

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES**

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

**STUDENT SENATE MINUTES**

**May 14, 1987**

The fourth meeting of the University Senate for 1986-87 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, at 3:35 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 117 voting members of the faculty, 47 voting members of the student body, one member of the Council of Academic Officers, and 50 non-members. President Kenneth Keller presided.

**I. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1987-88**

**Action (3 minutes)**

Student, alumni, and civil service memberships will be reported at the first Senate meeting fall quarter.

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY APPEALS** Faculty/academic professionals: Judith T. Younger (chr.), David Fox, Millard Gieske (UMM), Dario Menanteau, Philip Regal, Rogert Ulstrom, 1 to be named.

**BUSINESS AND RULES** Faculty/academic professionals: John Fossum (chr.), Marilyn Grantham, Charles Speakes, Wesley B. Sundquist.

**EDUCATIONAL POLICY** Faculty/academic professionals: John Clark (chr.), John Clausen, Jean Congdon, Sheila Corcoran, Roland Guyotte (UMM), Jan Maitland, Marvin Mattson (UMC), James Molle, Gene Piche, Naomi Schemm.

**EXTENSION & COMMUNITY PROGRAMS** Faculty/academic professionals: Thomas McRoberts (UMM) (chr.), Guy Baldwin, David Borr, Judith Gaston, Clayton Giese, Linda Hogan, John Leppi (UMD), Gordon Stobb, Luther Waters, 7 to be named.

**HONORS PROGRAMS** Faculty/academic professionals: Gary Fine (chr.), Richard Christenson (UMC), John Clausen, Donald White, 3 to be named.

**INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION** Faculty/academic professionals: Jane Plihal (chr.), Subir Banerjee, John Cogan, Kent Crookston, Genevieve Escure, Craig Kissock (UMM), Benjamin Liu, Joseph Westermeyer.

**LIBRARY** Faculty/academic professionals: John Fraser Hart (chr.), Neil Anderson, Thomas Bouchard, Changhae Chae (UMM), Louise Hawley (UMD), Stanford Lehmborg, Darrell Lewis, Robert McCollister, Dianne Monson, Arthur Norberg, Carl Osborne, 1 to be named.

**PLANNING** Faculty/academic professionals: Carl Adams, David Biesboer, Vernon Eidman, James Hearn, John Howe, Warren Ibele.

**RESEARCH** Faculty/academic professionals: David Hamilton (chr.), Ira Adelman, Robert Bruininks, John Chipman, Evelyn Firchow, Dwight Purdy (UMM), John Sheppard, 1 to be named.

SOCIAL CONCERNS Faculty/academic professionals: Barbara Knudson (chr.), Michael Baizerman, John Beatty, Warren Gore, John LaBree, 2 to be named.

SUMMER SESSIONS Faculty/academic professionals: John Malmberg (chr.), Ed Coen, Arnold Henjum (UMM), Allen Johnson, Walter Johnson, Judith Lambrecht, Richard Skaggs.

*Approved*

#### **INFORMATION:**

COMMITTEES Faculty academic professionals: Patricia Swan (chr.), Wilbert Ahern (UMM), Sheila Corcoran, Robert Johnson (UMC), John Leppi (UMD), Thomas Scott, George Shapiro, Roberta Simmons, Roger Stuewer.

CONSULTATIVE Faculty: Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Lynnette Mullins (UMC), Ronald Phillips, Kathleen Price, W. Phillips Shively, 1 to be elected from UMM. Students: Sonia Arreaza (Graduate School); David Dahlgren, Steve Kohlmeyer, Bruce Vandal, and Valentine Zweber (Liberal Arts). Student representatives from the coordinate campuses are to be elected.

*Accepted*

## **II. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

### **Information**

In the April 16 election to fill the 4 Twin Cities campus vacancies on the Senate Committee on Committees, Patricia Swan was elected for a 1-year term (1987-88), Roberta Simmons was elected for a 2-year term (1987-89), and Thomas Scott and George Shapiro were elected for 3-year terms (1987-90). In addition, Wilbert Ahern (UMM) and John Leppi (UMD) have been elected to 3-year terms (1987-90).

*Accepted*

## **III. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS, SELECTION AND REVIEW**

#### **Action (15 minutes)**

#### **MOTION:**

That the University Senate approve the following proposed guidelines for the selection and review of persons to hold middle management positions at the University of Minnesota. Middle management is defined here as all 93xx appointments except the President, Provosts, Chancellors, Deans, Chairs, Heads, and Directors (with faculty rank). Included are Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Provosts, Associate and Assistant Chancellors, Associate and Assistant Deans, University Librarian, Directors (University-wide), etc.

#### **I. Automatic Termination with Change in Command**

All officers in this class will, at the commencement of the appointment of a new person to whom they are responsible, be given a trial term appointment of up to six months, or for as long as is required for notice under the terms of their contracts, whichever is longer. At the end of the period their appointment will be terminated; however, the responsible official may at that time choose instead to continue their appointment without a new search. All University, state, and federal equal opportunity policies, and policies protecting academic freedom, apply to the decision not to reappoint officials under this procedure.

#### **II. Search Procedures**

Section VI of the April 17, 1980, Senate resolution on search committee guidelines should be supplemented with the following:

The responsible (hiring) officer, or the officer's agent, should meet directly with the search committee at certain key junctures of the search, including but not limited to (a) the selection of a set of candidates to be interviewed and (b) a discussion of all interviewed candidates at the conclusion of the interviews. Individuals to be interviewed will be jointly selected by the search committee and the responsible official. At the close of the interviews, and after further direct consultation with the responsible official, the search committee will consider whether any of the interviewed candidates are unacceptable. The responsible official, who will have been informed of the committee's views of the relative merits of the candidates from the direct consultation, may appoint any interviewed candidate who has been judged acceptable by the committee.

### III. Acting Appointments

Appointments should be made in an acting capacity only under urgent and exceptional circumstances, with a strong burden of proof on the responsible official that such an appointment was necessary. Except in cases of death or incapacitation, individuals should leave their positions with sufficient notice that a timely search for a successor is possible. When new positions are created, demonstrable urgency must be shown if ordinary search procedures are to be postponed, and an official appointed in an acting capacity.

### IV. Performance Review of Administrators

The performance of all administrators in this class will be evaluated annually by their responsible officer. Timely public notice of the review, and an invitation to comment on the review, should be offered to colleagues, to others with whom the administrator interacts or for whom the administrator performs a service, to other administrators at both higher and lower levels, and to faculty and students where appropriate.

### V. Implementation in College Constitutions

We urge that the above model be implemented in college constitutions.

### VI. Editorial amendments to "Search Committee Guidelines," approved by the University Senate, April 17, 1980.

- a) Section I, sentence one: Search committees are expected to seek out and identify the best qualified nominees available for administrative positions, irrespective of sex, religion, race, national origin, age, or any other criteria violating affirmative action equal opportunity statutes.
- b) Section IV.E.: Personal responsibility of each member for affirmative action and ~~discretion~~ confidentiality.
- c) Section V.B., first sentence: The President (or the President's agent), or the chairperson, shall file notification of the availability of the position in...

