

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES**

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

**February 17, 1983**

The second meeting of the University Senate for 1982-83 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, February 17, 1983, at 3:30 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 122 voting members of the faculty, 47 voting members of the student body, 8 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 11 nonmembers.

President C. Peter Magrath presided.

**I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 18**

**Action (3 minutes)**

*Approved*

**II. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1982-83**

(These are in addition to those approved at the May 20 and November 18, 1982, Senate meetings)

**Action (5 minutes)**

**SOCIAL CONCERNS** Faculty: Gayle Graham Yates

**BUSINESS & RULES** Student: Kathy Watson

**PLANNING** Faculty: Shirley Clark, Willard Hartup

**INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION** Faculty: Patricia Ferrieri

**RESEARCH** Faculty: John Sullivan

*Approved*

**INFORMATION:**

**EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT** Students: Geoffry Hilgermann, Vicky Sorheim, Dean Stedtfeld

**USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH** Faculty: Carol Austin, Terence Ball, William Bart, Pauline Boss, G. Mary Bradley, Paul Cashman, Robin Crickman, Bruce Dahlgard, Alfred Dees, Amos Deinard, Gerald Erickson, Phyllis Fleming, Heidi Gaenslen, Robert Gibson (UMD), Verona Gordon, Thomas Green, Megan Gunnar, Dale Hammerschmidt, William Hanson, Vernon Hendrix, Mark Herzberg, R. Edward Howell, Robert Jeffrey, Candace Kurth, Judith Lambrecht, Chung Lee, Lawrence Lockman, Ruth Loewenson, David Lykken, Jack Mandel, Robert McCaa, Philip McGlave, James Mitchell, Ernesto Molina, Jeylan Mortimer, Robert Patterson, Philip Porter, Jean Quam, Les Robinson, Sally Rode, John Rodman, Illeana Rodriguez, William Rowe, John Sauk, Naomi Scheman, Jacqueline Shick, Karl Smith, Clark Starr, Yang Wang, W. Dixon Ward. Students: Peter

Blaisdell, Jack Cain, Tom Deyo, Themis Economomou, Jim Find, Paige Johnson, Renee Kostner, Jeffrey Moser, Diane Prohofsky, Judith Reisman, Carrie Rethwill, Alan Rose-  
nauer. Community: Carol Clayman, Russell Frazier, Michael Steenson

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ASSEMBLY Faculty: Victor Bloomfield, Grover Cleveland, Roger Johnson, Jack Moran, Frederick Peterson (UMM), Robert Rathburn, Maynard Reynolds (Chr.), Michael Root, Richard Skaggs, Edwin Stueben, Gloria Williams, Gayle Graham Yates.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Student: Vicky Sorheim

*Accepted*

### **III. BUSINESS AND RULES COMMITTEE** **(5 minutes, for discussion)**

#### **A. ACADEMIC STAFF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL SENATE REPRESENTATION**

##### **INFORMATION:**

For two years, Business and Rules has considered the request that Senate membership be available to selected members of the academic professional staff of the University. Open hearings were held in 1980-81. The 1981-82 committee agreed that academic professionals should be represented in the Senate but that the academic professionals should not be counted in the allocation of seats. This proposal was circulated to the units interested in and affected by the proposed revision. In order to bring this matter to a conclusion, the committee proposes that the constitution be revised to allow academic professional staff on fixed terms of three (two) or more years, probationary, or continuous appointment full Senate membership. Such individuals would be eligible to vote for senators, serve as senators, and serve on Senate committees. They would also be counted in determining unit representation. The academic professional staff would participate in Senate elections as members of their academic units rather than as a new unit of academic professionals. Academic professional staff working in units not represented in the current Senate would not be included under the proposed changes. Business and Rules solicits reactions to our proposal. We will consider your comments carefully and bring the matter to the Senate (and Twin Cities Assembly) for action in May.

*Accepted*

#### **B. STUDENT SENATOR SELECTION, ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE**

##### **INFORMATION:**

This fall, a student senator pointed out to Business and Rules that certain units seldom fill their student seats in the Senate. Since faculty elect full quotas while students have a significant number of seats open, the actual faculty-student ratio is quite different from the target ratio. Business and Rules with the help of the Consultative Committee, the president, and the Minnesota Student Association will encourage the colleges to take appropriate action to see that candidates are available for the student seats. If we still are unable to fill the student seats, Business and Rules will propose constitutional changes that will allow for additional student representatives to be chosen in the fall of each year.

