

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

**May 15, 1986**

**UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE MINUTES**

The meeting of the Student Senate was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 40 voting members of the student body. Vice Chair Jill Gaudette presided.

**I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 20 MEETING**

**Action (2 minutes)**

*Approved*

**II. ELECTION OF 1986-87 CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

**Action (10 minutes)**

*Tim Pratt was elected chair unanimously.*

*Michael Rodriguez defeated Ron Denn, 22 to 13, for vice chair position.*

**III. OLD BUSINESS**

*none*

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**(5 minutes)**

*none*

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

**ABSTRACT**

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Jill Gaudette. Minutes of the February meeting were approved. Tim Pratt, Twin Cities campus, was elected without opposition to be the chair of the Student Senate next year. Michael Rodriguez, Twin Cities campus, and Ron Denn, Duluth campus, were nominated for the vice chair post; Mr. Rodriguez was elected.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

# UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES

The fourth meeting of the University Senate for 1985-86 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, at 3:45 p.m. Coordinate campuses except Crookston were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 110 voting members of the faculty, 40 voting members of the student body, 3 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 11 nonmembers. President Kenneth Keller presided.

## I. REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT

(5 minutes)

See abstract of the discussion.

## II. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1986-87

Action (3 minutes)

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY APPEALS** Faculty/academic professionals: H. E. Mason (chr.), E. C. Alexander, Philip Regal, Karen Richards, Harvey Sarles, Judith Younger, 1 to be named. Civil Service: 2 to be named. Students: 4 to be named.

**EDUCATIONAL POLICY** Faculty/academic professionals: W. Andrew Collins (chr.), Sheila Corcoran, Lawrence Goodman, Ian Maitland, Marvin Mattson (UMC), James Moller, Naomi Scheman, Mary Young, 2 to be named. Students: 5 to be named.

**EXTENSION & COMMUNITY PROGRAMS** Faculty/academic professionals: Peter Robinson (chr.), Guy Baldwin, Richard Cardozo, Judith Gaston, Clayton Giese, John Leppi (UMD), Thomas McRoberts (UMM), Gordon Stobb, Luther Waters, 1 to be named. Alumni: 1 to be named. Students: 5 to be named.

**LIBRARY** Faculty/academic professionals: Thomas Noonan (chr.), Thomas Bouchard, Evelyn Firchow, Leon Green, Louise Hawley (UMD), John Howe, Darrell Lewis, Robert McCollister, Carl Osborne, 3 to be named. Students: 4 to be named.

**PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE ALLOCATION** Faculty/academic professionals: Thomas Scott (chr.), Robert Dixon, Arthur Erdman, Anne Erickson, Richard L. Jones, Tap Payne (UMM), 1 to be named. Students: 3 to be named.

**RESEARCH** Faculty/academic professionals: David Hamilton (chr.), Ira Adelman, Ronald Anderson, John Chipman, Evelyn Firchow, Paul Gassman, Dwight Purdy (UMM), Robert Spencer. Students: 3 to be named.

**SOCIAL CONCERNS** Faculty/academic professionals: Timothy Knopp (chr.), Ronald Aminzade, Michael Baizerman, John Beatty, Barbara Knudson, John LaBree, 1 to be named. Alumni: 3 to be named. Civil Service: 3 to be named. Students: 7 to be named.

**SUMMER SESSIONS** Faculty/academic professionals: Chester Miracle (chr.), Edward Foster, Arnold Henjum (UMM), Judith Lambrecht, John Malmberg, Byron Marshall, 1 to be named. Students: 5 to be named.

**BUSINESS & RULES** Faculty/academic professionals: John Fossum, Marilyn Grantham, Joel Nelson, Wesley B. Sundquist. Students: David Lenander (chr.), Steve Florman.

**INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION** Faculty/academic professionals: John Cogan (chr.), Robinson Abbott (UMM), Subir Banerjee, Robert Dixon, Frank Hirschbach, Benjamin Liu, Byron Marshall, Jane Plihal. Students: 4 to be named.

**PLANNING** Faculty/academic professionals: Carl Adams (chr.), James Hearn, John Howe, Warren Ibele, W. Donald Spring, Patricia Swan. Students: James Clark, Tim Ziegenhagen (UMM).

*Approved*

**INFORMATION:**

COMMITTEES Faculty/academic professionals: Sheila Corcoran, Edward Foster, James Gremmels (UMM), Ruth-Ellen Joeres, Charlotte MacLeod (UMD), Roger Stuewer, Patricia Swan, C. Arthur Williams. Students: 7 to be named.

CONSULTATIVE Faculty: Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner, Charles Campbell, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Joseph Latterell (UMM), Cleon Melsa (UMC), Paul Murphy, Ronald Phillips, W. Phillips Shively. Students: 9 to be named.

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES Faculty/academic professionals: Richard L. Jones (chr.), Bert Ahern (UMM), Donald Berry, Wendell DeBoer, Sandra Flake, Fred A. Johnson, Larry Kinney, Michael Metcalf, Dennis Savaiano, Stephen Sylvester (UMC). Students: 5 to be named.

SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED Faculty/academic professionals: Lenore Burgard (chr.), Donald Asp, Frank Beil (UMM), Terence Collins, Manfred Meier, Susan Rose, 1 to be named. Students: at least 2 to be named.

*Accepted*

**III. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES  
Information**

At the April 17 Twin Cities Campus Assembly election to fill 3 Twin Cities campus vacancies on the Senate Committee on Committees, Patricia Swan was elected for a 1-year term (1986-87) and Sheila Corcoran and Edward Foster were elected for 3-year terms (1986-89).

*Accepted*

**IV. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND  
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**FINANCE COMMITTEE  
Action (3 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

To amend the Senate Bylaws, Article IV.1.C., description and membership of the Finance Committee, as follows (additions are underlined and deletions have lines through them):

The Finance Committee provides a channel by which faculty/academic professional, ~~and~~ student, and civil service staff ideas and concerns about programs, facilities, services, governance, faculty status, student affairs, and other matters may be voiced as biennial requests are formulated. It also serves as a consulting body to the Management Committee and to the vice president for finance and operations.

**Membership**

The Finance Committee shall be composed of at least ~~11~~ 13 members, ~~7~~ 8 of whom shall be designated by the committees which they represent: one member of the faculty and one student from the Senate Consultative Committee; one member of the faculty/academic professionals from the Educational Policy Committee; one member of the faculty/academic professionals from the Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee; one member of the faculty from the Faculty Affairs Committee; one member of the faculty/academic professionals and one student from the Planning Committee; one member of the faculty/academic professionals from the Research Committee; and at least 2 members at large from the faculty/academic professionals and 2 student members at large appointed by the Senate Con-

sultative Committee with the approval of the Senate; and 1 civil service staff member appointed by the president in consultation with the Civil Service Committee. At least one faculty/academic professional member and one student member shall be from the coordinate campuses; thus, if the stipulated membership does not include such representation, an additional faculty/academic professional and/or student member from the coordinate campuses shall be added by the Senate Consultative Committee. The faculty representative from the Senate Consultative Committee shall serve as chair.