### VII. Review of Policies

After these policies have been in place for two years, the Senate Consultative Committee will review them and the manner in which they have been implemented.

### COMMENT:

The above provisions are intended to make middle management officers more accountable, both to those whom they serve and to the officials under whom they work. It is intended to create a tighter system in which administrators have better control over those working under them for whose work they are responsible and can therefore be held more strictly accountable for the performance of their offices. Thus, when administrators are themselves reviewed for reappointment, they can properly be held responsible for the personnel and the general efficiency and effectiveness of their offices.

The provision in Article IV changes a previous (see Keller memorandum of June 22, 1983) permissive suggestion to a requirement that annual performance reviews be open to input from the administrator's colleagues and those whom the administrator serves. This is not intended to raise annual reviews to the formal status of the reappointment review, but seeks a regular infusion of constructive criticism into the administrators' performance reviews.

Article I is intended to insure a productive working relationship between middle management and those to whom they are responsible by requiring that their continuation in office after a change in command is a positive choice by the new official, rather than a normal expectation.

Article II involves the responsible official more directly than in the past in the selection of subordinate officials. Unlike faculty positions, where individuals are held accountable for their own actions, the middle management individuals dealt with by these provisions are accountable to a responsible officer, who will in turn be held responsible for their actions. Therefore, the responsible person should be able to play a more direct role in the selection of assistants for whose actions they will be held responsible.

By allowing the responsible official more direct involvement in searches, it is intended that Article II should eliminate any motivation for sham searches and evasive appointments on the part of hiring officials. Article III, which erects a strong burden of proof on the use of acting appointments, is intended for the same purpose.

**ELLEN BERSCHIED**  
Chair

*Approved*

**IV. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**  
**EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**INFORMATION:**

The Senate Committee on Committees and Educational Policy Committee endorses the proposal to establish a Twin Cities Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education and encourages each coordinate campus to establish mechanisms to discuss undergraduate education issues, if it has not already done so. (Refer to Item IV on the Assembly agenda.)

**C. ARTHUR WILLIAMS, Chr.**  
**Committee on Committees**  
**W. ANDREW COLLINS, CHR.**  
**Educational Policy Committee**

*Accepted*

**V. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

Action (5 minutes)

**A. BUSINESS AND RULES COMMITTEE**

**MOTION:**

To amend Article IV. 1. A of the Senate bylaws as follows: "Membership: The Business and Rules Committee shall be composed of 4 faculty/academic professional members, 2 students, and ex officio nonvoting membership of the clerk and parliamentarian of the University Senate. The members shall be appointed by the ~~Senate Consultative Committee~~ Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate."

**B. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

**MOTION:**

To amend Article IV. 1. B. of the Senate bylaws as follows: "The Committee on Committees...Duties and Responsibilities (fifth item)—to forward annually to the president an al-

phabetical list of candidates for each of the committees of the Senate whose members are to be appointed by the president (~~except the All-University Honors Committee~~). The list shall contain more candidates than there are positions to fill for each committee."

### **C. ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE**

#### **MOTION:**

To amend Article IV.2. of the Senate rules as follows: "All-University Honors...Membership...Faculty/academic professional and student members shall be nominated by the ~~Senate Consultative Committee~~ Committee on Committees and approved by the president..."

#### **COMMENT:**

The Committee on Committees appoints (subject to Senate approval) the faculty/academic professional and student membership of most committees of the Senate. The Consultative Committee appoints (subject to Senate approval) the faculty/academic professional and student members of the committees on Business and Rules, Finance, Planning, and (subject to the President's approval) All-University Honors.

Unremitting and increasing demands upon the Senate Consultative Committee lead us to recommend that responsibilities for membership appointments for the Business and Rules and All-University Honors Committees be shifted to the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees is particularly well prepared to carry out these responsibilities. Because the roles, functions, and compositions of the committees on Finance and on Planning have a special congruence with the Senate Consultative Committee, we do not propose to change the responsibilities for membership appointments for these bodies at this time. The Senate Consultative Committee will continue to appoint, or to advise the President and Vice Presidents about membership on, such ad hoc committees and task forces as are important to special Senate actions or extraordinary administrative activities.

**ELLEN BERSCHIED, Chr.**  
**Senate Consultative Committee**  
**C. ARTHUR WILLIAMS, Chr.**  
**Committee on Committees**

*The three motions were joined by the chair and were approved 145 to 0.*

## **VI. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

### **MINORITY PROGRAMS, COMMITMENT TO FOCUS**

**Action (5 minutes)**

#### **MOTION:**

That the University Senate endorse the establishment and maintenance of programs to expand and coordinate recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty on the campuses of the University of Minnesota, as specified in the recommendations of the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus. Recruitment should be enhanced by establishing a comprehensive, coordinated program to contact and recruit minority students, setting goals for the successful recruitment and admission of high-potential minority high school seniors, developing indices of academic potential appropriate to the educational backgrounds and experiences of nontraditional minority students, expanding and supporting contacts with minority elementary and secondary school students throughout the state, and improving financial aid packages for minority students. Recruitment of minority graduate students should be enhanced by placing the Office of Equal Opportunity in Graduate Studies in the office of an associate dean of the Graduate School, who

will have primary responsibility for leadership in this area. Retention of minority graduate and undergraduate students should be improved through greater coordination and accountability of minority student programs at the University, provision of facilities commensurate with the needs of these programs, careful tracking of students' progress after entering the University, improved financial assistance to facilitate continuous enrollment of upper-division minority students, enhanced professional and educational opportunities for minority program personnel, and staff-development programs for academic and student-support personnel to improve awareness, understanding, and communication skills needed for working with minority students. Recruitment of minority faculty members should receive continued coordination and monitoring in collegiate units and campus and central administration, and faculty retention should be addressed by encouraging academic units to find ways to enhance the progress of minority faculty members in their disciplines and in meeting other professional goals. A person in the office of the vice president for academic affairs should be assigned specific responsibility for leadership and coordination of efforts concerning minority faculty recruitment and retention and for minority student academic-support programs. The vice president for academic affairs should report annually to the Senate on actions taken to implement the recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee.

#### **COMMENT:**

The Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus believes that a commitment to increasing racial diversity and success of minority students is essential to achieving excellence in an international research university. SCEP endorses the recommendations in the Special Committee's report and commends the chair and members of the Special Committee for their conscientious analysis of significant issues in the recruitment, retention, and success of minority students and faculty at the University of Minnesota.