**DAVID L. GIESE**  
**Chair**

*Accepted*

## IV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

**INFORMATION:**

Shown on the chart below are proportions of new faculty appointments to Senate and Assembly committees by rank and sex, with comparable all-University figures for the 1982-83 academic year:

	Women		Men	
	Committees	All-University	Committees	All-University
Professor	10%	6%	90%	94%
Associate Professor	26	18	74	82
Assistant Professor	41	28	59	72
Instructor	0	43	0	57

**VIRGINA GRAY**  
**RUSSELL HOBBIE**  
**Co-Chairs, Committee on Committees**

**PATRICIA SWAN**  
**Chair, Consultative Committee**

*Accepted*

## V. FINANCE COMMITTEE

### INTERIM REPORT

**(5 minutes for discussion)**

The committee has held nine meetings during the current academic year and the main focus of attention has been on about seven items:

- 1) The 1983-85 biennial budget request,
- 2) The 1983 capital (building) request,
- 3) The financial aid—tuition situation of students,
- 4) The so called "Strategic Fiscal Planning Model" developed by Management Planning and Information Services to project future University revenues and outlays,
- 5) Data development relative to "salary matching" in support of requests for future faculty salary increases,
- 6) The latest round of budget retrenchments:
  - a) \$1.5 million reduction in state contribution to civil service retirement (mandated)
  - b) \$1.9 million reduction in state contribution to the faculty retirement fund
  - c) \$3 million permanent reduction in University O & M budget,
- 7) The planning process for the next two years which is designed to identify \$15-18 million in retrenchable funds for 1983-84 (about 6% of the state funded budget base) and about half that amount for 1984-85.

In general, the 1983-85 O & M budget and 1983 capital requests appear to be well done and well supported. Our committee felt that, in principle, both were consistent with immediate University needs and future priorities. At the same time, they recognize the State's stringent budget situation.

Similarly the biennial salary request for the next biennium (8% for 1983-84 and 9% for 1984-85) is consistent with University Senate action, with the principles of recapturing purchasing power lost by faculty in the 1970s, with modest recognition of some critical

market and retention phenomena and with the State's critical budget situation.

We expect to do some additional analysis of the student financial situation relative to future tuition and financial aid policies. Clearly, recent increases in tuition, a declining *real* value of financial aid programs, and difficulties for student employment in the current economic crisis have put many students in a financial squeeze. We hope to complete this analysis by the beginning of spring quarter.

The committee reviewed the "Strategic Fiscal Planning Model" and noted its high accuracy in tracking the past income inflows (legislative appropriations and tuition) and expenditure outflows for the University. Future projections using this model indicate a continuing budget deficit (and a continuing retrenchment scenario) for the University of the next several years. Thus, unless the past pattern of income and expenditure relationships can be modified, we need to continue to prioritize University programs and reallocate resources in support of high priority activities. We also need to work at modifying past income-outlay relationships.

The committee believes that selected use of faculty salary comparisons with other professional employee categories does effectively illustrate the continuing relative deterioration of faculty salaries. And, this can be an important input in supporting future salary increase requests. We cautioned, however, that not all faculty subgroups can be neatly compared with other employee categories and that salary matching must be done judiciously.

With respect to the current-year budget retrenchment (\$3 million recurring retrenchment plus a modest reserve against possible further retrenchments before June 30), the principles being used (no long-term damage, no major interruption or delay in student programs, and no significant "additional" financial consequences) appear reasonable, but the short-run impacts will probably be more of a "situational" than a "long-run priority" nature. The procedure(s) for recapturing the retrenched faculty retirement funds is still being evaluated and will probably be implemented starting July 1.

For the longer term, including the planned retrenchments for 1983-85, the committee has discussed our difficulties in making an effective input into the consulting process because:

- a) there are no well developed program priorities across the major units and programs of the University so it is hard to judge the appropriateness of targeted retrenchments for individual collegiate units and programs
- b) though the longer term planning process does provide mechanisms for systematic incremental program reductions, this longer term planning process needs to be guided by some a priori judgments relative to which programs (and units) are of highest priority and which ones are of lower priority.

We are hopeful that future budget retrenchments will be less severe and less sudden, thus permitting some increased flexibility in future financial planning for the University to realize program priorities and quality improvements.

Additional topics which have been discussed briefly by the committee are the financial impacts of

- 1) inloading and
- 2) increased correspondence between program costs and tuition rates for different programs (colleges).