**COMMENT:**

The Committee on Committees agrees with the Consultative Committee's request that the Finance Committee membership be changed to include a faculty representative from the Planning Committee because of the importance of having a planning perspective during finance deliberations. The two committees also agree that the Finance Committee should include civil service representation, since civil service staff stand to be affected by recommendations of the Finance Committee.

**SHIRLEY CLARK, Chr.**  
**Committee on Committees**  
**DEON STUTHMAN, Chr.**  
**Consultative Committee**

*Approved, 130 to 0*

**V. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND  
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**Action (10 minutes)**

**A. PHYSICAL PLANT AND SPACE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE**

**MOTION:**

To amend the Senate Bylaws, Article IV.1.D., as follows (underlined words are added, overscored words are deleted):

The Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee represents faculty, academic professionals, ~~and~~ student, and civil service staff interests in the development of principles, policies, and criteria for physical facilities planning.

**Membership**

The Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee shall be composed of no more than 7 faculty/academic professional members, 3 students, 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation as specified by a vote of the Senate. At least one of the faculty/academic professional members appointed each year shall be a senator at the time of appointment. Faculty/academic professional and student members shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate; civil service members shall be appointed by the president in consultation with the Civil Service Committee.

*Approved, 130 to 0*

**B. RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**MOTION:**

To amend the Senate Bylaws, Article IV.2.D., as follows (underlined words are added, overstruck words are deleted):

The Research Committee represents faculty, academic professional, ~~and~~ student, and civil service staff interests in research at the University and the institutional support for it.

## Membership

The Research Committee shall be composed of 8 faculty/academic professional members, 3 students, 1 civil service staff member, and ex officio representation as specified by a vote of the Senate. At least one of the faculty/academic professional members appointed each year shall be a senator at the time of appointment. Faculty/academic professional and student members shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate; civil service staff members shall be appointed by the president in consultation with the Civil Service Committee.

*Approved, 132 to 0*

## C. ANIMAL CARE COMMITTEE

### MOTION:

To amend the Senate Rules, Article IV.3., as follows (underlined words are added; overstruck words are deleted):

#### ANIMAL CARE

##### Membership

The committee shall be composed of ~~12~~ 14 members: 2 faculty/academic professional representatives of the Minneapolis Health Sciences; one faculty/academic professional member each from the College of Veterinary Medicine, College of Agriculture, College of Liberal Arts, College of Biological Sciences, Department of Environmental Health and Safety (either a member of the faculty, academic professional, or civil service staff), Duluth campus, Morris campus, a student, 2 (or 2 additional) civil service staff members, the director of Research Animal Resources, and one person who is not affiliated with the University. The primary concerns of at least one member must be in a discipline not utilizing live animals other than humans for research purposes; if the stipulated membership does not include such representation, an additional member shall be added. Members shall be appointed by the president.

*Approved*

## D. SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED COMMITTEE

### MOTION:

To amend the Senate Rules, Article IV.5., as follows (underlined words are added, overstruck words are deleted):

#### SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED

##### Membership

The committee shall be composed of at least 7 faculty/academic professional members, 2 students (at least one graduate and one undergraduate), 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation from the office of the vice president, student affairs. Members shall be appointed by the president.

### COMMENT:

In late 1982, the Senate Consultative Committee authorized an experiment to determine whether extended civil service representation on Senate and Assembly Committees would be desirable. The Civil Service Committee had for many years requested civil service membership on additional committees. The Senate Consultative Committee, encouraged by then-Vice President Nils Hasselmo, decided that temporary, non-voting, two-person representation on certain committees would be a useful experiment. This experiment was to last three years (1983-1986), after which the results were to be evaluated and a decision made for or against continuation and/or regularization.

In November 1985, Deon Stuthman, Senate Consultative Committee Chair, appointed a special Civil Service Representation Committee (CSRC) to evaluate the results of the experiment and to answer three questions:

1. On which, if any, of the committees included in the experiment should civil service representation continue?
2. If representation continues, should the civil service representatives have the right to vote?
3. Should civil service representation, either voting or non-voting, be extended to any other committees?

To gather information concerning the experiment from the chairs of the committees involved, CSRC held three one and a half hour meetings during winter quarter. All chairs either attended those meetings or transmitted their views by mail or by phone. CSRC also contacted the Civil Service Committee chair to obtain the civil service view on continued representation and voting rights.

In early March, CSRC reported its findings and recommendations to the Senate Consultative Committee. They were subsequently discussed by the Faculty Consultative Committee, Student Senate Consultative Committee, Senate Consultative Committee as a whole, and the Committee on Committees, with Professor C. Arthur Williams, CSRC chair, joining in several of those discussions. These committees accepted most of the recommendations of the CSRC but proposed some modifications, all of which Professor Williams accepted on behalf of the special subcommittee. With regard to representation, the committees were guided particularly by the criterion of the committee's decision having substantial impact on civil service personnel.

The groups are unanimous in recommending that, except for any experimental period, and except for *ex officio* representation as determined by the Senate, there should be only one category of membership on committees: all members should be voting members. The Committee on Committees, Consultative Committee, and the special Civil Service Representation Committee, jointly propose the following additions to Senate Committee membership:

- Research: 1 civil service representative
- Animal Care: 2 civil service representatives
- Finance: 1 civil service representative
- Physical Plant and Space Allocation: 2 civil service representatives
- Services for the Handicapped: 2 civil service representatives.

The same groups recommend that the Senate Library Committee, which was included in the experiment, include no civil service membership. Committee on Committees and SCC accept the findings of the special committee that the Library Committee's decisions have relatively small impact on civil service personnel and that civil service contributions are best provided through staff assistance from Library personnel. The separate Library Council includes civil service membership.

Finally, the groups recommend as a new experiment adding one civil service representative to the Committee on Extension and Community Programs. This experiment should be evaluated within three years in time for a Senate decision in spring, 1989, on whether to regularize that membership.

We extend to the special Civil Service Representation Committee our thanks and appreciation for their careful evaluation of the experiment and for their thoughtful and thorough report. The members were Barry Bridges of the Civil Service Committee, Caroline Czarniecki of the Business and Rules Committee, and C. Arthur Williams of the Committee on Committees, chair.