**W. ANDREW COLLINS**  
Chair

*"...and maintenance" was added to the first sentence as a friendly amendment and the motion was approved.*

## **VII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-1987**

Faculty membership: Ellen Berscheid (CLA), Chair; Mark Brenner (Agric.); Charles Campbell (IT), *ex officio* as vice chair of the Senate; Shirley Clark (Educ. and CLA), Associate Chair; Richard Goldstein (IT); Joseph Latterell (Morris Campus); Cleon Melsa (Crookston Campus); Paul Murphy (CLA); Ronald Phillips (Agric.); W. Phillips Shively (CLA).

Student members: John Bremer, succeeded in January by Kim Carlson (Waseca Campus); Patrick Durbin, succeeded in January by Jill Gaudette (Twin Cities); Brenda Ellingboe (Twin Cities); Jon Grahek, succeeded in January by Tim Allison (Duluth Campus); Ron Kubik (Morris Campus); Sarah O'Clair, succeeded in January by Don Peterson (Crookston Campus); Roy St. Laurent (Twin Cities), Chair, Student SCC; Andy Seitel (Twin Cities), Associate Chair, Student SCC; Bruce Vandal (Twin Cities).

(Note: Readers are advised to see also the annual reports of the Faculty Consultative Committee, the Student Senate Consultative Committee, and the Assembly Steering Committee because much of our major business was, as appropriate, conducted by one of these component parts of the SCC.)

The full Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), students and faculty from the coordinate campuses and the Twin Cities campus, will, by early June, have met eleven times this year; nine of those meetings included discussions with President Keller. The SCC Chair and Associate Chair met with the president once a month, ten days ahead of the committee meeting.

**SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ORIENTATION.** At the beginning of the new academic year, the Consultative Committee conducted a half-day orientation for the chairs of all Senate and Assembly committees and for all SCC members. Participants from central administration were President Kenneth Keller, Vice President Roger Benjamin, senior presidential assistant Richard Heydinger, and Clerk of the Senate Marilee Ward. In addition to presentations on the role and structure of the faculty-student governance system, its internal workings and its relationship with the administration, the chairs of the most central committees described their agenda for the year.

**FACILITATIVE COMMITTEE.** The Facilitative Committee consists of those committee chairs the SCC Chair elects to convene periodically to facilitate the business of the Senate. The Orientation served the purpose of a fall quarter meeting; the SCC Chair convened the chairs of fifteen Senate committees for a winter quarter meeting to help co-ordinate the work of the committees.

**ACADEMIC PLANNING: STRATEGY FOR FOCUS** was the most important business with which SCC was involved this year. In November, the SCC and President Keller and Provost Benjamin extensively discussed the overall planning process and the nature of the assignment of the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Planning. Previously, the FCC and the SSCC had had separate discussions with the Provost about the planning and evaluation processes. SCC's faculty and student members separately worked very closely with Dr. Benjamin and Acting Associate Provost Ed Foster to identify the task force membership. The Consultative Committee maintains a close liaison with the task force through its Chair, Charles Campbell, who, as vice chair of the Senate, is a voting *ex officio* SCC member. The link is enhanced by the service of two more faculty SCC members, Ellen Berscheid, Chair, and Phil Shively, who is also Finance Committee Chair, as *ex officio* members. Although the task force is advisory, the members carry a serious responsibility and we appreciate the contributions they are making to the University's future.

The Consultative Committee was seriously concerned that departments and colleges would not have, under the Provost's schedule, adequate time to prepare their plans and to obtain consultation; the committee prevailed upon the Provost to postpone the deadline for college reporting from the end of February to the end of March. The Provost was forthcoming with responses to the committee's numerous other questions and cooperative in solving problems raised by the SCC.

**GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND REVIEW.** The SCC carried out the second stage of an earlier SCC decision to evaluate the University's faculty-student governance structure. Following completion of an internal self-study of the governance system in the spring of 1986, the SCC decided to invite a small external team of experts to review the governance structure. Thus this past fall the SCC invited three reviewers to visit campus on February 9 and 10: Mark Filip, student body president at the University of Illinois and then a vice president (now president) of the American Association of University Students; Kenneth Mortimer, Vice President and Vice Provost of Pennsylvania State University, scholar and author in the field; and Martin Trow, Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. Our letter of invitation to the reviewers recounted to them the recent history of our governance structure issue and asked them to address in particular two questions: a) the return of faculty and student time invested in governance; b) whether a clear faculty voice reaches the administration and Board of Regents. Their February visit included meetings with faculty, students, central administrators, two Regents, staff closely involved with governance, and an open forum. We asked each reviewer to report separately. After receiving the reports in mid-April, FCC and SSCC have discussed them separately and will discuss them jointly; FCC and the full SCC also will have discussed them with President Keller. It is anticipated that some proposals with respect to governance will come before the Senate in Fall, 1987.

**ANTICIPATED REORGANIZATION OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION.** The committee discussed at length with President Keller his model for a reorganized central administration. The President explained his reasons for rejecting the system structure recommended by the consulting firm of Peat Marwick. The committee acknowledges that the

President is free to design his administrative structure. However, faculty members expressed their apprehension about the substantial non-academic, operational burdens on the Provost. The President told the committee that movement to the new model, which differs significantly from the current structure, would be gradual.

**SELECTION AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR PERSONS HOLDING MIDDLE-MANAGEMENT ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS.** The FCC developed, and the full SCC proposed to the Senate for action on May 14, clarifications to the policy of administrative terms of appointments, modifications to the Senate's search guidelines, and modifications of the University's policy of periodic review. (See the motion in these minutes.) The changes are intended to make middle management officers more accountable, both to those whom they serve and to the officials under whom they work. It is also intended to allow administrators to participate more actively in the choice of those working under them, for whose work they are responsible, so that they can therefore be held more accountable for the performance of their offices.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MINORITY PROGRAMS IN SUPPORT OF COMMITMENT TO FOCUS.** SCC enjoyed a constructive discussion with John Taborn following the publication of his committee's interim report. A Senate forum on the interim report took place on February 19. SCC strongly supported SCEP in bringing to the Senate for action in May a resolution in support of the principles and proposals outlined in the Taborn Committee report.

**ESTABLISHING A UNIVERSITY TASK FORCE ON AIDS.** In early spring, Professor Irwin Rubenstein (1983-86 SCC member and 1985-86 Associate Chair), visited SCC to urge the governance system to create a special committee, which would include health care and health education experts, to serve as an AIDS task force for the University. He underscored the magnitude of the AIDS threat, the relatively high risk to a large university campus population, and the serious consequences for the nation of the spread of AIDS. SCC was persuaded of the need for a task force, and by late April had identified the membership. The SCC thanks Dr. Robert Kane, Dean of the School of Public Health, for agreeing to chair the task force, which is to consider first the question of whether the University's current response to the AIDS epidemic is sufficient and, if it concludes it is not, to recommend steps the University should take. SCC has asked the task force to submit its report to the Senate at its fall quarter meeting, October 29.