**BURT SUNDQUIST**  
Chairman

*Accepted*

**VI. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE**  
**STUDENT FINANCIAL AID, DRAFT REGISTRATION**  
**(5 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

That the Senate approve the following resolution: That the University Senate considers the Military Selective Service Act of 1982 [(Section 1113a, Section 12), which requires all male applicants for financial aid to declare whether they have registered for the draft; if not, they shall be ineligible for any Federally-based financial aid. This law takes effect July 1, 1983.] to violate the Constitutional protections and academic freedoms of students, and hereby declares its opposition to this law and its enforcement.

**MOTION:**

That the Senate approve the following resolution: That the University Senate commends the University administration for taking legal action against the enforcement of this law.

**COMMENT:**

Whereas, this law violates students' rights of due process because it presumes guilt and provides no opportunity for a jury trial, and

Whereas, this law violates students' Fifth Amendment right to refuse to incriminate themselves, and

Whereas, this law ignores the Constitutional protection of attainder which prohibits one body from being both legislative and judicial bodies of government (Congress in this case is acting in both capacities), and

Whereas, this law discriminates against those students whose economic background dictates a need for financial assistance for their education, and targets them for punishment,

Therefore, the Social Concerns Committee presents the above resolutions to the University Senate for action.

**PATRICIA A. WILLIAMSON**  
Chair

*Approved*

**VII. BUSINESS AND RULES COMMITTEE**  
**ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

In sharp contrast to 1980-1981 when Business and Rules wrote the constitution, bylaws, and rules for the University Senate, the 1981-1982 committee had time to discuss and reflect on various issues. One, the issue of academic staff representation on the Senate, divided the committee. Committee members agreed that academic staff should be represented in the Senate and that the academic staff should vote with their colleagues at the collegiate level. Committee members disagreed on the issue of academic staff being included in the determination of the number of faculty/academic staff representatives on the Senate.

The committee was also concerned with the agenda of the Senate, the interpretation of consecutive years of service on the Senate, and the responsibility of Senate committees reporting significant policy changes to the Senate for information and/or action. In particular, Business and Rules began working on a report from the Human Subjects Committee and reviewing a policy change approved by the Library Committee but not reported to the Senate.

**DAVID L. GIESE**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## VIII. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ASSEMBLY ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82

The University College Assembly met nine times during the year with the primary agenda item being the revision of the University College academic plan in light of the program priorities statement. In order to absorb a 5.8 percent reduction in the UC budget base for 1982-83 the Assembly decided to suspend its University-wide solicitation and support of proposals for new experimental academic programs. During 1984-85, or before, the assembly will review its future long-term commitment to stimulate and support innovative programs in light of the directions taken by other University educational development programs. Through the mid-1980s, University College will focus its financial and staff resources on consolidating and strengthening its two individualized degree programs, Inter-College Program (ICP) and University Without Walls (UWW).

The University College Assembly adopted the goals for 1982-83 of seeking to make University College programs more accessible and to improve academic advising for students. To meet these goals, the University College staff will be directed to accomplish the following college-wide objectives:

1. Continue developing and testing strategies to increase by 20 percent over a three-year period the revenue to University College through the Department of Independent Study.
2. Increase annual fund contributions by 10 percent and maintain an alumni program.
3. Reach agreements with Academic Affairs on appropriate workload measures and on a cost model for University College.
4. Reach agreements with Academic Affairs and other interested parties regarding the appropriateness and purposes of new centers for advising returning and adult students and for advising students seeking individualized programs.
5. Place each professional academic adviser in the academic adviser series, produce a plan for reviewing advisers for continuous appointments, and implement new performance review system.
6. Obtain space for locating Inter-College Program and University Without Walls in contiguous space.

In other actions, the assembly authorized completing over the next three years the redress of salary inequity experienced by University College academic advisers and administrators; approved a new registration system for UWW students that better matches the phases of the UWW program and the activities of the students; and authorized the cessation of recruitment and admission of students into the University Scholars Program, with the eventual phase-out of the program as students complete their degree programs.

The assembly's Consultative Committee met with Vice President Kenneth Keller to discuss the position of the assistant vice president for outreach, educational development, and undergraduate affairs. The discussion focused on the role the assistant vice president might play in directing the affairs of University College.

Maynard Reynolds was re-elected chairperson for the 1982-83 academic year.

**MAYNARD REYNOLDS**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **IX. USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

The committee has continued with its main activity of processing research proposals. During this period the committee operated at approximately full strength (60 members). One of the problems of membership of the committee, however, has been the lack of representation in specific areas where expert knowledge is needed. This is particularly true in the health sciences. This kind of problem can often be solved by seeking advice from experts in a given field who are not members of the committee and by continuing efforts to secure for the committee as wide a range of membership as possible. Cooperation from the entire University community is necessary if the committee is to function at top efficiency.