**DEON STUTHMAN, Chr.  
Consultative Committee  
SHIRLEY CLARK, Chr.  
Committee on Committees**

*Approved*

**VI. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE  
AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**INDIRECT COST RECOVERY FUND DISTRIBUTION**

**Action (5 minutes)**

**MOTION:**

That the University Senate recommends that the Board of Regents adopt the following policy regarding indirect cost recovery funds:

Indirect cost recovery funds retained by the University should be distributed as follows: 50% should be retained by central administration to support research activities, to be allocated by the Graduate School and by central administration, and the remaining 50% should be distributed on a proportionate basis to the colleges that generated these funds. Should budgetary circumstances warrant consideration of less than 50% distribution to the colleges, consultation with the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Research Committee is required. In no case, however, will the distribution to the colleges be less than  $\frac{1}{3}$ . Colleges should then allocate their share of these funds as follows:  $\frac{1}{3}$  retained by the college for centralized allocation to support research activities,  $\frac{1}{3}$  allocated on a proportionate basis to the departments that generated the funds, and  $\frac{1}{3}$  to the faculty who generated the funds, unless the proportionate share amounts to less than \$100, in which case it should revert to the department. In colleges where the faculty so votes, however, the collegiate distribution may differ from that prescribed by this formula.

**COMMENT:**

Considerable support exists among the faculty for the implementation of a more well-defined process for the distribution of those indirect cost recovery funds which exist. In permitting the University to retain a portion of the funds resulting from indirect cost, the legislature recognized the need for the use of these funds to support ongoing research and to stimulate new research. Those faculty who have been heavily involved in bringing these funds to the University see this as: (a) a method of helping central administration bear a portion of the cost necessary to convert the University of Minnesota into a research university of the first rank; (b) a method of helping support the financing of research at both the collegiate and departmental levels; and (c) a method of both supporting and encouraging those faculty who were responsible for bringing these funds to Minnesota.

Lengthy discussion, over a two-year period, resulted in a consensus that an equitable distribution would be: (a) no more than 50% to be retained by central administration; (b) of the remaining funds  $33\frac{1}{3}\%$  should be distributed to each of the following: 1. the generating colleges, 2. the generating departments, and 3. the generating principal investigators (each in proportion to their contribution).

**WILLIAM H. HANSON, Chr.**  
**Educational Policy Committee**  
**PAUL G. GASSMAN, Chr.**  
**Research Committee**

*The Finance and Consultative Committees proposed addition of "That the University Senate recommends that the Board of Regents adopt the following policy regarding indirect cost recovery funds" before the first sentence, and "Should budgetary circumstances warrant consideration of less than 50% distribution to the colleges, consultation with the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Research Committee is required. In no case, however, will the distribution to the colleges be less than  $\frac{1}{3}$ ." between the first and second sentences of the motion as submitted. Both were considered friendly amendments by the chairs of the Educational Policy and Research Committees, and the original motion as amended was approved. Above is the final, approved version.*

## VII. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

### INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE AGREEMENTS

Action (8 minutes)

#### MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the changes outlined below in the University Policy and Procedures with Regard to Proposals for All-University International Exchange Agreements.

#### INTRODUCTION

The University wishes to encourage international involvements whenever those involvements enable better fulfillment of University missions. In most instances, such activities are undertaken as a normal part of University activity, and individuals participating in them are guided by the normal standards of academic behavior.

There are many ways in which cooperation between individuals and units of the University of Minnesota with foreign academic institutions can take place. One form of cooperation is the all-University exchange agreement, under which formal university-to-university ties are proposed.

When exchange agreements of an all-University nature are proposed, some additional concerns arise. It is the purpose of this document to define the principles governing University policy on all-University exchange agreements, the criteria to be used in deciding upon their approval, and the procedures to be followed in seeking such approval.

This document, therefore, pertains to proposals for all-University exchange agreements. It does not apply to other international involvements, although policy statements regarding them may be formulated at a later date should the need arise. It should be underlined, however, that this statement is designed to cover only special circumstances surrounding exchange agreements. It does not replace existing University policies and practices which pertain to all activities.

#### COMMENTS ON RECOMMENDED CHANGES

The Senate Committee on International Education (SCIE) recommends changes to existing University Policy and Procedures concerning proposals for All-University International Exchange Agreements. These changes reported here were approved by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) for action of the Senate. They involve some modifications, minor editing, and updating of University Policy and Procedures approved by the Senate in 1977. (See University Senate, Minutes, March 3, 1977, pp. 26-28)

The Committee on International Education (SCIE) encourages the approval of this report which:

- (a) Reiterates the principles and governing functions of the University Senate concerning policy matters and procedures with regard to Proposals for All-University International Exchange Agreements:
- (b) Seeks to facilitate mechanisms of communication and consultation procedures within the University community in order to enhance all-University exchange agreements as one form of international involvement; and
- (c) Brings the text of current University policy up to date with changes in both central administration and the Senate committee structure dealing with international education. The existing policy was approved by the Senate in 1977 and some of the units referred to in the original document have changed. For example: The Council on International Education is now the Senate Committee on International Education, and the Office of International Programs is now the Office of the Assistant Vice President for International Education.

#### I. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING ALL-UNIVERSITY EXCHANGE AGREEMENTS

- 1-(1) An exchange agreement is an enabling document providing for mutual benefits

and reciprocal obligations, but it is not tied to specification of the involvement of particular numbers of persons or resources.<sup>1</sup>

I-(2) Individual members of the University community, and units of the University, are free to enter into exchange arrangements without all-University approval, provided that the individuals or units involved explicitly indicate that they are not representing a wider University community.

It is expected that review procedures at the appropriate levels will be developed to ensure that such arrangements conform to the criteria outlined in this document for all-University agreements.

Individual scholars are encouraged to carry on their own scholarly pursuits as in the past, subject only to the usual University rules of conduct and the code of ethics of their respective professions.

~~I-(3) The University mission is in teaching, research, and service. When its mission is furthered by international exchange, no criterion of "political acceptability" of the nation in which the partner institution is located can be used in deciding upon exchange agreements because such a criterion would place the University in the intolerable position of "approving" of the government of any country in which an exchange agreement is in effect.\*~~

I-(3) It should be clearly understood that general University policies and rules of conduct apply to all students, faculty, and staff while participating in all-University exchange programs.

I-(4) Both institutions involved should subscribe to the principle of academic freedom.

## II. CRITERIA FOR ALL-UNIVERSITY EXCHANGE AGREEMENTS

II-(1) As with other international activities, exchange agreements should be made at the level of the responsible University unit. All-University exchange agreements should be proposed only when the purposes of the agreement cannot be satisfactorily carried out under the purview of a particular college or other University unit.

II-(2) There must be a legitimate area of common academic and scholarly concern, and the agreement should be demonstrated to be mutually beneficial.

II-(3) The agreement cannot obligate individual units of the University to participate unless those units indicate their willingness to do so.

II-(4) The University resources committed under the agreement should be limited to those approved by the units involved in the agreement.