**CIA RECRUITMENT ON CAMPUS.** At the fall quarter Senate meeting, Brenda Ellingboe, a student SCC member, introduced a resolution calling for an end to the University's providing the CIA with facilities in which to conduct interviews. The Senate referred the resolution to SCC for steering. SCC asked both the Committee on Social Concerns and the Assembly Placement Services Committee to consider the resolution, asked Placement Services to develop a proposal for a campus recruiting policy which the Assembly would consider, and asked both committees to keep one another informed, as well as the CLA Career Development Office and to report their progress in May. The SCC/Assembly Steering Committee considered the matter of constructing for the first time a campus-wide recruiting policy to be sufficiently complex as to require a good deal of study and preparation.

The Social Concerns Committee worked expeditiously and submitted to the April 16 Senate meeting a resolution, which the Senate approved (see Senate minutes). The Placement Services Committee was prepared to present its recommendation on a recruiting policy to the Assembly for the May 14 meeting. The Ellingboe resolution was due to return to the Senate floor on May 14.

**CREATING A SENATE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION SYSTEMS.** SCC continued this year to press the Educational Policy Committee and its Interim Extended Subcommittee on Information Systems to submit a proposal for a regular Senate committee on information systems which would concern itself particularly with the availability of computers and other information systems to the students and faculty. At year's end, SCEP had completed the proposal and submitted it to SCC, awaiting early fall action by the SCC and then the Senate.

**REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE AND ASSEMBLY SYSTEM FOR UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL IN THE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CLASS.** In late winter, SCC established a special committee, chaired by SCC member Ronald Phillips, to consider whether eligibility of AP&A staff for Senate and Assembly governance participation should be increased. The Chair of the AP&A Advisory Council requested this attention following the Senate and Assembly votes one year ago to extend to civil service staff eligibility for membership on an increased number of Senate and Assembly committees. At present, only a small fraction of Academic Professional Staff (those with continuing, probationary, or fixed terms of two years or more in length) are eligible; those, however, are eligible to share in the faculty slots of both the Senate and Assembly bodies themselves, and on the committees. The Phillips committee will continue its work into next year.

**UNIVERSITY'S GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.** The prolonged effort to arrive at a workable comprehensive revision of the grievance procedures continued with SCC faculty member Paul Murphy serving as our liaison to the drafters of the revision (Carol Pazandak and Phyllis Freier), the Academic Staff Assistance Officer (Charlotte Striebel), and the most directly interested committees: Judicial, Tenure, Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, and Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals. The complexity of the procedures in the current draft revision has provoked a new effort towards some streamlining. Work will continue into 1987-88. Because student procedures are not encompassed in this revision, the Senate Consultative/Assembly Steering Committee has requested Vice President Wilderson to assign staff to gather information on the spectrum of student grievance procedures.

**ISSUES OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESEARCH RELATING TO THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE (SDI).** When, last fall, a student senator introduced a resolution for the Senate to take some initiative in assuring that there would be an on-campus forum concerned with SDI, the SCC expressed itself firmly that there must be no subversion of the clear Senate vote in spring, 1986, against prohibiting the University from accepting funding from SDI-related sources. SCC recommended the Senate defeat the resolution, which called for the Senate to take an initiative in arranging a forum. However, the SCC welcomed the idea of a significant campus forum on the subject, provided it had the cooperation or sponsorship of an academic unit. With staff support from the Humphrey Institute, and financial support from central administration, plans are apparently now well under way for such a forum to be held late in 1987. Student SCC member Brenda Ellingboe has been an enthusiastic and indefatigable worker in that effort and has made a series of brief progress reports to the SCC.

**STUDENT SERVICES FEE.** SCC steered to the Student SCC and the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs governance consideration of the Report of the Task Force on Student Services Fees. ACSA was augmented by coordinate campus representation for this business. SCC was subsequently assured by its student members that adequate consultation did occur.

**TUITION REFUND SCHEDULE FOR STUDENTS CANCELLING CLASSES.** The committee discussed with Jeanne Lupton, Acting Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, a proposal which reportedly has been years in the making but was revealed for governance consultation only this spring. The committee appreciated that both the financial and educational policy aspects were significant; however, it was not convinced that immediate action was needed, given the lack of research into the reasons why students drop classes and given the lack of consultation.

**ANIMAL CARE ISSUES.** In response to an appeal from the advisor to the University branch of the Animal Rights Coalition for clarification on what parts of Animal Care Committee (ACC) meetings could be attended by non-members and on what basis ACC could discriminate among non-members in determining who could attend closed portions of the meetings, SCC recommended that the ACC consider seeking *ex officio* committee membership for the technical advisers it frequently calls on to attend. The ACC, however, re-

sponded that it did not wish to obligate those experts to attend all meetings; it only wishes them to be available when needed.

The ACC requested, and the SCC and the Clerk of the Senate agreed, to try a telephone hotline to the Senate office through which on-campus callers could report any observed instances of animal abuse.

**MAKING NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.** The SCC fulfilled its responsibilities in terms of identifying members for several regular committees, as required by the bylaws and rules. However, SCC and Committee on Committees have jointly brought for Senate action on May 14, motions to shift responsibilities for naming several of those committees to the Committee on Committees. While a demanding agenda has stimulated this change, the Consultative Committee will retain nomination and appointment responsibility for the faculty and student membership of two Senate committees with which its work is closely linked: Finance and Planning. The SCC will also continue its practice of nominating to the Senate a vice chair for the Senate; that individual becomes an *ex officio* voting member of the Consultative Committee. This year we nominated Charles Campbell for re-election.

**OTHER INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS.** The committee received regular reports from the Chair of the Senate Finance Committee, Phil Shively. The bylaws require that the SCC's faculty representative to the Finance Committee chair SFC. Topics on which President Keller reported to the SCC, or which we discussed with him to a lesser extent than governance, academic planning, and central administrative reorganization, included the legislative session, University bookstores profits, campus security, the fact that college constitutions are not part of any employee's contractual agreement with the University, and various aspects of the goal and means of making the University one of the nation's top five public universities.

**ELLEN BERSCHIED**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **VIII. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

The work of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy has been dominated by two topics of central concern in University affairs: the organization and effectiveness of undergraduate education; and the establishment of a role for the Senate governance structure with respect to computer, telecommunications, and information-systems policies. A third item of singular importance during the year was SCEP's review of the report issued by the Special Committee on Minority Program in Support of Commitment to Focus. SCEP forwarded a motion to the Senate endorsing the Special Committee's recommendations.

Several of the issues before the committee had been discussed by SCEP, the Senate, and the Assembly in previous years, but the majority were new agenda items in 1986-87.