In addition to its regular business, the committee has drawn up revisions in the procedures governing review of research proposals. These proposed changes were provided the Senate Consultative Committee and the Senate Committee on Research in March, 1982.

During the 1981-82 academic year, the committee reviewed 507 new proposals, 67 previously reviewed proposals which required amendment or involved changes, and 858 renewals. There were 24 meetings of health sciences review panels and 22 meetings of social sciences review panels. In addition, meetings of the full committee were held on December 2, 1981, and February 24, 1982, to discuss changes in procedure.

**ROBERT GIBSON  
JOHN J. SAUK, JR.  
Co-Chairmen**

*Accepted*

## **X. EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82**

The Educational Development Committee is charged to develop guidelines and operating procedures for the Educational Development Program (EDP) and to review and recommend action on proposals for educational development efforts.

The Committee reviewed at its meetings during the fall quarter 1981 the evaluation of the Educational Development Program. This evaluation was commissioned by the committee and conducted by the Center for Educational Development and Measurement Services Center. Plans for the 1982-83 Educational Development Program were made in the light of findings in the evaluation and within the constraints of the University's budget reduction. The committee recommended to the vice president for academic affairs that the entire 1982-83 allocation be used at the college level of the program.

During the spring quarter 1982, the committee conducted its review of EDP proposals submitted by each college or campus and made a recommendation to the vice president for academic affairs as to which of the proposals should be funded and at what level. The review of the proposals in each case was based solely on the announced criteria of the EDP. The priorities assigned by the colleges were not a matter of review by the committee. Sixty-one projects were recommended for funding for a total amount of \$145,244. The vice president for academic affairs approved the committee's recommendations, and individuals and units were notified of the outcomes of their requests.

**KENNETH HOWEY  
Chair**

*Accepted*

# XI. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE PLANNING COMMITTEE

## UNIT CONSULTING MECHANISMS

### INFORMATION:

Responses from deans and provosts on involving students and faculty in the consultative process to be followed in second-cycle planning, as requested by the University Senate at its November 18, 1982, meeting, are as follows:

**AGRICULTURE**—An *ad hoc* advisory committee (six faculty, one undergraduate, one graduate, one civil service, one department head) to assist with planning and budget priorities. Will work in conjunction with other established groups (department heads, the College Assembly, the Faculty Consultative Committee) to develop and refine College of Agriculture plans.

**BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES**—A committee composed of a faculty member from each department in the college, one undergrad, one graduate, will be responsible for the initial preparation of the second-cycle plan. Plan then goes to the Administrative Committee of CBS for comment and redrafting. (Administrative Committee includes all department heads, two undergraduates, two graduates, one civil service person, one associate dean, and two academic professional staff.)

**CONTINUING EDUCATION**—Plans will progress through the Planning Committee (three department heads, plus deans and administrative director, plus vice chair of the CEE Council) to the Department Directors' Group to the CEE Council (the CEE Council is made up of 24 people including a maximum of eight department heads and the remaining sixteen members a mix of faculty, professional, and administrative staff, and soon-to-be-added, a student).

**EDUCATION**—Faculty/Student Consultative Committee (five faculty, one student) advises the dean. Civil service personnel not on this committee usually but for second-cycle planning the chairperson of the College of Education Staff Association will be invited to attend meetings when planning is being discussed.

**FORESTRY**—The Executive Committee (department heads, director of graduate studies, director of student services, coordinator of Cloquet Forestry Center, Coordinator of Recreation Resource Management, director of Remote Sensing Lab, program leader of Renewable Resources Extension, chair of Faculty Consultative Committee, assistant to dean, dean, three faculty members, three students, and three civil service personnel) will work with planning.

**GENERAL COLLEGE**—The Long-Range Budget and Planning Committee is the working group (seven faculty, three civil service people, one student).

**GRADUATE SCHOOL**—The Executive Committee is the main planning body. It includes the six chairs of the Policy and Review Councils, the deans of the Graduate School, the chairs of the fellowship committee and the Research Advisory Council, the chair of the UM Duluth graduate faculty committee, four graduate students, one civil service person. This body delegates issues to the Policy and Review Councils and the UMD Graduate Faculty Committee as appropriate.

**HUMPHREY INSTITUTE**—The main working body for planning will be the Executive Committee (comprised of the three directors of the main educational programs plus one more faculty member plus the administrative director). There will be full faculty consultation, and two representatives from the Public Affairs Students' Association attend faculty meetings. The final budget is a consensus within the body of professors, fellows, senior staff, and student leaders who meet every three weeks.

