

a. The president of the University shall chair the University Senate. A vice chair shall be elected by the Senate at its last regularly scheduled meeting in the spring semester of the academic year ~~from among its current members~~ for a term of one year and shall be eligible for re-election. The president, with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint a clerk and a parliamentarian of the Senate (non-members of the Senate), whose duties shall be prescribed in the Senate Bylaws.

...

COMMENT:

The Consultative Committee does not believe there is any compelling reason to restrict the choice of Senate or Assembly vice chair from the current members of the Senate or Assembly. The traditional practice for a number of years (although not required by any Senate or Assembly rule) is that the faculty (typically the Faculty Consultative Committee) nominate the vice chair of the Senate and the students (typically the Student Senate Consultative Committee) nominate the

vice chair of the Assembly. When the vice chair of the University Senate is a faculty member, that individual has also automatically served as chair of the Faculty Senate (in the event a student were elected vice chair of the University Senate, the Faculty Senate would elect from among its members someone to serve as vice chair). The vice chair of the Senate is a voting member of the Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees (or, if the vice chair of the University Senate were a student, the vice chair of the Faculty Senate would serve as a voting member of the Faculty Consultative Committee).

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), in identifying a nominee to serve as vice chair of the University and Faculty Senates, considers the balance of its membership. To restrict the nominations to current members of the Senate or Assembly restricts the degrees of freedom FCC has to ensure it can adequately represent the interests of faculty from across the University.

The Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), believes this change would provide an opportunity for one more student to become involved in the University and Student Senates. With the small number of student senators compared to the total student population, many student voices and opinions are often left unheard or unknown. If the student elected was a nonmember, one more student prospective would be brought forth, allowing the Student Senate to better represent the student body.

**DAN FEENEY, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**18. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT
Twin Cities Campus Assembly Officers
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly**

COMMENT:

This is the second meeting at which this motion is being presented. The motion received 123 votes in favor at the October 3, 2002, meeting.

MOTION:

To amend Article II, Section 4 of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Constitution as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~).

ARTICLE II. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

...

4. Assembly Officers

The president of the University shall chair the Assembly. A vice chair shall be elected by the Assembly at its last meeting in the spring semester of the academic year ~~from among its current members~~ for a term of one year and shall be eligible for re-election. The president, with the consent of the Assembly, shall appoint a clerk and a parliamentarian of the Assembly (non-members of the Assembly), whose duties shall be prescribed in the Assembly Bylaws and Rules.

...

COMMENT:

See the comment to the previous motion.

**DAN FEENEY, CHAIR
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE**

**19. UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT
Electronic Voting
Action by the University Senate**

COMMENT:

This is the second meeting at which this motion is being presented. The motion received 143 votes in favor at the October 3, 2002, meeting.

MOTION:

To amend Article VIII and Article IX of the University Senate Constitution as follows (new language is underlined).

ARTICLE VIII AMENDING PROCEDURE

An amendment to this Constitution shall be approved either by a two-thirds majority of all voting members of the University Senate at a regular or special meeting, or by a majority of all voting members of the Senate at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting; and provided the proposed amendment has been distributed, in writing, to the persons and in the manner provided in Article III, Section 7, for distribution of the Senate agenda, at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed amendment. An amendment shall be effective following approval by the University Senate and by the Board of Regents.

If a proposed constitutional amendment has received affirmative votes of 80% or more of those present and voting at a meeting of the Senate, but the number of votes cast is insufficient to adopt the amendment (either a two-thirds majority of all voting members at one meeting or a majority of all voting members at the second of two meetings), the amendment may be submitted electronically to all members of the Senate for a second vote. The votes must be cast no later than three working days from the time of adjournment of the Senate meeting at which the item was considered. The number of votes required for electronic approval will be the same as the number required for approval at the meeting.

ARTICLE IX. BYLAWS

The University Senate may enact or amend its Bylaws either by a majority of all voting members of the University Senate at a regular or special meeting, or by a majority of all members of the Senate present and voting at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting, provided the proposed change has been submitted, in writing, to each member of the Senate at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed change.

If a proposed bylaw amendment has received affirmative votes of 80% or more of those present and voting at a meeting of the Senate, but the number of votes cast is insufficient to adopt the amendment (either a majority of all voting members at one meeting or a majority those present and voting at the second of two meetings), the amendment may be submitted electronically to all members of the Senate for a second vote. The votes must be cast no later than three working days from the time of adjournment of the Senate meeting at which the item was considered. The

number of votes required for electronic approval will be the same as the number required for approval at the meeting.

COMMENT:

There have been repeated occasions over the past several years when constitutional or bylaw amendments have received unanimous or near-unanimous support from the Senate or Assembly but which were nonetheless not adopted because the required absolute majority vote was not obtained simply because there were not enough people present at the meeting. The Senate Consultative Committee recommends that when an item has received the support of at least 80 percent of those present at a meeting (and most of these items receive 100 percent support), the Senate office be permitted to submit the item to senators electronically for a vote of all members. If members of the Senate or Assembly fulfill their responsibility and respond to the electronic ballot, most of the proposals could then be adopted promptly and the business of the Senate and Assembly could proceed unimpeded.