#### **ORGANIZATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

The quality of undergraduate programs and the student experience has been widely discussed in recent years, partly because of President Keller's Commitment to Focus initiative and partly because of a resurgence of interest, nation-wide, in the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate education. SCEP's agenda in this area was diverse, but a common premise to the actions taken and to those still pending was the need to enhance the quality of undergraduate education in tandem with anticipated enrollment declines and the institution of increased preparation requirements. The committee reviewed and provided comments on the work of the Implementation Task Force on Undergraduate Education, established by the Senate in spring 1986. In addition, a number of issues were first discussed and brought to the committee's attention by its Subcommittee on Liberal Education,

consisting of John Clark, Susan Collison (student member), Leisa Krych (student member), Gretchen Kreuter (chair), and Naomi Scheman. The following were the major items of action:

1. Establishment of an Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education. SCEP and the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy recommended establishing a standing committee of the Twin Cities Assembly to address issues of curriculum and educational practice that affect collegiate units on the Twin Cities campus. SCEP noted that most coordinate campus assemblies now have similar committees and endorsed establishment of a Twin Cities committee to serve a parallel function. The charge to the committee includes a range of responsibilities for initiating and reviewing actions in the areas of curriculum, educational practice, and the effectiveness of teaching and learning. A primary role of the committee will be to increase effective communication and coordination among collegiate units on these matters.

2. Endorsement of attention to the organization and quality of lower-division education. SCEP passed a resolution urging that the vice president for academic affairs give special consideration to the quality of lower-division education in undertaking the Strategy for Focus planning activity. This action reflected the committee's concern that this cross-collegiate aspect of the Commitment to Focus recommendations might not have been central to unit-based planning documents. A particular reason for concern was the committee's finding that most undergraduates meet their liberal-education distribution requirements in a relatively small group of large-enrollment lower-division courses. Enhancing these lower-division courses could have important educational benefits to large numbers of students.

3. Review of the policies now governing in-class contact time in undergraduate courses. The committee was charged by the Steering Committee of the Twin Cities Assembly with reviewing current practices that affect in-class contact time for students on the Twin Cities campus and with making appropriate recommendations in the interest of educational quality. The committee found considerable variation among and within units of the Twin Cities campus in the ratio between contact time and credit hours. Some units commonly schedule one or more class meetings per week for each credit hour, but others frequently schedule fewer meetings than a 1:1 ratio requires. Practices at comparable institutions are typically standardized at one class meeting per week for each credit hour granted.

The committee believes that efforts to improve the quality of undergraduate education at the University should include an increase in contact time between students and faculty, both in and outside of formal class meetings. Accordingly, a proposal is now being considered that would involve two related actions: (1) an increase in the length of standard class periods from 45 to 50 minutes; and (2) adoption of a standard for the Twin Cities campus of one 50-minute class period per week, or its equivalent, for each credit granted. The committee is now consulting with faculty, staff, and student groups on the Twin Cities campus about the implications of enacting these changes.

In addition to these new issues, SCEP continued its role in the University's major program of recognition for teaching excellence, the Morse-Amoco Awards for Distinguished Contributions to Undergraduate Education. Eight faculty members received the awards in spring 1987. In addition, SCEP prepared a motion, subsequently passed by the Senate, that winners of the Morse-Amoco Award be designated by asterisks in the college and University bulletins. The purpose of the action was to inform new cohorts of students about the winners of these awards.

Finally, two items now under discussion by SCEP should be continued by subsequent committees. One concerns the problem of graduation rates among undergraduate students at the University and the related problem of retention. The current committee believes two aspects of the problem must be addressed: (a) the appropriateness of graduation rate as a criterion for effectiveness and the possibility of alternative criteria; and (2) the need for, and appropriate form of, University and other programs for increasing retention. The second concerns the implication of current and proposed actions for change in undergraduate education for transfer and returning students. The committee is currently examining the question of whether such students will be at a disadvantage, relative to new high-school graduates, when new University and college policies become effective.

## COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

SCEP was directed by the Senate Consultative Committee to address the need for a standing committee on computing, telecommunications, and information systems to monitor planning and review policy issues as operations in these areas expand and mature at the University. The need for such a committee was suggested by SCEP's Extended Subcommittee on Computing and Information Systems in 1985; and discussions this year were concerned with the composition of such a committee and an appropriate charge to it. The Extended Subcommittee recommended establishment of a standing committee of the Senate, reporting through SCEP, to make recommendations on matters concerned with policies and administration of computing, telecommunications, and information systems; to monitor the working of existing policies, to propose new initiatives, to coordinate such matters with the Senate Committees on Libraries and on Research, and to advise the administration on these matters. Members of the Extended Subcommittee were John Chipman, Sheila Corcoran, Lael Gatewood (*ex officio*), Russell Hobbie, Thomas Scott (chair), John Sullivan, and Barbara Wolfe (*ex officio*).

## OTHER BUSINESS

SCEP receives reports and consults with several committees of the Senate that are charged with issues related to scholarly activities at the University. This year, consultations were undertaken with the Senate Committee on Libraries regarding the need for an external peer review of library staff and operations and the necessity for long-range planning for the libraries' future space needs. On the latter topic, SCEP also sought consultation with the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation and the Senate Committee on Planning.

## MEMBERSHIP

The members of SCEP in 1986-87 were John Clark, W. Andrew Collins (chair), Susan Collison, Sheila Corcoran, Lawrence Goodman, Roland Guyotte, Crystal Hanscombe, Leisa Knych, Gretchen Kreuter, Ian Maitland, Marvin Mattson, Jams Moller, Robert Myers, Naomi Scheman, John Wallace (*ex officio*), and Mary Young.

The committee was fortunate to have very able staff assistance from Patricia Thomas, administrative fellow assigned to SCEP.

**W. ANDREW COLLINS**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## IX. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE

### ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87

The Social Concerns Committee was involved in three major issues during the 1986-1987 academic year:

1. University Investments and Proxy Votes
2. Academic Freedom/SDI Forum
3. C.I.A./On-Campus Recruiting

In cooperation with Roger Paschke of the Investment Office, a subcommittee chaired by Steve Sarvi took on the task of reviewing shareholder resolutions and advising the investment office on how the University's proxies should be voted. This was an on-going function of the Social Concerns Committee initiated in the 1985-86 year. The committee approved a motion to advise the investment office to vote in favor of all resolutions to withdraw from South Africa without the necessity for the committee to advise on each resolution. As of this writing the subcommittee is considering two resolutions that will be placed before the board of the IBM Corporation. One has to do with funding a study of alternatives to the use of animals in testing toxicity, and the other with computer sales to South Africa.

Our committee was asked to assist in implementing a forum suggested by a resolution presented to the University Senate by Miguel Carter on November 6. The Chair met with Provost and Vice President Roger Benjamin and Dean Harlan Cleveland of the Humphrey Institute and was assured of their support. The Social Concerns Committee agreed that the proper role of the committee would be to serve as a connection between the ad hoc forum committee and the University community. The committee could also provide guidance to the forum planning committee and possibly draft a Senate resolution on research policy after the forum has been conducted. The Chair of the Social Concerns Committee has served on the ad-hoc Academic Freedom/SDI Forum Committee, which has formulated a program and selected possible speakers. The forum is scheduled to take place in October of 1987.