**HOME ECONOMICS**—The dean of the college and the Policy and Planning Committee of the college have primary responsibility for planning at the collegiate level. Policy and Planning Committee consists of one faculty from each department, three faculty at large, two undergraduates, two graduates, and one civil service person. (The dean, associate

and assistant deans, and extension home economics program leader are ex-officio and non-voting members.)

**LAW**—Plan will be drafted by a small working group made up of the president of the Law School Council, selected members of the Consultative Committee, and one administrator representing the civil service employees. (The Law School Council is made up of ten students; the Faculty Consultative Committee had seven faculty members plus the dean.)

**LIBERAL ARTS**—Council for Policy and Planning (twelve faculty, two undergraduates, one graduate, one civil service person, dean and associate deans, the directors of honors and student academic support services, and the chairs of five faculty committees) is the representative group working with planning. Its actions must be approved by the College Assembly.

**MANAGEMENT**—The Executive Committee (fourteen chairs, directors, associate deans, assistant to deans, and dean) plus three faculty and four students will be the group advising the dean on planning priorities.

**UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**—The College Assembly is the primary group dealing with program ranking and unit priorities. This body includes faculty, students, staff, and civil service personnel.

**VETERINARY MEDICINE**—Consultative groups for the second planning cycle are: Long-Range Planning Committee (administrators, civil service staff, and students), the Faculty Council, the Student Council, and the Civil Service Council.

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES**—A Central Planning Committee is being established comprised of three departmental directors, four chairs of library-wide planning committees, two academic staff, two civil service staff, and the University librarian. The library director will substantively review planning with the Senate Library Committee, which does have faculty and student members, who can then respond and participate in the planning. Minutes of Planning Committee meetings will be published in the library newsletter.

**INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**—A Planning Committee is being formed which will be advisory to the dean. Committee will have four faculty, two department heads, and two students (one from the honor society and one from the student board), and the associate dean as an ex officio member. On approval of the dean the plan would be forwarded to the IT Administrative Council for adoption by the college.

**CROOKSTON**—Has a planning committee that represents faculty and students. Assistant provost meets with that committee to develop recommendations.

**DULUTH**—Provost's Group (the assistant provost, three vice provosts and the provost as chair) will assume responsibility for campus planning coordination and consultation with members of the University community. Administration will work with the UEA in a meet and confer mode as the exclusive representative of the faculty. This procedure for consulting with faculty will be supplemented as appropriate when a governance system is reinstated on the Duluth campus. Consultation with students, professional staff, and civil service will be accomplished through the elected representatives of the respective organizations.

**MORRIS**—Campus Planning Committee (seven faculty, four students, one civil service person, the academic dean, the assistant provost, the superintendent of plant services) is the working group. Plus there will be usual ad hoc consultation between units, groups, or individuals most directly affected by actions to be taken.

**WASECA**—Campus Planning Committee (the Administrative Committee, which is comprised of unit heads; the presidents of the Faculty Association; the Student Association; and the Civil Service Association) is the working group.

**DENTISTRY**—The Planning Committee for Planning Cycle II is made up to the Council on Administration and three additional faculty members representing the clinical, basic, and behavioral sciences. The Council includes the student member (the president of the Student Council) and the chairperson of the Civil Service Advisory Council. The Council on Administration is made up of the department chairpersons and the associate deans and is chaired by the dean.

**PHARMACY**—The College Planning Council is the working group. It is made up of seven faculty members, a community pharmacist, a faculty member from nursing, the assistant

vice president for health sciences, the student College Board president, a graduate student, the director of student services, and chaired by the associate dean.

**PUBLIC HEALTH**—The planning body will be the Administrative Council, which consists of the dean (or acting dean) as chair, seven division heads, two School of Public Health senators, one elected faculty member, the Student Senate president or alternate, and two associate deans as ex officio members. A civil service representative will join the Administrative Council when it functions as a planning body.

**NURSING**—The body will consist of the following: the Consultative and Long-Range Planning Committees (11 faculty); two students, undergraduate and graduate levels; one civil service staff member.

**MEDICAL SCHOOL**—The planning group is composed of the following members: four department heads, two faculty representatives, a medical fellow specialist (graduate student), a graduate student, and a medical student.

**UMD MEDICINE**—The Second Cycle Planning Group consists of the dean, associate dean, dean's administrative assistant, civil service representative, medical student, and eight department heads.

**PATRICIA SWAN, Chr.**  
**Consultative Committee**

**IRWIN RUBENSTEIN, Chr.**  
**Planning Committee**

*Accepted*

## **XII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT**

**(15 minutes)**

See Abstract of Discussion at the end of the Minutes. Copies of data distributed at the meeting are on file in the office of the clerk of the Senate.