**DAN FEENEY, CHAIR
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**20. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT
Electronic Voting
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly**

COMMENT:

This is the second meeting at which this motion is being presented. The motion received 123 votes in favor at the October 3, 2002, meeting.

MOTION:

To amend Article VI and Article VII of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Constitution as follows (new language is underlined).

ARTICLE VI. AMENDING PROCEDURE

An amendment to this Constitution shall be approved either by a two-thirds majority of all voting members of the Assembly at a meeting, or by a majority of all voting members of the Assembly at each of two meetings; and provided the proposed amendment has been distributed, in writing, to the persons and in the manner provided in Article II, Section 5, for distribution of the Assembly agenda, at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed amendment. An amendment shall be effective following approval by the Assembly and the regents.

If a proposed constitutional amendment has received affirmative votes of 80% or more of those present and voting at a meeting of the Assembly, but the number of votes cast is insufficient to adopt the amendment (either a two-thirds majority of all voting members at one meeting or a majority of all voting members at the second of two meetings), the amendment may be submitted electronically to all members of the Assembly for a second vote. The votes must be cast no later than three working days from the time of adjournment of the Assembly meeting at which the item was considered. The number of votes required for electronic approval will be the same as the number required for approval at the meeting.

ARTICLE VII. BYLAWS

The Assembly may enact or amend its Bylaws either by majority of all voting members of the Assembly at a regular or special meeting, or by a majority of all members of the Assembly present and voting at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting, provided the proposed change has been submitted, in writing, to each member of the Assembly at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed change.

If a proposed bylaw amendment has received affirmative votes of 80% or more of those present and voting at a meeting of the Assembly, but the number of votes cast is insufficient to adopt the amendment (either a majority of all voting members at one meeting or a majority those present and voting at the second of two meetings), the amendment may be submitted electronically to all members of the Assembly for a second vote. The votes must be cast no later than three working days from the time of adjournment of the Assembly meeting at which the item was considered. The number of votes required for electronic approval will be the same as the number required for approval at the meeting.

COMMENT:

See the comment to the previous motion.

**DAN FEENEY, CHAIR
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE**

21. UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Allocation of Functions and Powers

Action by the University Senate

COMMENT:

The motion received 119 votes in favor at the March 28, 2002, meeting was withdrawn from the April 25, 2002, meeting, and received 137 votes in favor at the October 3, 2002, meeting.

MOTION:

To amend the Senate Constitution, Article III (3), as follows (new language is underlined):

3. Allocation of Functions and Powers

...

d. In general, functions allocated to the Faculty Senate shall include but not be limited to accreditation, designation and granting of University honors, policies concerning faculty appointment and tenure, and matters within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Affairs and Judicial Committees. Only those members of the Faculty Senate who hold probationary or tenured faculty appointments may vote on changes in the "Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure," any matters related to tenure, or any matters related to the Judicial Committee.

...

COMMENT:

As part of a package of bylaw revisions establishing positions on some Senate and Assembly committees for academic professional members, the Faculty Consultative Committee and the

Council on Academic Professionals and Administrators agreed that academic professional members of the Faculty Senate should not be voting on tenure or Judicial Committee matters, which are issues of concern exclusively to the faculty.

**DAN FEENEY, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A senator commented that she is opposed to the proposed change in item 21. She felt that faculty, other than tenured faculty, could have opinions and input that are relevant to issues of tenure. The proposed change might also lead to a power differential.

Professor Daniel Feeney, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), said in recent changes to the Senate Constitution, academic professionals were added to committees as well as the Senate. Other University policies dictate who can and cannot vote on items. This change is simply meant to put the Senate Constitution into compliance with these other documents, not to exclude certain groups from voting.

With no further discussion a vote was taken and the Senate motions were approved with 117 in favor, 12 opposed, and 8 abstentions. The Assembly motions were approved with 101 votes in favor, 6 opposed, and 6 abstentions.

APPROVED

END OF MOTION A

**22. INTRODUCTION OF MEDICAL SCHOOL DEAN,
NATURAL RESOURCES DEAN, LAW SCHOOL DEAN, AND
PUBLIC AFFAIRS DEAN**

Vice Chair Marti Hope Gonzales made the following introductions to the University Senate: Susan Stafford as the new Dean of the College of Natural Resources, Alex Johnston, Jr. as the new Dean of the Law School, and Brian Atwood as the Dean of the HHH Institute of Public Affairs. They were given a round of applause by the senators. Vice Chair Gonzales then noted that Deborah Powell, new Dean of the Medical School, was unable to attend today's meeting.

**23. STADIUM DISCUSSION
Discussion by the University Senate**

Professor Daniel Feeney, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that the University will soon be facing a decision on this issue, and this is the first opportunity for senators to have any discussion. As of this date, several committees have sent a list of concerns to the administration and the Regents as to what can go wrong in this endeavor.