The issue of CIA recruitment on campus was brought to the committee by student representatives, the Senate Consultative Committee, and the President's Office. John Beatty took on the task of investigating existing policy and reporting to the full committee. He also contributed much of the wording that went into the final resolution. Student members of the Progressive Student Organization (PSO) and the Central American Working Group (CAWG) were invited to attend two of our meetings and express their views. The committee shared a meeting with the Placement Services Committee that was also asked to deal with this issue. A resolution was presented to the University Senate at its April 16 meeting. The resolution, which called for an explicit non-endorsement statement, the provision of information on CIA employment, and the on-going monitoring of similar issues by a Senate committee, was approved.

The committee wishes to give special recognition to Brenda Ellingboe, student member of the University Senate and the Senate Consultative Committee, for her contributions to the work of the Social Concerns Committee. Brenda helped to keep the committee informed and she served as a liaison between the committee, the students, the SCC committee, and the President's Office. Much of what the committee accomplished is the result of her efforts.

**TIMOTHY B. KNOPP**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **X. UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

The University-ROTC Relationships Committee held one meeting during the winter quarter. At this meeting the committee heard a report of the annual meeting of the Association of Naval ROTC Colleges and Universities. Changes in the Naval ROTC program were announced at this meeting designed to improve its quality and attractiveness. The implications of these changes for the local program and recruitment were discussed. The committee was informed of the proposed program to rehabilitate and improve the Armory facilities and how these improved facilities would affect the ROTC programs. The committee discussed in general the desirable academic qualifications for ROTC faculty appointments.

During the year, by mail and phone conversations, the committee evaluated the dossiers of and recommended for approval nine candidates for faculty positions in the ROTC programs. Two positions were approved for each the Aerospace Science and the Naval Science programs and five positions for the Military Science program. The Military Science faculty was increased from six to ten because of increased student enrollment from 150 to 215.

Several members of the committee attended the Tri-Service review and two members actively participated in the Tri-Service commissioning ceremony.

A spring meeting was cancelled for lack of an agenda

**KONALD PREM**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XI. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

The Senate Committee on International Education (SCIE) met five times during the academic year. Members of the committee included Robinson Abbott (Morris), Subir Banerjee, Frank Hirschbach, Benjamin Liu, Byron Marshall, Jane Plihal, Joseph Westermeyer, Miguel Carter, Kimberly Didier, David Lykins, Virginia Mills, Joseph Mestenhauer (ex-officio), Robert Kvavik (ex-officio) and John Cogan.

The SCIE focused its attention on the following issues during the course of the year:

1. The need for an international student orientation program.
2. The need for established procedures in negotiating exchange agreements with institutions abroad.
3. The need to explore recovery of the portion of indirect costs on grants to be reinvested in research projects.
4. The need to act as advisory to the newly created Office of International Education.
5. The need to monitor the development of the Office of International Education.
6. The need to establish a faculty development strategy vis-à-vis things international.
7. Explore ways to generate more support for foreign students.
8. Explore issues related to academic freedom and foreign language acquisition.

The committee strongly recommended full implementation of all items on the President's Task Force on the International Character of the University. The committee was in agreement that the basic elements of developing a truly international university are contained in the Task Force recommendations. They simply need to be implemented. The establishment of an Office of International Education and the naming of an Assistant Vice-President for International Education is already showing positive results.

**JOHN J. COGAN**  
Chairperson

*Accepted*

## **XII. ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY APPEALS COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

The committee serves as an appeals body to hear appeals from collegiate appeals committees, and in special cases as the original hearing body. During the 1986-87 academic year, no cases were brought to the committee.

**H. E. MASON**  
Chair

*Accepted*

### **XIII. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

The EEOWC met ten times during the 1986-87 academic year. Members are Miriam Cohn, Patricia Faunce, Eleanor Hoffman, Patricia Mullen (ex officio), Clarice Olien, Muriel Ryden, Janet Spector, Betty Robinett (ex officio), and Gloria Williams.

Monitoring the University's progress in implementing the terms of the Rajender Consent Decree is among the committee's charges. Sue Stingley, Special Master, met with the committee in November and May to discuss the status of the Rajender petitions. Proposed settlements for the Professional/Administrative Petition and the Specificity of Standards for Promotion and Tenure Petition were reviewed in April. Roger Benjamin, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, met with the committee in February to discuss progress by Academic Affairs in implementing recommendations made by the Ad Hoc P/A Committee and endorsed by the EEOWC last year. Other issues discussed during this meeting included retention and equity funding, the question of centrality of affirmative action in administrative decision-making, evaluation of administrators' performance with respect to affirmative action, and potential impact of Commitment to Focus on affirmative action.

As part of the settlement for the Internal Tribunals Petition, the position of Academic Staff Assistance Officer was created. Charlotte Striebel, who was appointed by the SCFA to this position, discussed her role and the numbers and types of cases. She also reported on her involvement with changes in Judicial Committee and other grievance procedures.

During the fall quarter, Stephen Dunham, Vice President and General Counsel, met with the committee twice to discuss his proposed changes in the Consent Decree. At one of the meetings, Eric Olson of Sprenger, Olson & Shutes, Class Counsel, joined the discussion. Recommendations were made by the committee on each of the proposed changes.

Another charge of the committee is to review the University's affirmative action program for women in all of its academic units. Patricia Mullen, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Director, reported on hire activity by college and progress toward hiring goals.

Problems of part-time faculty and the need for flexible employment have been on the EEOWC agenda for some time. A revised version of an earlier proposal has been forwarded to the SCFA.

Last year, two members of the committee undertook studies to determine why women have left the University. The Duluth campus study, conducted by Eleanor Hoffman, is near completion, and the Twin Cities campus study, conducted by Patricia Mullen, is in the initial stages of development.

Other topics discussed by the committee included sexual violence counseling and education with Irene Greene, Sexual Violence Program Director, child care on the Twin Cities campus, and the need for representation on the committee from the academic professional employment category.

**CLARICE OLIE**  
**Chair**

*Accepted*

### **XIV. LIBRARY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

The Senate Library Committee has met twice each term during 1986-87. At its initial meeting in October, the committee agreed upon a basic agenda for the year. Items on this agenda included: monitoring of automation implementation; the status of our collections; long-term space needs; staffing; relations with collegiate Library Advisory Committees; library user satisfaction; and, problems of the coordinate campuses and Law libraries. While the committee has not been able to examine all of these items, it has made some progress in several areas. It has received reports from University Librarian Eldred Smith at every

meeting on the progress of automation and, at its final meeting in May, will receive a demonstration of the LUMINA system. Much time has been spent on long-term space needs, especially as a report by the Library Facilities Planning Officer, Mr. Donald Kelsey, indicated that many of our libraries would run out of space within a decade. The committee is now consulting with S CEP on how to best address this looming problem. During the year, the committee also reached an agreement with the Library Advisory Committees in IT which would leave only one such advisory committee. The committee also received reports from the coordinate campus and Law libraries and acted successfully to resolve their most urgent concern. Finally, the student and faculty members of the committee met to draft possible questions to be addressed to the University Libraries as part of the Strategy for Focus process.