## **XIII. OLD BUSINESS**

none

## **XIV. NEW BUSINESS**

none

## **XV. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS**

### **RUSSELL F. HANSON**

1939-1982

Russell F. Hanson, M.D., Ph.D., died on November 19, 1982, from injuries sustained in an automobile accident. He is survived by his wife, Eunice, and his children, Kristen, Robert, and Daniel of Minneapolis.

Russell Hanson was born in Vermillion, South Dakota, on April 1, 1939. He graduated from the University of South Dakota in 1962 and received his M.D. degree from the University of Minnesota in 1966. As a medical student, under the guidance of Dr. James B. Carey, Jr., Russ developed his investigative interest in the formation of bile acids from cholesterol. Between 1966 and 1971, he was engaged in post-M.D. residency training in internal medicine, a specialty fellowship in gastroenterology, and continuing pursuit of his

interest in biomedical research. In 1971, the C. J. Watson Award for outstanding research by a resident physician was awarded to Hanson. His Ph.D. thesis on the isolation, identification, formation, and metabolism of bile acids in man was completed in 1972. Following the death of Dr. Carey, Hanson's thesis adviser and research collaborator, Russ continued the tradition of bile acid research at the University of Minnesota by successfully assuming the leadership role for this effort. At the time of Hanson's death, the laboratory was actively involved in investigations related to the pathophysiology of neonatal cholestatic syndromes, the physiology of bile flow, the *in vivo* chemical dissolution of human gallstones, and bile acid metabolism.

Hanson's career on the University of Minnesota faculty was characterized by rapid advancement and national recognition. He was promoted from his original appointment as instructor through the academic ranks to professor of medicine in eight years. He was elected to several prestigious societies in medical research, including the American Society of Clinical Investigation, the American Gastroenterological Association, the Central Society for Clinical Research, and the American Association for the Study of Liver Disease. Because of his recognized abilities as an investigator and medical scientist, the responsibilities of membership on National Institutes of Health Study Sections, Veterans Administration Merit Review Boards, and journal editorial boards became a time-consuming but important part of Russ' academic work.

Russ was an accomplished internist, gastroenterologist, and medical mentor who provided an excellent role model for his students. He gave his time willingly to teaching and to numerous committee responsibilities in the Medical School and the University.

Russell Hanson was gentle, warm, and thoughtful. Patients and colleagues cared deeply for him, will miss him greatly, and will remember him with love and gratitude.

## XVI. ADJOURNMENT

### ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION

The February 17 meeting of the University Senate was called to order by President C. Peter Magrath at 3:40 p.m. following a meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. The minutes of the last meeting and additions to current year committee memberships were approved.

*Academic Staff Professional Personnel Senate Representation.* David Giese, professor, General College, and chair of the Business and Rules Committee, announced that his committee would soon introduce a constitutional amendment to provide for membership in the Senate and its committees for academic staff professional personnel. He said at most the result would be an addition of five to the Senate, largely from the libraries and Continuing Education and Extension.

*Finance Committee Interim Report.* Patricia Swan, professor of food science and nutrition and chair of the Consultative Committee, in the absence of Professor Sundquist, announced that the interim report was open for discussion. There being none, the chair continued with the agenda.

*Student Financial Aid, Draft Registration.* Patricia Williamson, administrator, curriculum and instruction, and chair of the Social Concerns Committee, introduced two resolutions having to do with a 1982 bill passed by Congress requiring male recipients of financial aid to be registered for the draft. The first resolution declared the Senate's opposition to such legislation and the second commended the University administration for taking action against enforcement. Anne Hunt, student and committee member, offered several editorial changes which were accepted as friendly amendments, and the resolutions were approved almost unanimously.

*Annual Reports.* Ms. Swan reported that her committee was making a concerted effort to ensure that all committees of the Senate turned in annual reports to the Senate for 1981-82. All but five have done so. She urged that senators seek out committee members to

discuss their committee work. President Magrath added that it is important that the Senate monitor the work of its committees. Ms. Swan noted how annual reports are useful in publicizing the work of committees such as the Human Subjects in Research Committee, a large, hard-working group which needs help in fulfilling its commitments to serve as hearing panels.

*Unit Consulting Mechanisms.* Ms. Swan explained that consulting mechanisms for second cycle planning were presented by unit so that faculty and students could understand the process and could report to the Planning or Consultative Committees as to whether the mechanisms were making a difference. Listed for each unit were the personnel involved. Leonid Hurwicz, Regents' professor of economics, asked whether an elective process had been used or whether all had been appointed by administrators. Ms. Swan responded that there was variation in units' constitutions in the way consulting groups are formed so there is probably a mixture. She and President Magrath agreed that it would be useful for the Planning and Consultative Committees to see how many used the elective process.