He reminded senators that the legislature appropriated \$500,000 to explore this issue, develop a pre-design, and write a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU is due to the Regents in December, so there is still some time for the University Senate to express its thoughts and concerns. Discussions have been held regarding a poll of senators, but this plan has not been implemented yet.

In the document sent from the committees, several risks were identified. One of which was the effect on the quality of life on campus by hosting NFL Football. Another was the fiscal responsibility of the University. A third was the legislative perception about a building on University grounds in terms of other academic initiatives.

There are several options that are emerging besides a joint-use stadium on campus. There include a joint-use stadium at an off-campus location or a Gopher-only stadium.

At sometime in the future senators will be asked for input on a more formal basis, but currently senators should feel free to express their thoughts and concerns. The output from this discussion will be shared with the several Senate/Assembly committees which are working on this issue.

A senator said that the finished MOU should adhere to the six guiding principles adopted by the Regents. This MOU should limit the financial risk of the University, should ensure a financial benefit to the University, and should preserve governance control of all aspects of the stadium. There are two principles though, which an MOU cannot adequately address. One regards the academic mission of the University, which is not compatible with the mission of a private corporation. There is great risk that the teaching, research, and service missions of the University will be subordinated and diverted to other objections unrelated to the mission of the University. The second principle regards the integration of the stadium with the campus environment. As currently conceived the stadium would occupy four city blocks and would rise two and one-half times that of Williams Arena. Because the missions of the Vikings and University are incompatible, and because the physical enormity of the proposed stadium is incompatible with the surrounding University and residential areas, he opposed the joint-use stadium.

Another senator stated that he is also concerned with the details and with the fact that no answers are being supplied during the negotiations. There are also problems with the view that the Vikings and Gophers can remain in the Metrodome and just remodel the building. In particular, he has not heard any discussion about mission-related opportunities about bringing people onto campus, even if the reason is to view a Vikings game. Questions to be answered include: Would public relations be improved by having non-University people on campus? Can music and arts be promoted? Who will explore other uses for the stadium?

Professor Feeney said that besides the several Senate/Assembly committees reviewing this issue, there are two joint administrative-faculty committees working on issues related to stadium finance and the other is alternate uses for the stadium. The idea of music and arts exploration has not yet been addressed, but can be. Discussion regarding marketing the campus have been held but not with any great detail.

A senator then said that, from a student perspective, concerns have been raised regarding the displaced Huron Parking Lots. Students currently pay \$3.25 per day to park in these lots. Multiplied by five times per week for nine months, a student pays approximately \$600. This figure would significantly increase if students needed to park in garages and ramps. On the other hand, students state an unfriendly environment as a top reason that they leave the University. An on-campus stadium would not completely alleviate this problem, but it would keep students on campus for other events.

Professor Feeney said that the goal of the proposal is to not shift the increased parking cost to the students. In order to realize this goal, the projection is that the parking ramp would lose several million dollars each year. Several parking proposals have been circulated, but no decision has been made.

A senator from Morris was concerned about financing the stadium. In light of the state budget situation, how can the University address this proposal knowing that academic funding needs to come first? What will be the funding return to the University in the proposal? This proposal does not support the mission of the University and the discussion should not be taking place at this time.

Q: How would this proposal impact the coordinate campuses financially?

A: One of the Regents' principles was that the stadium should not have any negative financial impact on the University, but should be a source of revenue. The details of this principles are being addressed in the MOU. There is no recent projection of the annual parking ramp deficit, but the last figure was \$3 million per year. This amount would need to be funded from some source. It does not appear that there is any language in the MOU that budget shortfalls would be restricted to the Twin Cities campus. No questions can be completely answered until the MOU is released at the end of November.

A senator said that the University and a joint-use stadium should not be a solution to keeping the Vikings in the Twin Cities. If the stadium is built, and the Vikings leave anyway, then the University would have all the financial responsibility for the joint-use stadium. A better alternative is exploring a Gopher-only stadium.

A senator then stated that in a discussion with students, sentiment was expressed regarding being able to walk to an on-campus football game. However, serious concern was raised about parking. A student also noted that this is a political situation for the University to go against the proposal.

Another senator then said that the academic mission of the University should be the most important consideration. In a meeting with an official from the Vikings, students asked about this issue and the representative agreed that the academic mission is to remain primary in this relationship. Then he was asked what academic benefit would students realize in building the stadium. He could not provide any answer and students could not see an advantage in this relationship. There are several disadvantages, however. One would be the parking situation while the ramps are being built. While shuttles are one solution, the increased time in this scenario does not work for many students. Additionally, many students are on campus on weekends and in the evening, and would therefore be affected by night and weekend events.

A senator then said that Viking events which happen eight times per year would not have much impact on music, arts, and parking on campus. The critical issues are architecture and economic implications, and these are where the discussion should be focused.

Q: It appears that whatever advantages there might be are heavily outweighed by the disadvantages. Therefore, what is fueling the process? How can people have a voice in the process?