II-(5) The agreement should not preclude similar arrangements with any other institution.

II-(6) The agreement should indicate the full extent of expected interaction between the University and its proposed exchange partner. Should there be any third parties to the agreement, such as foundations, or international or national government agencies, that should be explicit in the documents accompanying the proposal.

II-(7) Members of the University of Minnesota academic community involved in the agreement should be satisfied that they will enjoy academic freedom in their participation in the exchange.

## III. PROCEDURES

~~III-(1) The Office of International Programs is prepared to advise in the preparation of draft all-University exchange agreements. Once the agreement is ready for formal submission, it should be presented to the Council on International Education, with a copy to the Office of International Programs.~~

<sup>1</sup>The distinction here is between the contents of the agreement and activities carried out under the agreement. In the agreement, resources cannot be committed. Under the agreement they can be so committed subject to the qualifications below.

\*An amendment to delete I-(3) was approved by the University Senate in 1977. The report, as amended, was approved. (University Senate, Minutes, March 3, 1977).

III-(1) The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs through the Office of the Assistant Vice President for International Education is prepared to advise in the preparation of draft all-University exchange agreements. Once the agreement is ready for formal submission, it should be presented to the Senate Committee on International Education with a copy to the Office of the Assistant Vice President for International Education.

~~III-(2) After submission of the proposed agreement and any supporting documents to the Council, the Council will make a public announcement of the proposal, and set dates for hearings during which members of the University community specifically involved in the agreement are asked to come before the Council and discuss the specific arrangements involved.~~

III-(2) After submission of the proposed agreement and any supporting documents to the Senate Committee on International Education, the Committee will review the proposal to determine if criteria for an all-University exchange agreement have been met. In cases where questions arise concerning the potential effects of the proposed agreements e.g., situations involving threats to academic freedom, negative impact of programs on educational personnel and academic principles, and cases involving possible violations of human rights, the Committee may call for a public hearing during which members of the University community specifically involved in the agreement are asked to come before the Committee and discuss the specific arrangements involved. These individuals would be expected to demonstrate to the Council Committee that the proposed agreement is in conformity with the principles and criteria outlined above, and to answer such questions as the Council Committee might have in deciding upon whether the proposed agreement conforms with the principles governing all-University exchange arrangements. Other members of the University community having information relevant to the decision will also be free to address the Council Committee.

In determining upon the desirability of the agreement, the Council Committee will act in conformity with the criteria outlined above. For criterion (1), it will be necessary for interested members of the University community to demonstrate that their activities will be greatly facilitated by an all-University exchange agreement, and that such activities cannot be adequately undertaken by an agreement at a lower level. For criterion (2), it will normally be expected that involved students and staff with ongoing research and other scholarly interests would address the Council Committee, indicating the nature of the research and the benefits to be derived from cooperation. Should there be no such individuals, that will be taken as *per se* evidence that criterion (2) is not satisfied. Criteria (3), (4), and (5) can be determined by examination of the proposed agreement. Criterion (6) will in general be satisfied if individuals proposing the agreement are prepared to declare that there are no aspects of the agreement which are not reported in the proposed documents. Criterion (7) will be met if the individuals involved under the agreement inform the Council Committee that they are satisfied that they will enjoy academic freedom in their participation in the exchange.

~~III-(3) When the Council is satisfied that it has heard sufficient evidence to determine whether the proposed agreement meets the criteria, it will decide by majority vote whether to approve the agreement. Approval by a majority of all members present and voting will be sufficient to establish that the criteria are satisfied, provided only that: (1) at least two weeks shall elapse between the time of the receipt of the proposal and the time when the vote is taken, and (2) the exchange agreement is on the agenda of the Council meeting at least one week before a vote is taken.~~

III-(3) When the Committee is satisfied that it has sufficient evidence to determine whether the proposed agreement meets the criteria, it will decide by majority vote whether to approve the agreement. Approval by a majority of all voting Committee members will be sufficient to establish that the criteria are satisfied provided that, in cases when a public hearing has been called, the proposed exchange agreement is on the agenda of the Committee meeting at least one week before a vote is taken.

III-(4) Once the Council Committee has voted to approve the agreement, the proposal, with a supporting statement from the Council Committee, will be reported to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and placed on the Senate docket for action. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy and the Senate are encouraged to act on the recommen-

dition of the Committee with expediency. Action should be expected within 3 months after approval by the Committee.

III-(5) A copy of this document will be provided to each exchange partner and be understood to be a part of the agreement, reflecting the partner's acceptance of the principles and criteria set forth herein.

III-(6) ~~An annual report of activities under the agreement should be provided to the Office of International Programs and to the Council. The Council will normally expect periodically to review operations under exchange agreements.~~

III-(6) An annual report of activities under the agreement should be provided to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs through the Office of the Assistant Vice President for International Education and to the Committee. The Committee will periodically review operations under exchange agreements.

III-(7) Should any member of the University have reason to believe that, once in operation, the specified criteria are being violated, complaint can be brought to the ~~Council~~ Committee. If shown ~~be~~ to be valid, the situation will either be corrected or the agreement suspended.

**DARIO MENANTEAU**  
Chairperson

*Approved*

## **VIII. ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY APPEALS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86**

During the year since the committee's last report, the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals Committee has handled two matters and has commented extensively upon the proposed University grievance procedures, which have been circulated by the Senate/Faculty Consultative Committees.

The committee appointed a panel of three members to hear an appeal in regard to a decision on the grievance of a faculty member. The panel heard arguments and issued an opinion on July 3, 1985, that found no violation of academic freedom which would justify any greater remedy than that already accorded by the CEE Grievance Committee. The committee made several recommendations on the case which were accepted by the President of the University.

The committee has received a complaint in regard to the Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology of the Medical School. The committee has appointed a panel which helped to encourage the parties to resolve some of their differences without a formal hearing. Further proceedings may be required.

The Senate/Faculty Consultative Committees requested the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals Committee to prepare comments on the proposed University grievance procedures. Four members of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals Committee prepared written comments. The committee had two discussions on the proposed procedures and transmitted its views to the Consultative Committees with a request that the Appeals Committee be informed of what changes had been made to the proposals.

**DAVID WEISSBRODT**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **IX. BUSINESS & RULES COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86**

The Business and Rules Committee includes four faculty/academic professionals, two students, and ex officio nonvoting membership of the clerk and parliamentarian of the University Senate. Those serving on the committee this year were Caroline Czarnecki, John Fossum, Marilyn Grantham, John Kaatz, David Lenander, Joel Nelson, and ex officio Josef Altholz and Marilee Ward.