*Budgets, Current and Future.* The Consultative Committee asked the president to comment on three budget matters: the current budget retrenchment, the status of the second planning cycle, and the prospects at the Legislature for the University's 1983-85 request.

With respect to the first, President Magrath indicated he hoped that the University was in the final stage of retrenchment for this fiscal year, that the biennium couldn't end soon enough for him. He pointed out that the University had lost \$32 million from its base during the past biennium, including a fiscal 1983 midyear retrenchment of \$3.6 million. The latter cut had to be made on short notice so there was not time to permit decisions consistent with the planning process. Each vice president was given a target, he explained. He said he believed there would not be any more state mandates this year.

In regard to 1983-85, he predicted that the state's economy would remain "soft" for the foreseeable future and that the University must of necessity share in the pain. However, he outlined several objectives to be pursued regardless of the biennial request outcome: to offset the effects of appropriations reductions, especially midyear; to generate funds to offset certain deficits that remain from previous state cutbacks; and to assist in implementing critical institutional planning themes (improving the quality of the University's major graduate and research programs and enhancing the economic climate of the state). As a step toward achieving the latter objective, he said, the University was building on the enormous contributions that it makes to the state by naming the Task Force on Minnesota Higher Education and the Economy chaired by School of Management Dean David Lilly for the purpose of improving the contributions of the University to the Minnesota economy. The last objective, and most important, he said, is to maintain the quality of high-quality programs. He then reported that a plan was under way for an internal reallocation of 6 percent for the first year and 3 percent for the second and that faculty and students, including the University Senate, would be involved. Criteria to be used, which were developed in consultation with the Consultative Committee, he said, would be quality, connectedness, demand, uniqueness, cost-effectiveness, and integration of teaching, research, and service. In conclusion, he said it was hoped that by late spring the recommendations would be provided to him, at which time they would be reviewed with the appropriate Senate committees.

In response to the third Consultative Committee query, he said it was too early to comment on the legislative outlook. He said he had met with many individual legislators and appeared before appropriate legislative committees. He said the recent recommendations by Governor Perpich would need to be studied in detail, but in general he thought there was cause for some encouragement and that there was general legislative awareness of how hard the cuts had been for the University. He noted that the governor's recommendation could not be compared item by item to the University's request, and that it assumes there will be a significant change in tuition and financial aid policies.

Kenneth Keller, vice president for academic affairs, distributed copies of a tabulation showing allotments by unit for academic salaries, civil service, and supplies for 1982-83 and urged senators to share it with those they represent. (Copies are on file in the office of

the clerk of the Senate.) Ms. Swan asked whether the administration was asking colleges to prepare two plans, one to reflect the current constraints and one not reflecting those constraints. Mr. Keller responded that units had been asked for an optional plan for units which would be programmatic in character. However, deans had indicated that there were constraints that could be ignored. The administration believes, he said, that across-the-board cuts are a very poor way to meet budget reductions and it hopes to get a plan for each unit without constraints from which creative options could be arrived at to reach a quality, "optimal" university. Gerald Kline, professor of journalism and mass communication, asked how a two-year plan with constraints could fit along side a four-year plan; Mr. Keller responded that there could be pieces that could be acted on during the two years even though they are part of a longer term plan.

A student asked whether the governor had indicated that higher education appropriations would depend on the number of students in institutions. President Magrath responded that Governor Perpich favored a plan calling for consideration of 12 factors, one of which is enrollment, and one would take into account the cost of instruction. Asked about the governor's proposal for more engineering schools in the state, while the University's Institute of Technology suffers from inadequate funding, the president said the University was seeking the amount outlined in the biennial request and not endorsing establishment of new institutions. However, he said, the University was not opposed to discussion of engineering-related activities. When asked what criteria were used to make the unit cuts, Mr. Keller indicated resources available, workload, and experience with the first phase. Units were not put in any kind of rank.

Bruce Thorpe, student body president, asked whether the first priority consideration in implementing budget cuts had not been visibility. President Magrath responded that the University had been cut so often that all efforts to cope are now visible. He said that a memo suggesting that visibility had been an objective had been directed to him that day by Mr. Thorpe and that it did not represent the administration's thinking or strategy. He said it would be a shallow and transparent way to operate. He went on to explain that he had met with the Consultative Committee, the Planning Council, and other Senate committees, and had received suggestions from members of the Senate commenting on strategies, and he urged others to send in their thoughts. In conclusion, he said the state of Minnesota must set its priorities and it is imperative that the University be near the top of that list.