A: Consideration of a joint-use stadium was not a University initiative, but was mandated by the legislature. There is a level of frustration among all groups involved in the process in dealing with the impact that a joint-use stadium will have on campus. The Senate has discussed polling faculty, staff, and students, but at this point the discussion is premature. Any input can be forwarded to the Senate Office.

A senator stated two reasons against the stadium. One, this University worked to make campus into more than a commuter school. Any effort that would counter this revitalization would be detrimental. Second, there is no way to measure the long-term impact on the University budget

as seen by the public. While the University would not receive revenue from Viking events, would it be possible to separate Viking and University events in the public's minds?

A motion was then made and seconded to increase the time for discussion for 10 minutes. A vote was taken and the motion was approved.

Q: How is the \$500,000 allotment from the legislature being spent? Can it be used to solicit community feedback to the proposal?

A: The state allotment was for a pre-design and an MOU. How the funds are actually being spent is decided by the administration. At some point in the future, polling might be done.

A senator expressed concern that faculty, staff, and students at large still have not had an opportunity to express their views on the proposal.

A senator then said that another public research institution has an on-campus stadium which does not appear to hurt its academic mission. The positive impacts from this arrangement should be researched.

Another senator stated that students at Duluth are adamantly opposed to funding a stadium in the Twin Cities, as well as a parking ramp that is proposed to lose funds each year.

24. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Policy on Voting

Action by the Faculty Senate

MOTION:

To adopt the following policy. All language is new.

POLICY ON VOTING

--Only tenured full professors may vote on whether to recommend a candidate for promotion to full professor with tenure. The tenured full professors may consult other tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, P&A and term faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and any others they wish. The meeting at which the final deliberations and vote take place, however, shall be open only to the tenured full professors in that unit.¹

--Only tenured associate and full professors may vote on whether to recommend a candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The tenured associate and full professors may consult other tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, P&A and term faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and any others they wish. The meeting at which the final deliberations and vote take place, however, shall be open only to the tenured associate and full professors in that unit.

--Only tenured faculty may vote on whether to recommend a candidate for tenure. The tenured faculty may consult non-tenured faculty, P&A and term faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and any others they wish. The meeting at which the final deliberations and vote take place, however, shall be open only to the tenured faculty in that unit.

¹ The provision in this and succeeding paragraphs that "the meeting at which the final deliberations and vote take place, however, shall be open only to . . ." explicitly bars all others, including support staff.

--Only the tenured and tenure-track faculty may vote on whether to recommend hiring a candidate for a tenured and tenure-track faculty position in a unit. The tenured and tenure-track faculty may consult P&A and term faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and any others they wish. Individuals other than tenured and tenure-track faculty members may serve on search committees; however, meeting at which the final deliberations and vote take place shall be open only to the tenured and tenure-track faculty in that unit. It is not required that all tenured and tenure-track faculty in a unit participate in the decision to recommend that a candidate be hired, but the decision to recommend hiring of a tenured and tenure-track faculty member shall be made only by tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

COMMENT:

The Tenure Subcommittee was asked by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs to consider issues associated with voting on faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure. The Subcommittee, after discussion over several meetings, recommended a proposed policy to the Committee on Faculty Affairs. The Committee on Faculty Affairs, and the Faculty Consultative Committee, offered a number of suggestions that were incorporated in the policy. The Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Tenure Subcommittee recommend that the Faculty Senate adopt the policy

This policy is intended to be supplemental to the tenure regulations. We believe that the provisions of this policy are implicit in the tenure code but that additional clarification cannot hurt.

**JOHN FOSSUM, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

DISCUSSION:

Q: In the fourth bullet, regarding hiring, it lists several exclusions for search committees and final voting. If approved, this would result in changes some current practices. Why was this item included?

A: This language was deliberately added to address the problems that some units have had with the hiring of tenure and tenure-track faculty in which the proceedings were dominated by non-tenure and tenure-track people. The feeling of the committee was that these hires should be decided by the tenure and tenure-track faculty.

Q: In the other bullets, the definition of a candidate being voted upon is clear, but in the fourth bullet the language implies all the steps from announcing the position to completing the hiring process. Was this the intended definition?

A: The intent was not to exclude other groups at the earlier stages of the process, just at the final decision and vote.

A senator commented that while the intent is correct, there are several problems with the actual wording. First, the Tenure Code makes a distinction between rank and tenure, which is not addressed in this policy. Second, most departments have a staff member present at the meeting, in confidence, to take minutes from the meeting, but this policy excludes any staff members. Lastly, a distinction should be made in the policy between search committee recommendations and the final decision to hire.

Professor William Garrard, Chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, noted that the intent of this policy was to formalize a procedure for the University, since currently each department or unit has their own procedures.

A motion was then made and seconded to refer the item back to the committee. A vote was then taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED – REFER TO COMMITTEE

25. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

26. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

27. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2002-03 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

OCTOBER 31, 2002

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2002-03 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, October 31, 2002, at 11:37 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 38 voting student members and one ex officio member. Chair Ryan Osero presided.