**TOM NOONAN**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XV. BUSINESS & RULES COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

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 John Fossum, Marilyn Grantham, David Lenander, Joel Nelson, Burt Sundquist, 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 constitution, 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.

**DAVID LENANDER**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XVI. HONORS PROGRAMS COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

This committee was established by the University Senate in November 1986, and members were appointed in December 1986. As a result, the committee has met only three times this year. In the course of these meetings:

1) We discussed the importance of maintaining the vitality of Honors Programs in light of the new budgeting process being organized by Vice President Benjamin. To this end we wrote to Assistant Vice President Wallace and Vice President Benjamin emphasizing our belief that Honors Programs must continue to be adequately funded. The Chair of the committee (Prof. Fine) met with Assistant Vice President Kvavik to express the same issues.

2) We are currently in the process of preparing memos which address four aspects of Honors at the University of Minnesota. These will be completed by the end of this academic year:

- a) A general mission statement for honors programs at the University
- b) Issues of planning and budgeting for honors programs
- c) Individual college honors programs
- d) Cross-collegiate cooperation in honors programs

**GARY FINE**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XVII. RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

During the past year the Research Committee met five times to address the following major items:

**RESEARCH FRAUD.** Although the issue of definition of fraud had been addressed by the Research Committee in previous years, no definition was forthcoming. This year the Research Committee was asked again by the Senate Consultative Committee to attempt to provide some definition that could be included in the Grievance Procedures Manual for the University. After extensive discussion (in which it was pointed out that no definition could be all inclusive), the Research Committee adopted the following:

Research fraud is defined as intentionally dishonest presenting of research results.

It was decided that rather than attempt to provide examples of fraud in the definition, a brochure on fraud would be developed with illustrative examples, similar to that done in the brochure on sexual harassment.

**SUMMER FRINGE BENEFITS.** Faculty on nine-month contracts who receive grants for summer research must pay fringe benefits out of their grants. Faculty who do not receive grants for summer research have their fringe benefits paid by the University. This inequity appears to reward lack of initiative. The Research Committee considered this issue and determined that for the University to pay the fringe benefits of those faculty with research grants would cost ~\$551,184 per year. After considerable discussion the following motion was adopted unanimously:

It was moved that the Senate Research Committee recommend to the Senate Finance Committee and to the central administration of the University of Minnesota that fringe benefit charges for the health plan, unemployment compensation, group life and disability benefits, FICA (social security), and tuition benefits no longer be charged during the summer session to grants from which faculty members on nine-month contracts are receiving summer compensation.

**RESEARCH SPACE MANAGEMENT.** Space management at the University is conducted using the Minnesota Facilities Model as a major input to decision-making. For instance, by use of the Model it was determined that the University has enough space. The Research Committee began discussion of the Model with a presentation from the Office of Planning and Space Management. During discussion by the Research Committee it was pointed out that the Model has many problems and cannot be used effectively to manage space at the departmental (or even school) level, since it was designed to be used only for large units where the fluctuation in personnel is relatively small. Also, questions of space quality and its appropriateness to its function are not considered by the Model. It was suggested that the Research Committee could be used in the future to evolve workable refinements to the space management model.

**HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH.** The Research Committee considered the amended guidelines for research on human subjects (based on regulations from NIH) and, with minor suggestions for change, passed it back to the Consultative Research Committee for transmittal to the Senate.

**CENTRALIZED RESEARCH RESOURCES.** One of the major failings at the University of Minnesota is the lack of centrally supported research resources for high cost, high technology science. If the University is to attain its goal of national preeminence in research, some means must be found for support of such resources. For this year consideration was restricted to the central shops, but it is anticipated that in the future other types of facilities will be considered. The Research Committee considered, and adopted unanimously, the recommendation that the three technical service shops (glass shop, machine shop, and electronics shop) be subsidized by the University in the following manner:

The Senate Research Committee supports continuation of funding to the Technical Services Shops at a rate of \$223,000 to be funded proportionally from 0100 and 0959 funds in FY 1987-88. Over a two-year period the subsidy should progressively increase to 40%.

ANIMAL CARE. The report of the task force on animal care (in which the main issue was centralization of resources) was discussed with respect to its impact on research. It was pointed out that the University has little leeway in implementation of the report (since most of the recommendations are federally mandated), but that a crucial element in success of centralizing animal care was that the Director of Research Animal Resources and his/her staff need to be knowledgeable about research. The Research Committee recommended that an annual (or some regular) review of the Director be instituted to assure that animal resources are properly managed.

INDIRECT COSTS RECOVERY. Again this year the issue of disbursement of ICR was a focus of discussion in the Research Committee, primarily because President Keller decided that he was not able to support the motion that had been adopted last year by the Senate. The Research Committee met with the President and there was a frank exchange of views, but the Research Committee was not able to change the President's position. Further discussion was Academic Vice President and Provost Benjamin on IRC allocation indicates that a rapprochement may evolve between central administration and the Senate. For this reason the chair of the Research Committee asked the Faculty Consultative Committee to ask President Keller not to take the ICR issue to the Regents this academic year.

**DAVID HAMILTON**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XVIII. EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

This year's committee has met several times to discuss policy concerning educational development. We looked at several development-related proposals that have emerged from some of the recent University task forces, but as in the past we have found the question of the committee's role in educational development pressing. Until it is resolved, we feel that we cannot be effective participants in educational development at the University. Our main recommendations for the year thus concern a possible re-organization of the committee structure.

At a December meeting, we reviewed the various changes the committee has gone through during the past two years. Most important, of course, is the decision that the committee would no longer serve as the grant-reviewing body for EDP and small grants programs. As a result of previous changes, it was left to the committee to deliberate on educational development policy matters, but what remained unclear was what kind of a role in development policy the committee might play given the diffuse and multiple development-related activities we knew were going on all around us. We discussed in particular the survey on departmental-level development funding and the TA training proposal that had been written in the previous year as a result of work done by the OEDP to follow up on suggestions that had emerged from previous committee discussions. The status of both projects remained unclear, as did their prospects, in light of discussions taking place in other quarters. We decided that we needed to be informed about the work of the implementation task force, whose recommendations would have implications for educational development, before we proceeded with our own discussions.

In February, we met with John Wallace to determine the probable direction of the implementation task force's recommendations and their implications for the work of our committee regarding educational development policy. At the meeting it became clear that many of the programs administered by the OEDP were under consideration by the task force, and that some questions were being raised about the degree of centralization of development funding, the use of development funds for relatively small projects, and the like. We arrived at no resolution of our questions regarding policy-making, but it seemed clear that the committee would be unwise to devote time to substantive discussion of proposals that were simultaneously affected by the task force plans.