*Faculty Salaries Following UMD and UMW Settlement.* Russell Hobbie, professor of physics, and Edward Ney, Regents' professor of astronomy, asked for a comparison by rank of median faculty salaries for the current year following the Duluth and Waseca negotiated settlements. Copies of the data were distributed at the door and sent to coordinate campuses. (Copies are on file in the office of the clerk of the Senate.) They also included weighted averages for each campus. Twin Cities campus figures included only those areas comparable with UMD. Ms. Swan asked whether any progress had been made in arriving at a comparison with peer institutions, which would be most useful. Mr. Keller is collecting that data and will share with Ms. Swan's committee and the Senate, the president said. Mr. Hobbie asked why the median had not been used; Mr. Keller said that complete Duluth and Waseca data were not currently available, but could be shared later.

Senators rose in silent tribute to three recently deceased colleagues, and the University Senate was adjourned at 4:50 p.m., to be followed by a meeting of the Faculty Senate.

**MARILEE WARD**  
**Abstractor**

# FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

The second meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1982-83 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, February 17, at 4:50 p.m. following the University Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the role as present were 122 voting members of the faculty, 8 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 11 nonmembers.

President C. Peter Magrath presided.

## I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 18

Action (3 minutes)

*Approved*

## II. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1982-83

(These are in addition to those approved at the May 20 and November 18, 1982, Senate meetings)

Action (5 minutes)

TENURE Faculty: Mary Dietz      Students: Robert Mayer, John Paulson

*Approved*

## III. JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

HEARING PROCESS COOPERATION

Action by Faculty Senate (5 minutes)

### MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate approve the following resolution: That the Faculty Senate hereby encourages faculty members to cooperate fully with the Senate Judicial Committee, both in the form of oral testimony during hearings and in the form of written information during the hearing process.

### COMMENT:

Whereas, the faculty of the University of Minnesota depends upon the grievance system to protect their rights within this University, and

Whereas, faculty participation in certain aspects of the judicial process is voluntary, and

Whereas, the continuing integrity of the University Senate's judicial process depends on the cooperation of the faculty and can work fairly only if it has that cooperation.

Therefore, the Judicial Committee presents the above resolution to the Faculty Senate for action.

**RICHARD POPPEL**  
Chair

*Approved*

## IV. TENURE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82

The Tenure Committee met ten times in 1981-82. It was charged by the Senate Consultative Committee to examine the Proposed Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, as recommended by the Faculty Senate in May 1973, to determine whether any changes were needed, and, if they were, to begin to make them. Some changes were mandatory, such as those required by the State of Minnesota Privacy Act and by the

Rajendar decree; other changes involved dealing with classes of appointments that were rapidly disappearing, and with questions that have arisen more recently than 1973, such as proposals for shared appointments. A systematic review of the proposed regulations was started, but it was interrupted early in 1982 by a request from the SCC Subcommittee on Financial Exigency to examine their proposed procedures governing the handling of a fiscal emergency. This meant concentrating on Sec. 15 of the "new" code. Several meetings were held jointly with some members of the SCC subcommittee, and a preliminary draft of Sec. 15 was arrived at. The committee secured the assistance of Professor C. Robert Morris of the Law School, who raised some serious questions about the draft, which led to further redrafting, which was not completed by the end of the academic year.

**S. GASIOROWICZ**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **V. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR INFORMATION**

**PATRICIA SWAN**  
Chair

See Abstract of Discussion at end of Minutes.

### **VI. OLD BUSINESS**

none

### **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

none

### **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

## **ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION**

The Faculty Senate convened following the University Senate meeting. Minutes for November 18 and membership additions to the Tenure Committee were approved.

*Hearing Process Cooperation.* Richard Poppele, professor of neurophysiology and chair of the Judicial Committee, presented a resolution encouraging cooperation with his committee during hearing procedures. He pointed out that the committee did not have the power of subpoena nor could it swear in witnesses. In conclusion he noted that thoughtful, wise, and dedicated people were needed to serve on his committee. The Faculty Senate approved the resolution almost unanimously.

*Tenure Code Revision.* Ms. Swan announced that on February 18 an open hearing on proposed revision of the tenure code would be held under the auspices of the Tenure Committee.

*Faculty Night.* Ms. Swan invited all faculty members, spouses, and guests to a Faculty Night on March 10 consisting of dinner at the Campus Club followed by the women's basketball game with Purdue.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

**MARILEE WARD**  
Abstractor