**1. DISCUSSION WITH PROFESSOR DAN FEENEY,
CHAIR OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Faculty and Student Interactions in the Senate**

Ryan Osero announced that Professor Feeney had been called to another meeting and was unable to speak with the students today.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ryan Osero wished everyone a Happy Halloween.

**3. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 3, 2002
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/ssen/021003stu.html>

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

DISCUSSION:

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

APPROVED

**4. UNIVERSITY SENATE/TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY
BYLAWS AND RULES AMENDMENTS
Information for the Student Senate**

Ryan Osero called the attention of senators to a list of amendments to the Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules which will be presented for action at today's University Senate meeting. He asked that everyone attend that so these items can be approved.

**5. DISCUSSION WITH ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT
RICHARD PFUTZENREUTER, OFFICE FOR BUDGET AND FINANCE, AND
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT DONNA PETERSON,
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS
University's Legislative Request**

Richard Pfutzenreuter, Associate Vice President for Budget and Finance, distributed a chart describing where the state revenues come from and where the state expenditures are spent. Most of the state revenues come from income tax and sales tax, which creates a revenue problem for the state when the economy does poorly.

For the expenditures, higher education is only 10 percent of the state budget, which is split between the University and the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU). In 1989, the state expenditure for higher education was close to 16 percent. This decrease means that higher education spending has not grown with the state budget, which is a national trend. The state budget priority has been property tax relief, K-12 education, and health services.

The following sheets look solely at the University's revenues and expenditures without including sponsored research funds. This shows that 36 percent of the operations and maintenance budget comes directly from the state, as well as another 5 percent in state specials. Lastly, tuition contributes 16 percent to the budget. The diagram demonstrates why more pressure is placed on tuition in years when state funding decreases.

In the last session of the state legislature, the state balanced the budget by using all one-time monies available, which left the budget for the next biennium with a deficit of close to \$3 billion. The next budget forecast will be released in December, so the new governor and legislators will wrestle with how to balance the budget. With a deficit of this size, taxes could not be raised fast enough to generate enough money to alleviate the deficit.

Next week the University will approve the budget request to the state to fulfill its needs. The request has four investment areas: set and implement academic directions, support talented faculty and staff, help students realize educational goals, and build and maintain academic infrastructure, for a total of \$192 million.

In the past few years, the University would have requested the entire amount, minus a 3 percent tuition increase, from the state, so that the entire request was paid from two sources, the state and tuition. This year, in light of the state deficit, the University is proposing a third funding source: contributions from the University, in a partnership with the state. Therefore, the state is being asked to fund 50 percent of the request, \$96 million, and the University will raise the other half through tuition and internal reallocation. For the University's contribution, it will consist of 4.5 percent back-to-back tuition increases and a 2.5 percent internal reallocation of existing money towards University priorities.

This request reflects the need for the University to look at its priorities and reinvest in those areas recognized by the Regents and President. It also acknowledges the state deficit by requesting less than half of past requests. Additionally, while this is the year for biennial requests, the University will be asking for funding for \$61 million in capital requests that were cut by the governor at the end of the last session.

This request will be approved by the Regents next week. The legislative session starts January 7 and does not have to adjourn until the end of May. The governor's budget recommendations will be made in late January.

Q: Is the proposed 4.5 percent tuition increase the same amount for all colleges, or is it an average across colleges so that some, such as the Medical School, could have a higher tuition increase than other colleges?

A: If this budget request is adopted, tuition will only increase 4.5 percent for students in all colleges. The University, though, is sensitive to market conditions in some of the professional schools. Tuition in some programs is as high as tuition in private colleges and out state schools. The University will need to closely monitor tuition increases in several professional schools.

Q: What will be the tuition increase if the entire budget request is not received?

A: The University will fight to receive the entire amount from the state. If the University did not receive any funding, then tuition would need to increase 13.4 percent back-to-back to cover all the University priorities. This would not happen though since the University would make cuts in the request for aspirational items, although there are certain expenses that cannot be cut.

Q: Will the central administrative fee scheduled be increased?

A: There is no planned increase in the central administrative fee.

Q: Last year when students were scheduled to receive a tuition increase, the support staff opposed this increase and worked with the students to increase funding. During the internal reallocation, how will the University avoid, as much as possible, human cuts and lay-offs?

A: The University is a 'people business' in that almost 70 percent of the spending is for faculty, staff, and student workers. Therefore, reallocations cannot avoid impacting people, but hopefully this can be accomplished through attrition in vacancies. Staff cuts and lay-offs is not a goal of this plan, but the University has trimmed all the easy excess.

Q: Is the University addressing the fact that students cannot receive more financial aid to offset the increases in the cost of living expenses?

A: The University does care about the cost of attendance. In the last few years more attention has been focused on the undergraduate level, but expenses for graduate and professional students will need to be looked at.

Q: Two years ago, a new fee for international students was introduced. Are there any plans to remove this fee for international students?

A: There have not been any discussions to reduce or remove this fee.

Q: How will the University ensure that the internal reallocation will contribute to the University's budget request as proposed?