The committee to date has held four meetings to carry out its duties with respect to all items brought to its attention. A number of proposed revisions of the constitutions, bylaws, and rules of the Senate and Assembly were reviewed. In addition, the committee prepared and distributed the agendas for the Senate and Assembly meetings, and supervised the submission of annual reports of the committees of the Senate and Assembly. With regard to the latter, the annual reports were reviewed for items that should have been brought to the attention of the Senate or Assembly for action during the year.

**CAROLINE M. CZARNECKI**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **X. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86**

The committee met monthly from October 1985 through May 1986, a total of eight times.

Two major concerns of the committee were the petitions on the internal tribunal process and the professional academic classifications that had been filed as part of the Rajender claim. This committee along with several others provided input to Vice President Stephen Dunham and to Acting Vice President Rama Murthy concerning the University's response to these petitions.

Several other items of significance to faculty women were discussed through the year. The committee received a report from Cheri Perlmutter as to the disposition of T appointments in the Health Sciences. Several meetings were devoted to a discussion of a recommended policy on part-time academic employment. A final draft is expected to be acted upon in May, 1986. The Hire Activity by Colleges for Faculty Report was brought to the committee for information by Pat Mullen. Fran Guminga, chair of the Rajender/P.A. Committee, reported on its activities, and this committee accepted their recommendations. The University's response to the problem of sexual assault and prevention on campus concerns was discussed, and recommendations for stronger action were sent to President Keller and Vice President Wilderson.

**VERA M. SCHLETZER**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XI. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ASSEMBLY**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86**

University College began this academic year with its formal response to the Commitment to Focus recommendations concerning University Without Walls (UWW). That response, in the form of a report to the Regents, affirmed the value of UWW's academic

program to the University. The major change is that some potential UWW students who can be served by other baccalaureate programs at the University or elsewhere in the state should be advised to seek out the alternative. UWW will continue to serve strongly motivated students whose academic plans can only be met at the University.

President Keller approved the UWW report, and it met with a favorable reaction by the Regents.

During the year the University College Assembly addressed some internal matters which strengthen the educational opportunities for University College students. The most important was to approve a program for student recognition—a major award named after former dean J. W. Buchta for promising juniors, a director's award for outstanding projects, and small grants to support independent-study work. The Assembly also participated in screening UROP proposals by students whose interests spanned more than one college.

Through its curriculum committee the Assembly approved a plan for University College honors seminars. A request for proposals went out to faculty, and at least two seminars are scheduled for next year (one is being taught this quarter by Professors Lukermann and Penn).

In December the Assembly discussed the then-forthcoming reports by the Collins and Hanson task forces with the chairs. We later responded formally to the Hanson committee's interim report.

During winter quarter, the Assembly developed a proposal at Assistant Vice President Wallace's request for the academic programs to be associated with a new undergraduate living-learning opportunity.

In conjunction with the Educational Development programs, a new program for awards to academic advisers was approved by S CEP, and will be announced this spring.

In spring quarter, the Assembly met with Lesley Cafarelli, Director of Educational Development Programs, Elaine May, Chair of the Educational Development Committee, and Assistant Vice President Wallace to discuss issues of mutual concern.

**DONALD ROSS**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XII. SEXUAL HARASSMENT REVIEW BOARD**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86**

The Sexual Harassment Review Board (SHRB) is composed of the following members: Julie Bates (S), Ellen Berscheid (F), Vasilikie Demos (F), Nora Hall (AP), Gary McLean (F), Paul Murphy (F), Richard Purple (F and Chair), Marianne Syers-McNairy (S), and Doris Wiehe (CS). Patricia Mullen, Director for Equal Opportunities and Affirmative Action, serves as *ex-officio*. The duties for the SHRB include monitoring and reporting to the University Senate on the Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures passed in 1984, hearing appeals of administrative decisions on complaints if there are any, hearing cases directed to us by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and making suggestions for policy or procedural changes if our experience in the other duties appears to suggest such.

The board has held 3 meetings this year. Below is appended a listing (in neutered form) of the case histories filed by the Entry Level Office for 1984-85 and for 1985-winter quarter, 1986, which cover cases involving faculty, civil service, and academic professionals. One may note that the University is averaging about 20 of these reported complaints each year. Sanctions have been levied that vary from warnings to dismissals. One of the more interesting, and perhaps precedent-setting, sanctions involves billing the budget of a department for tuition, fees etc., for a student now pursuing her studies elsewhere, as it was impossible for her to continue with her major at the University of Minnesota due to a damaged academic environment for her here. We also note that no frivolous charges have been filed against any male faculty member, but one frivolous case has been filed against a female faculty mem-

ber. Cost estimates for the Sexual Harassment Policy implementation (including publicity, University incurred costs for complainants with valid need of relief, and administrative time) are being compiled and will be published in a supplement to the annual review we will file in the fall of '86 to bring the "complaints" file up to date for the '85-86 academic year.

In addition to the closed cases reported here, there are usually 4-5 cases under consideration at any given time, and that is true for the present time. The SHRB is not privy to information on current active cases, as we may be asked to conduct a formal hearing on any one or more of them. In that appeals of decisions on faculty members go to the Senate Judicial Committee, and that their findings may be very important with respect to the policy, the SHRB has asked the Judicial Committee for formal observer status on cases involving sexual harassment. This would give the SHRB an opportunity to observe and to comment on cases before findings are official, as well as give the board timely notice of decisions that might require policy or procedural changes. The SHRB has been assured by the chair of the Judicial Committee that we should be eligible for official observer status.

Implementation of the 1984 policy appears to be running smoothly, and Director Mullen reports that one of the biggest advantages of the new policy has been the section that makes clear the responsibilities of line administrative officers for fostering a positive academic environment free of sexual harassment within their areas. As a result of this section, administrative department chairs, etc., have been involved more quickly and have been much more active in resolving the complaints that have arisen within their jurisdictions, thus easing the burden on the Entry Level Officer. A possible negative to this may be the under reporting of cases handled at the local level.

The Sexual Harassment Survey sponsored by vote of the University Senate in 1984 remains in limbo. At present, the survey has been blocked-out in some detail, including a cost estimated at \$38,000. We are now awaiting the administration's decision on funding the survey.

The SHRB is also presently attempting to gather information on complaints involving students as both complainants and respondents (student vs. student cases). These are not handled by the Entry Level Office. They are routed either through the Special Counseling Bureau for Students or through Residence Hall review boards. We hope to present statistics on these cases in the fall '86 addendum. In addition, we plan to enter into discussions with various persons within the administration with respect to a number of issues of jurisdiction that pertain to students. For example, publicity surrounding fraternities and sororities may be linked to the University of Minnesota in the public's mind, but the fraternities and sororities are outside the University's legal jurisdiction. Another problem appears to involve complaints which may originate on campus but continue off-campus, or vice-versa. The University's jurisdiction and possible sanctions for these cases appears problematical.