A: The Regents will hold the administration to reallocating its portion of the request. A budget advisory committee is already meeting to determine how to reallocate the \$16.6 million for the first year.

Q: If higher education funding is a national problem, what are other states doing?

A: Most states started cutting higher education last year because they did not have the reserves that Minnesota had. Actions of other institutions range from freezing salaries to tuition increases to lay-offs.

Q: During the capitol request last year, many students felt that their hard work would not come to fruition until after they had graduated. In this plan, there seems to be a need to engage the student body. What efforts are under way to engage the entire student community?

A: The University has a grassroots organization with representatives from every college and campus, as well as staff and the Student Legislative Coalition (SLC). The University will continue to work with SLC as the student voice and to help organize students. Budget success comes from pressure on the legislature from faculty, staff, and students. Two things students can do is vote and then send their representatives an e-mail reminding them of the University's request. Government Relations is also willing to work with other student organizations to make lobbying efforts as effective as possible.

Critical dates for this request will be: November 5 to vote, late January when the governor's budget is released since the governor receives 95 percent of his or her budget, and then late April/early May when student concerns can be addressed to the administration and the Regents.

Q: What areas are being considered for cuts?

A: No specific areas are being considered at this time.

Q: Will the University consider increasing gifts and endowments to raise additional funding?

A: The Minnesota Foundation receives \$2.5 million for operations and maintenance from the University to finance the foundation, as well receiving a fee on all endowments. The last campaign was successful, but the University must continue to support the efforts of the Foundation to pursue new prospects from the campaign.

Q: Is there a maximum tuition increase that the University is proposing?

A: It is hard at this time because of the uncertain budget forecast. A more accurate figure can be provided once the governor's budget has been released. The administration and the Regents do not want double-digit increases, but it really depends on the state's situation.

Q: During the reallocation , will cuts be across-the-board or will each coordinate campus be able to decide on its own cuts?

A: Because of the decentralized operation, each unit will be given a target amount to cut, but the decision will be up to each unit, although central administration will provide guidelines that financial aid and instruction should not be negatively impacted.

Donna Peterson, Associate Vice President for Government Relations, said that 10 years ago there was a discussion in the legislature about a higher tuition/higher aid model for undergraduates in Minnesota. This issue is back again from the private colleges and business organizations. This proposition is a simple solution to a very complex problem with the result that middle-class students are caught in the system.

Richard Pfitzenreuter stated that the rationale to give all funds directly to students is that it would force institutions to be more efficient with their resources. There is no evidence to prove this model, but the proposal has resurfaced because of the lack of state funds.

Q: Because of the small request this year, will the next increase, at a higher level, look outrageous in comparison?

A: There is a cycle to these requests, and as the economy improves so can the University's request without any criticism.

Q: What is MnSCU's request?

A: They are requesting \$107 million with an additional \$40 million for increased enrollment. They are not suggesting any type of partnership and their proposal does not acknowledge the state's financial situation.

Richard Pfitzenreuter said that he would be happy to return in February to update senators on the legislative request and budget situation.

6. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH DISCUSSION

Ryan Osero, Student Senate Chair, said that Josh Colburn, student member on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, has joined the meeting to hear comments and feedback from students on the process and what they would like to see in the next president. Due to the nature of the search, he cannot answer many questions about the process or the candidates.

Q: What is the timeline for the search?

A: The committee membership was finalized by the Regents this summer with a completion date for the committee's work by the end of December.

Q: What is the committee doing to ensure racial and gender diversity in the candidate pool?

A: Racial and gender diversity is a very important part of the work of the committee. At this point, the candidate pool is very strong and candidates have a wide variety in their breadth of knowledge of institutions like the University.

Q: How many final candidates will be considered?

A: This number is considered confidential.

Q: What are the University's priorities for its candidates?

A: The Regents published a brochure on the 14 specific qualities that are being considered in all candidates.

Q: Is the search committee considering increasing the number of faculty and student representatives?

A: No. The membership was determined by the Regents.

Q: What is the level of coordinate campus representation on the search committee?

A: Each coordinate campus has one representative.

Q: What is the make-up of the search committee and the background of its members?

A: The committee has 12 members, determined by the Regents. There is one student, 3 faculty, 2 professional staff members, as well as representatives from the private sector. Biographies for each committee member is available on line.

Q: Why is there secrecy in the process?

A: The committee conducts its business in secret so that it can consider candidates from other institutions who might not otherwise be willing to be considered if the process was open. The committee is separate from the Regents so that it is not covered by the open meeting law rule.

Josh Colburn said that he has been talking to as many students and student groups as possible, from each of the campuses, to solicit feedback on what students want in their next president. He reminded senators that the committee will not be selecting the next president, but just recommending final candidates to the Regents.

A senator said that University is at a crossroads in terms of becoming solely a research institution or keeping the University accessible for students so candidates need to be able to balance these two missions.

Another senator said that the University needs to become more world-class while still maintaining its cost-effectiveness, so the next president needs to be able to lobby the legislature while maintaining academics.

A senator stated that the state is better if the University is nationally-ranked, but that a president needs to be able to find a balance in missions.

A senator said that the next president should continue to promote attracting international students.

Another senator stated that while a former governor or business leader might be considered, the next president needs an academic background.

In conclusion, Josh Colburn said that he willing to listen to any additional comments. He can be reached during his office hours at the MSA office or via e-mail at colb0013@umn.edu, as well as through a web form on the presidential search website.

7. MINNESOTA HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES OFFICE Biennial Budget Request Action

Ryan Osero, Student Senate Chair, stated that he represents the University on the Student Advisory Council (SAC) for the Minnesota Higher Education Services Office (HESO). SAC asked that each institution present the budget to its students for approval and bring the results back to the next SAC meeting.

He distributed the budget for approval to the senators noting that last year HESO received a large cut. The purpose of HESO is to distribute all state funds for financial aid to all students. Therefore, most of their budget is for financial aid in the form of state grants, work-study, and child care with a small portion covering administrative costs.

A second sheet shows what the state mandates as the maximum cap on tuition and living expenses per year to be used in calculating financial aid. Currently, the cap only affects private schools, but with the way that the University's tuition is rising, the University will hit the cap in 5 years. Once a student has reached the cap, no more state grant aid is awarded. Ryan Osero stated that the living and miscellaneous expenses (LME) amount is set at \$5405 and HESO is not

suggesting that it be increased. The total LME is the amount that a student is supposed to live off for the nine-month academic year.

Q: Is the LME what the University states is the cost or is it what the University is willing to provide to low-income students?

A: The LME is not what the University states, but is a figure determined by HESO as to what it will contribute for LME. This figure is applied state-wide and therefore is not adjusted for different areas of the state.

Q: What budget changes are being asked for from HESO?

A: For the total budget, HESO is asking for a total increase of \$22 million for 2004, with a total biennial increase of \$61 million. Most of this increase is for student aid in the form of tuition and fees and LME.

A senator commented that apartment rent alone can consume the entire LME.

Q: Is HESO proposing an increase in state grants and work study funding?

A: Yes. Line five of the proposal, tuition and fees is for an increase in state grants and work study.

Q: How does this request affect the University's request?

A: HESO does not have a direct link to the University, but works with all institutions of higher education to disperse student aid. Once all student aid has been determined, HESO disperses a lump sum to the University, at which time it is allocated to each student.

Q: What is the total tuition and fees for an undergraduate student on the Twin Cities campus?

A: It is roughly \$6600 per year.

Q: Will HESO listen to any concerns that are raised about the request?

A: HESO will likely approve the request as is, but SAC asked that the Student Senate consider the request.

A senator commented that an increase in LME would seem to compete with the University's request and force the University into a high tuition/high aid model.

Q: Are the change items to be included in the base budget?

A: Yes since it covers the restoration of funds that were taken from HESO last year.

Q: What is the college savings program?

A: It is a new program in Minnesota to get families saving for college at an earlier age with tax benefits to the program.

A member then advocated for increases in work study funds since without this type of financial aid, the student experience is hurt.

A senator then made a motion and seconded to disapprove the HESO budget request. The floor was then opened for discussion.

Q: What would students like in the HESO budget that is not there?

A: Many students have been discouraged to do research by the lack of work study funding, so this amount needs to be increased above what it was in the past.

A senator stated that he would disapprove the budget because he would like more information on what exactly the numbers mean and how it affects students. He asked that someone from HESO be at the next meeting to explain the numbers and answer questions.

Q: What is the timeframe for this budget request?

A: A preliminary budget was submitted from HESO to the state in October and a final budget request will be submitted in November.

A motion was then made and seconded to table this item until the next meeting. A vote was taken and the motion was approved with 21 in favor and 12 opposed.

MOTION TABLED

8. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT

Ryan Osero, Student Senate Chair, did not have a report at this time.

9. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Judy Berning, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that SSCC will be bringing a stadium resolution or position statement to Student Senate in December for approval. Eric Steinhoff, the SSCC Chair, is looking into the problems with the work study funding shortage at Morris and will have more information for the Student Senate in the spring. Lastly, she encouraged all senators to apply for a Senate or Assembly committee.

10. CAMPUS REPORTS

Crookston – Jean Korkowski reported that Crookston held its Torch and Shield Banquet last night as a thank you to its donors.

Duluth – Nick Cecconi reported that last week Weber Music Hall had its grand opening. He also noted that all the Duluth senators are present.

Morris – Reginald Davis stated that MCSA is holding stadium discussions, many gubernatorial candidates have visited campus, and discussions are starting regarding financial aid concerns.

Graduate and Professional Student Association – No report.

Minnesota Student Association - Josh Colburn said that there will be a voter rally on November 5 on the Northrop Plaza.

11. UPDATE ON STUDENT SENATE TASK FORCE Information

Ryan Osero, Student Senate Chair, said that Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Task Force membership has been completed, except for the graduate/professional student representative. The Task Force Chair is Reid LeBeau, members are: Thomas Rutledge from UMDSA, Jacob Elo from MSA, Khama Sharp from MCSA, and Jean Korkowski from CSA.

12. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

13. NEW BUSINESS

A senator stated that at the October 3 University Senate meeting, for item 43, a vote was taken. The minutes reflect that there were no votes opposed, but this vote was never taken because of the rush to finish the meeting prior to the State of the University Address. She would like the minutes to reflect that an opposed vote was not taken.

Second, this item is on the agenda again for today's University Senate meeting as item 21. She felt that the amendment raises questions regarding the distribution of power between those that are and those who are not tenured, and since business can move swiftly, she wanted students to be aware of the issue prior to the meeting.

Q: Can an item keep being brought back to Senate meetings until there are enough votes for it to be approved?

A: There is a clause in the Senate Constitution which allows for amendments to the Senate Constitution to be approved by two-thirds of the total membership at one meeting or by a majority of the total membership at two consecutive meetings.

Ryan Osero noted that these points should be addressed at the University Senate meeting.

Another senator then asked that when a response to the questions and concerns on the Gophers-Vikings Stadium is received, that the response be sent to all senators.

Ryan Osero said that any response would be shared with all senators.

Another senator then said that this is a critical time for students to give their feedback on pros and cons regarding the stadium proposal.

Ryan Osero reminded senators that the Student Senate did approve a statement at its last meeting. He then referred senators to Item 23 on the University Senate agenda which is a discussion of the proposed stadium.

14. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

APPENDIX A MEMORIAL STATEMENTS

Joseph C. Olson, Jr.

Dr. Joseph C. Olson, Jr., professor of microbiology in the Department of Dairy Microbiology, died May 3, 2002. He was 89.

Dr. Olson was born on March 15, 1913. He graduated from the University of Minnesota with a B.S. in Dairy Bacteriology in 1935, and served as an instructor until he joined the U.S. Army Medical Service Department. He spent six years in the Army, attaining the rank of Colonel. When World War II ended, he returned to the U of M and earned a Ph.D. in Dairy Microbiology in 1948. Dr. Morse joined the faculty of the University of Minnesota, in the Department of Dairy Microbiology, and was promoted to Professor, with a joint appointment in the Microbiology Department of the Medical School.

In 1967, Dr. Olson accepted the position of Director of the Department of Food and Cosmetic Biology of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, and he held that office until his retirement in 1989. While at the FDA, he served on numerous international food regulatory committees.

Dr. Olson was co-author of *Microbial Ecology of Foods*, which became the standard textbook in university dairy microbiology courses., and *Evaluation of Microbial Criteria for Food and Food Ingredients*. During his career he received numerous national and international honors and citations, and held memberships in professional organizations such as the International Association of Milk, Food, and Environmental Sanitarians.

His research focused on raw milk quality, thermal destruction of non-sporeforming bacteria in milk, and the microbiology of dry milk. Many domestic and international food safety standards and regulations are a direct result of his influence and research findings in dairy microbiology.

Dr. Olson is survived by his wife, Irene, and his son, Joseph C. Olson III, of Sun City, Arizona.

Robert G. Robinson

Professor Emeritus Robert G. Robinson was born in Minneapolis, MN, on January 26, 1920, and died on September 13, 2002, at his home in Falcon Heights, MN.

Robert Robinson received a B.S. degree in Vocational Agriculture from Iowa State University in 1941 and M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Agronomy and Soil Science, respectively, from the University of Minnesota in 1947 and 1948. He was appointed assistant professor in the Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics in 1948 and, after a 38-year career, retired in 1986. Professor Robinson worked tirelessly to educate students and to increase crop production options for Minnesota and the Upper Midwest region.

Professor Robinson headed a research program known as “new, uncommon or little-researched crops” and over the years studied more than 200 plant species. By testing a wide variety of potential crop species, Professor Robinson determined which were suitable for production in Minnesota’s environmental conditions. His goal was to find or develop new crops that could be produced profitably. For many of these possible crop species, he initiated the first production and management studies in the State. He laid the groundwork for development of sunflower as a commercial crop in Minnesota – first as an edible seed crop and then as an oil-seed crop. Many of his publications are landmarks for plant breeders and agronomists and cover research on crop

management, weed control, crop physiology, crop morphology and the registration of 20 crop varieties in 10 different species.

Professor Robinson had a keen and abiding interest in the education and well-being of students – especially undergraduates. Over the years, many undergraduate students worked side by side with Professor Robinson; however, it was a notable achievement when a student could work as long and as hard as he did. During retirement, Professor Robinson established substantial endowments to provide scholarships for students in the College of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Sciences, and to provide fellowships for students in the Department of Communication Disorders.

Robert G. Robinson was preceded in death by his brother Barton Hoxie Robinson and sisters, Elizabeth Graham Robinson and Helen R. Petersen. He is survived by niece Marilyn Petersen Powell (John) of San Marino, CA, and grandnieces Beth McCluney of Fullerton, CA, and Jennifer Berry of San Francisco, CA.