With respect to the Policy on Sexual Harassment, we recommend no changes; it appears to be working well.

#### Summary of Complaints of Sexual Harassment 1984-85:

Formal Complaints—5

Informal Complaints—14

Status of Complainants:

Student (or on behalf of student)—10

Civil Service Employees—8

Faculty—1

Anonymous—1

Status of Respondents:

Civil Service—7

Tenured Faculty—5

Tenure-track Faculty—2

Grad Student—1

Post Doc—1

Unknown—1

Student employee—1

Recruiter (not University  
of Minnesota employee)—1

Respondent was complainant's:  
supervisor—2  
advisor—4  
co-worker or relationship was unknown—13

Type of sanction/outcome:  
Termination—1  
Employees resigned—3  
Withdrew from project—1  
Did not get tenure—1  
Warning letter—2  
Verbal warning—4  
Suspension without pay—1 (currently on appeal)  
Other action—6

Summary of Complaints of Sexual Harassment 1985-86 to be filed in 6/30/86

Entry Level Office for  
Sexual Harassment

## SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS

Filed and closed 7/1/84 to 6/30/85\*

Status of Complainant	Status of Respondent	Date and Issue	Complaint Handled by	Type of Complaint	Date and Outcome
Student	Civil Service Employee	8/13 Unwanted attempts at "counseling" of student and perceived threat of request for sexual favors	E.L.O.	Formal	9/18 Second complaint vs. respondent. Accepted resignation effective 10/31/84 & formal warning that any contact with any students before will effect immediate termination.
Civil Service Employee-Director	Civil Service Employee	10/22 Repeated comments, jokes, suggestive remarks to complainant & other female clerical workers 6/4/85 Report of another incident—no complaint filed	E.L.O.	Formal	12/4 Employee moved out of bldg. Warning letter says next proven report may terminate.
2 Students 1 Former Student	Tenured Faculty Member	11/21/84 current: repeated unwanted attention by faculty to student enrolled in class; 2 others had similar exp. in 81-82. Informally handled then.	E.L.O.	Formal	Faculty member resigned 6/15/85 to pursue non-teaching career
Graduate Student	Tenured Faculty Member	11/29/84 "Consenting" relationship resulted in illness, difficulty in completing M.A. Program and emotional stress	E.L.O.	Formal	3/15 V.P. for Academic Affairs finds sexual harassment & sanctions. Leave without pay April 15-June 15, 1985. Finding & sanction appealed to Judicial Committee.
Ext. Fellow & Instructor	Grad. Student	12/4 Grad student persisted in pursuing relationship with Ext. Fellow by asking her out etc.	Student Conduct Code Officer & E.L.O.	Formal	Student agreed to move office location and not to make contact with complainant.
Anonymous	?	7/3 Nude pinups in public building	Collegiate E.L.O. Officer	Informal	7/11 Picture removed
Civil Service Employee	Post Doc ** **due to finish 9/15/84	7/13 Unwanted request for dating relationship	Dept. Head	Informal	7/13 Verbal warning, employee reports no further contact attempted.
Civil Service Employee	Civil Service Employee	7/13 Inappropriate comments about physical appearance of employee	Dept. Head	Informal	7/17 Verbal warning.
Students (anonymous)	Tenured Faculty Member	11/7 Crude remarks in class, i.e. "... (animal's) hind end was like the butt end of a librarian."	Dean	Informal	12/13 Faculty member sent written apology to all women in class

Civil Service Secretary	Faculty (tenure-track) Member (not supervisor of employee)	12/18 Termination of consenting romantic relationship resulted in discomfort	E.L.O.	Informal	3/11 warned faculty member. Tried to help her find new job and counseling. She did find another position at the U.
Anonymous	Tenure Track Faculty Member	2/8 Reports of harassing students and Civil Service employees	Dept. Head	Informal	2/8 Oral warning will not be returning, did not pass tenure review.
Civil Service Secretaries	Student Employee	2/18 Sexually suggestive remarks to secretaries	Dept. Head	Informal	2/18 Terminated student when student declined to correct behavior.
Graduate Student	Recruiter for outside employer	2/13 Suggestion of job interview in exchange for sexual favors	Student's Advisor	Informal	2/13 Company agreed to change recruiter
Student by an anonymous 3rd party	Tenured Fac. member	3/20/85 Invited student to summer home where another person approached student for sexual favors	E.L.O.	Informal (student did not come forward)	4/12/85 Respondent denied charges. Agreed to abide by policy.
None-colleague & supervisor for project confronted respondent	Tenured Faculty member	4/19/85 faculty member is inappropriate in subject matters & comments for a group advised by faculty member. Also seems to single out one or another student for special friendship. Several students have complained that this makes them uncomfortable	Program coordinator and her supervisor	Informal	4/22/85 Discussed allegations with respondent who withdrew as program advisor.
Civil Service Employee	Civil Service Employee	4/23/85 abusive language	Manager	Informal	4/24/85 letter of reprimand in employee file.
Student	Civil Service Employee	5/6 Letter containing broad complaints of sexism, possible harassment	Supervisor	Informal	Employee denied most of allegations. No relief had been requested. No formal complaint was filed.
Civil Service Employee	Civil Service Manager of Employee	5/8/85 References to employee's body, underwear and other inappropriate remarks	Civil Service	Informal	Written warning, Manager has since quit.
Anonymous	Civil Service	6/10 Turns everything into a sexual joke. Vulgar language, touches students inappropriately	E.L.O. & V.P.	Informal	6/18 Warned about behavior of this type in meeting with employee. Allegations were denied.

\*"Closed" means final action has been taken by Entry Level Office.

## SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS

Filed and Closed 7/1/85-3/31/86\*

Status of Complainant	Status of Respondent	Date and Issue	Complaint Handled by	Type of Complaint	Date and Outcome
Civil Service Employee	Tenured Faculty Member	4/2/85 derogatory comment	E.L.O.	Informal	11/20/85, written agreement to separate parties and provide training for department regarding sexual harassment.
Civil Service Employee	Civil Service Employee	6/12, Stories told which were homo-sexually graphic and unwelcome (events occurred 11/84)	Supervisor	Informal but later, part of other formal complaint	7/1/85 Since behavior was not repeated, no further discipline.
Student Undergraduate	Tenured Faculty Member	6/18, Inappropriate affection toward and attention to student. Displays of jealousy. Repeated attempts to discuss "relationship".	E.L.O.	Informal	9/26, written agreement provides for student to take classes in major elsewhere at U expense until she graduates
Intern with City, former student	Civil Service Employee	7/2, Inappropriate show of affection. Some touching	Greg Fox (UMD)	Informal	7/12, written apology from respondent and agreement to have no future contact
Civil Service Employee	Civil Service Employee	7/19, Inappropriate physical contact	Supervisor	Informal	7/19, Employee was terminated. Report of incident placed in his personnel files at U of M.
Civil Service Employee	MSA bookstore: Coffman Union	7/31, sale of coffee mugs which say "Sexual Harassment isn't a problem around here, it's one of the benefits."	EEO Officer for Student Affairs	Informal	8/8, Mugs were removed. Will not be reordered.
U of M graduate student during internship at corporation	Supervisor at Corp.	9/4, Request for dating relationship by supervisor. Did not persist after student said no but atmosphere became very difficult for student.	Academic Dept. at U of M and Corp. EEO Officer	Informal	Reassigned internship. Warned corp. that if employee did not heed warning he received, it would not be used as future site
Grad Student	Undergrad Student	10/16, Repeated unwelcome contacts by phone, etc. after relationship terminated	Student Conduct Code Officer	Informal	12/20, Student agreed to stop contacts. Had counseling session with 2 parties and Boynton counselor.
Undergraduate Student	Tenured Faculty Member	8/7/85, Unwelcome attention, suggestive remarks and touching	E.L.O.	Formal	1/30/86, written agreement definite retirement date, one month suspension w/o pay; counseling; no U support for professional meetings.

Civil Service Temporary Employee	Civil Service Supervisor	1/8/86, Felt termination was caused by employees lack of response to supervisor's desire for relationship	E.L.O.	Formal	3/31/86, written agreement dept. reinstated employee with back pay to end of temporary employment.
Graduate Student	Several Faculty	8/23/85, Comments made in class about students' personal appearance made her uncomfortable	E.L.O.	Informal	3/5/86, E.L.O. met with faculty and communicated student's concerns.

\*"Closed" means final action has been taken by Entry Level Office.

**RICHARD L. PURPLE**  
Chair

*Accepted*

### **XIII. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE RESEARCH**

**(15 minutes)**

##### **MOTION:**

That the University Senate approve the following resolution:

Whereas the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) is a project to research, develop, and deploy a space-based missile defense system which has been suggested as a method of nuclear deterrence; and,

Whereas the implications of SDI are an acceleration of the arms race and the destabilization of the strategic balance; and,

Whereas the rights preserved by academic freedom need to be balanced with the recognition that the participation of University faculty in SDI research is a *de facto* political and institutional endorsement for SDI and will reflect on the University of Minnesota;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the University Senate urges the University of Minnesota to refrain from participating in research specifically for SDI.

**LISA STEIDL**  
Senator

##### **COMMENT:**

The above motion was introduced in the February 20 Senate meeting and, in accordance with Senate rules, was referred to the Senate Consultative Committee for its consideration and presentation back to the Senate. The Consultative Committee asked the Committee on Research and the Committee on Social Concerns, two Senate committees with a particular interest in this question, to consider the motion, keep one another apprised of their respective positions, and report directly to the May 15 Senate meeting. The committees will make those reports.

**DEON STUTHMAN, Chr.**  
Consultative Committee

##### **MOTION:**

That the last paragraph of the proposed resolution regarding research on the Strategic Defense Initiative be amended to read:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the University will not accept research projects or grants where the funds are identified as originating with the Strategic Defense Initiative.

##### **COMMENT:**

The Social Concerns Committee urges the Senate to consider the motion as amended above. The committee passed the motion by a vote of 11 to 0. We offer the changes above as a friendly amendment to the original motion. It was further moved that the committee endorse the motion and urge its passage by the Senate. That motion passed by a vote of 10 to 1.

We dedicated two meetings to discussion of SDI. Many issues were discussed. A central problem is academic freedom. The original motion attempts to limit research, which is an unacceptable infringement on the rights of individual faculty members. The new motion (which was originally introduced to the Senate Research Committee) deals with funding of research grants, which are legal contracts between the funding agency and the University, represented by the Board of Regents.

The motion as amended by the Social Concerns Committee still represents a restriction on the freedom of faculty members to seek funding from any source, and this generated protracted discussion by the committee. The minority held that each individual should have the choice to participate in this program or not. The majority considered that, as a major new

weapons development project, SDI represents not only a serious escalation of the arms race but also the beginning of the irreversible militarization of space. As such it threatens society as a whole and jeopardizes the future of the human race; therefore the University as an institution should repudiate it.

**JOHN DICKEY, Chr.  
Social Concerns Committee**

*The Social Concerns Committee amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment, and the original motion as amended was defeated 79 to 55.*

**XIV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
(5 minutes)**

Report by Professor Deon Stuthman, Chair.

See abstract of the discussion.

**XV. SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE  
(5 minutes)**

Report by Professor Jack Merwin, Chair.

See abstract of the discussion.

**XVI. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT  
(15 minutes)**

none

**XVII. OLD BUSINESS**

none

**XVIII. NEW BUSINESS  
(15 minutes)**

none

**XIX. ADJOURNMENT**

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the University Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses except Crookston were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 110 voting members of the faculty. President Kenneth Keller presided.

### I. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1986-87

#### Action (2 minutes)

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN** Faculty appointed: Clarice Olien (chr.), Eleanor Hoffman (UMD), Janet Spector, 2 to be named. Faculty elected: Miriam Cohn, 1 to be named.

**TENURE** Faculty: George Copa (chr.), Daniel Feeney, Philip Frickey, Audrey Grosch, H. E. Mason, Larry Miller, 1 to be named. Students: 2 to be named.

**JUDICIAL** Faculty: Amos Deinard (chr.), F.R.P. Akehurst, Laird Barber (UMM), Carole Bland, Clara Bloomfield, Miriam Cohn, Hans Courant, Timothy Dunnigan, Arnold Flikke, Donna Forbes (UMD), Janice Hogan, James Jordan, Norman Kerr, Candace Kruttschnitt, C. Robert Morris, Roger Park, Stephen Prager, Kathryn Reyerson, George Seltzer, Gordon Swanson, Wolfgang Taraba, Andrew Whitman, Frank Wood.

*Approved*

### II. TENURE COMMITTEE

#### ANNUAL REPORT, 1985-86

During 1985-86 the Tenure Committee completed work on "*Procedures for Reviewing the Performance of Probationary Faculty*," the final step in a five-year process resulting in a new tenure code and its full implementation. In accordance with the Tenure Regulations, the document was reported for information to the Faculty Senate and the Board of Regents, and revised after comments from these sources, Senate committees, and many others. It is now in place and will be applied to all evaluation of probations commencing fall, 1986.

The committee held hearings and solicited comments of the system of outside letters and on whether, given Minnesota law, the non-confidential letters were useful. The overwhelming majority of comments favored retention of the system.

We have been working with the vice president and University counsel to establish firmly University support for faculty sued for normal scholarly evaluations arising out of employment. Vice President Dunham has written us expressing his opinion that this is inferentially covered by University policy and we are working on an explicit statement of this policy.

The new Tenure Regulations require our review of all non-regular appointments that run beyond 7 years. We have now a print-out of such appointments and are developing a form that will ask units to justify such renewals. We anticipate that it will take another year to put a system of review in place that will minimize burdens on units, while maximizing non-regular appointment protection.

**SAMUEL KRISLOV**  
Chairman

*Accepted*

### III. ADJOURNMENT

## ABSTRACT

The meeting of the University Senate was called to order by President Kenneth Keller at 3:45 p.m. in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus. Coordinate campuses except Crookston were linked by telephone.

*President's report.* The President opened by reminding the Senate that he had earlier introduced a new concept into the Senate docket by proposing that he, as presiding officer, be offered the opportunity to engage in debate, if he chose, by setting aside time for remarks before the formal agenda was begun. To that end, he indicated his support for the proposed restructuring of the distribution of indirect cost recovery funds. He said that, if the federal government is buying research, it must recognize the full cost, but may not want to pay all costs. If the state agrees to share costs, then those costs are not collected. He explained that the University had gone to the state to persuade it to let the University keep the funds because it could use them better for such things as equipment on new projects and seed money. In the last few years that request had met with some success because state officials were told that the University would not have to come to the state for money for certain budgets.

*Committee memberships.* Committee memberships for next year were approved after two additions from the floor.

*Finance Committee.* Shirley Clark, professor of educational policy and chair of the committee, proposed faculty/academic professional and civil service staff additions to the Finance Committee, pointing out that the former would provide faculty input on the Planning Committee. John Malmberg, director, Extension Classes, asked why only one civil service person was indicated. Deon Stuthman, professor of agronomy and chair of the Consultative Committee, said the decision was a compromise position. Ms. Clark's motion was then approved unanimously.

*Physical Plant & Space Allocation, Research, Animal Care, and Services for the Handicapped Committees.* The addition of civil service representation to the four committees was approved without debate.

*Indirect cost recovery fund distribution.* Paul Gassman, professor of chemistry and chair of the Research Committee, presented a proposal to revise the formula for distribution of indirect cost recovery monies, which he said had been two years in the making. He said it would permit some of the funds to come back to be used as seed money and would provide investigators funding in proportion to their contributions. Mr. Stuthman introduced an amendment from his committee and the Finance Committee to provide consultation with those committees wherever budgetary circumstances warrant consideration of less than 50 percent distribution to the colleges, and that distribution to colleges should never be less than one third. William Hanson, professor of philosophy and chair of the Educational Policy Committee which co-sponsored of the original motion, said his committee accepted the Stuthman amendments as friendly. Asked who would determine the budget circumstances identified in the amendment, Mr. Stuthman said the statement would have to be part of the administration's proposals in developing the budget. The President added that the University's request would be discussed with the Finance Committee and that it would have to agree that the budgeting circumstances existed. With that, the motion as amended was approved.

*International exchange agreements.* Dario Menanteau, associate professor of rural sociology and chair of the International Education Committee, introduced a number of changes in the University policy and procedures with regard to proposals for all-University international exchange agreements, which he said represented an update that was approved by the Educational Policy Committee. His motion was approved without debate.

*Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) research.* Lisa Steidl, student, presented her resolution urging the University not to participate in research specifically for SDI that had been before the Senate in February and, as a new item, had been referred to the Consultative Committee. Ms. Steidl accepted as a friendly amendment a motion from the Social Concerns Committee to prohibit such research when funds are identified as originating with the SDI. The chair then announced that each speaker, alternating pro and con, would be permitted three minutes, and Ms. Steidl concluded her remarks by indicating that faculty mem-

bers should be responsible for the social and political ramifications of the research they accept. Paul Gassman, professor of chemistry, reported that his committee, the Research Committee, had found the motion "totally repugnant" in a vote of 7 yes, 4 no, and one abstention. He said such action would undercut academic freedom, set a precedent, and was inappropriate in that it would superimpose beliefs of one group on the University. Such issues as abortion could well come next, he warned, as another form of political endorsement.

Edward Ney, Regents' professor of astronomy and Research Committee member, favored the motion. While admitting that forbidding the research might be an infringement of academic freedom, he maintained that such research would lead inevitably to the further militarization of space. He said that universities should be leaders in the creation of new knowledge, the possession of wisdom, and the exercise of morality, and should not participate in dangerous enterprises initiated by Edward Teller and implemented by a President who "doesn't know the difference between a missile launch and an underground nuclear test." He then presented the results of a poll of the members of the National Academy of Sciences on the issue indicating overwhelming opposition to the current Star Wars program.

Bruce Overmier, professor of psychology, said it was sad that it is a political issue, and he reiterated the argument that beliefs could not be imposed on the University community—that such actions would open the door to other dangers such as controls in biotechnology research. He urged that the University not be taken down that path. Paul Udstrand, student, favored the motion, claiming that ultimately all people will be affected and all life on this planet. He urged that the Senate take an ideological position opposing SDI and send a message to all students and to the government by its action. He emphasized that "We are talking about nuclear weapons that can affect us now."

Mr. Stuthman reported that the Consultative Committee had opposed the motion 10 to 4. At this point the question was called, and the Senate defeated the motion as amended 79 to 55. A group of about 20 persons then marched to the podium with loud shouts of "SDI off campus!" and proceeded to commandeer the microphone. The President gave them one minute to vacate and when they stood their ground, two University police officers escorted them from the room, where they continued the noisy demonstration. President Keller commented that the demonstration illustrated "how justified our concern is for academic freedom on campus," and Ms. Steidl later expressed her concern to professors who might look unfavorably on those who chose the wrong avenue, pointing out that not everyone chose to participate. Both statements were applauded.

*Consultative Committee.* Deon Stuthman, chair, applauded those committee chairs who had submitted annual reports and urged others to have them for the next meeting; announced that the proposed revised patent policy, the University-industry relations principles, the academic calendar survey, the child care report, and a resolution from the Special Committee on Coordinating Lower Division Education on the Twin Cities Campus would be on the agenda of the June 5 Senate meeting; and reported there would be no forum preceding that meeting, but the Governance Committee would make its report at the Assembly meeting.

*Finance Committee.* Jack Merwin, professor of educational psychology and chair of the committee, reported that his committee had spent a lot of time discussing the University's borrowing plan. The committee had endorsed the plan to restore faculty purchasing power and it agreed to take up the proposal to fund child care. He said the charge to the committee was to work with the administration to establish criteria to develop the University budget and the biennial request, but he indicated that it had not worked this year, and that the process might have to be reviewed if the committee were to fulfill its responsibilities. President Keller admitted that the process did "slip" this year and that the whole procedure needed to get back on track.

The Faculty Senate approved committee memberships, and adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

**MARILEE WARD**  
Abstractor