The question of policy-making with respect to educational development came to a head during our April 15 meeting to discuss the OEDP planning document prepared by Lesley Cafarelli and her staff. Discussion of that report brought again to the table the series of problems that has troubled this committee now for several years: lack of co-ordination between the Senate Committee on Educational Development and the various ad hoc groups around the University who have been deliberating on development questions; the unrealistic charge, now that we are no longer a grant-reviewing body, to make policy decisions affecting educational development while long-term planning about development activities was going on elsewhere. Also clear from the report was the extent to which the functions and scope of the Office of Educational Development Programs has expanded over the years, suggesting a need for a thorough re-examination of the relation between the Senate and the office. From its initial charge to oversee EDP the small grants programs that were once its major responsibility, the office has taken on the administration of, for example, Morse-Amoco teaching awards, the Bush sabbatical program, and honors program development as well as greatly extending its programming in the areas of workshops and publications in aid of the pedagogic development of the faculty. Some of these programs were spinoffs from earlier EDP experiments and others were assigned to the office by reason of their connection with educational development. The Senate committee, meanwhile, has for the most part limited its connection to the EDP and small grants review and policy.

Furthermore, there is a strong suggestion in early versions of the task force report and the OEDP planning document itself that new programs relating to educational development will be forthcoming: a program of research on undergraduate learning, a program of evaluation of teaching and consultation services for faculty members wishing help with teaching are a few of the more obvious possible outcomes of existing concerns with the quality of education at the University. There is a strong rationale for the inclusion of some aspects of these programs under the auspices of the one central office concerned with educational development, but we feel that such a direction would make more imperative a re-orientation of the relationship between OEDP, the central administration, and the Senate Committee on Educational Development.

There was a strong agreement among the committee members present at the April 15 meeting that we should move toward a new style of Senate involvement in the various educational development activities. We suggest the replacement of the existing committee with a Senate-appointed advisory board to involve itself in policy regarding all of the programs of the OEDP, which office in turn could administer the various existing and proposed educational development activities, as far as such centralized administration is deemed beneficial. Where appropriate, development funds of a routine sort can be administered in a decentralized fashion by colleges, perhaps eventually by departments as well, with the central office maintaining only review of expenditures to assure that they are in fact being spent on educational development. The OEDP would then be freed to devote its energies to those programs best handled centrally.

The advisory board would be a broad policy-making group whose functions would be to discuss new programs, help to determine the directions of existing programs, relative levels of funding for various development activities, and the like, in consultation with both the staff of the OEDP and the vice president for academic affairs. Specific tasks concerning ongoing programs (such as small grants review, determination of topics for workshops etc.) could be handled by ad hoc subcommittees who would report back to the main advisory board. We feel that such a structure would alleviate many of the ambiguities and duplications of effort that now exist. We feel that educational development will be more crucial than ever in the coming years as we as an institution renew our commitment to quality teaching. But until the functions of the committee are redefined, as well as its relationship to both the OEDP and the vice president for academic affairs, routine faculty and student participation in educational development planning will be difficult. We will discuss a proposal to change the Senate charge to our committee at our last meeting of spring quarter.

As a final note, it should be pointed out that some ambiguity also exists around the division of responsibilities between the Senate Committee on Educational Development and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. If we are looking for places to clarify and

streamline the Senate structure as well, we might consider the overlaps between those two committees.

**MARY JO MAYNES**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **XIX. SEXUAL HARASSMENT BOARD**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

The Sexual Harassment Board is composed of the following members: Ellen Berscheid (F), Nora Hall (AP), Eric Klinger (F), Dorothy Loeffler (F), Gary McLean (F and Chair), Richard Purple (F; resigned mid-year), Marianne Syers-McNairy (S), Gina Vanderloop (S), Doris Wiehe (CS), Frank Wood (F; began mid-year). Patricia Mullen, Director for Equal Opportunities and Affirmative Action, serves as entry level officer and as resource to the SHB.

The role of the SHB is to monitor and report to the University Senate on the Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures passed in 1984, and revised in 1985; hear appeals of administrative decisions on complaints, if any; hear cases by referral from the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs; and make suggestions for changes in policy or procedures, if needed.

Appended below is a listing (in neutered form) of the case histories filed and closed between 7/1/86 and 4/15/87. This list indicates that the entry level officer has filed and closed seven formal complaints and seven informal complaints. Included for the first time is a report of the complaints filed and closed by other units—a total of 11 to date. This figure is likely to be understated as complaints may have been closed by other units and not reported to the entry level officer. There are currently 12 open cases, and 20 inquiries were received that did not result in a complaint. It is difficult to know why there is such an apparent increase in complaints filed, though it is likely that increased societal awareness of the issue, supported by the campus-wide brochure, accompanied by a letter from President Keller, are all partial explanations. The SHB currently has a hearing panel for a complaint referred to it by Vice President Benjamin.

The SHB has scheduled five meetings for this academic year. In addition to the activities outlined above, the board spent its time reviewing three primary issues: the "Procedures of the SHB for Hearing Complaints and Appeals;" the relationship of the SHB to the Senate, particularly the Judicial Committee; and a campus-wide survey on sexual harassment.

One concern of the board has been to insure that our hearing procedures are fair to both parties and that both parties will have fair and equal access to resources to present their positions. A second concern has been to clarify our role relative to the Senate's Judicial Committee to attempt to minimize apparent overlap of responsibilities. Finally, we are continuing to try to obtain funds for a campus-wide survey on sexual harassment, first called for when the Senate adopted the sexual harassment guidelines in 1984. None of these issues has yet reached resolution.

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS  
FILED AND CLOSED BETWEEN 7/1/86 AND 4/15/87  
IN ENTRY LEVEL OFFICE**

FORMAL

Status of Complainant	Status of Respondent	Date and Issue	Date and Outcome
Graduate Student	Tenured Faculty	6/18/86, Requests for sexual favors in exchange for financial & academic support and collusion by others to protect faculty member.	10/14/86, Complaint dismissed by E.L.O. after investigation. Respondent denies charges and no supporting evidence could be produced.* No appeal filed to S.H.B. by complainant.
Student Employee Undergrad	Student Employee Undergrad	7/17/86, Suggestive remarks & attempt to kiss student on elevator	7/28/86, Uncontested letter of reprimand in student file.
Student	Tenured Faculty	7/23/86, Supervisory sessions contained sexual innuendos. Kissed her at last session.	4/8/87, Failed to get written agreement; recommended sanctions to Acad. V.P.
Social Worker	Same person as above	7/31/86, Sexual overtures and hugs during supervisory sessions.	4/8/87, Failed to get written agreement; recommended sanctions to Acad. V.P.
Undergrad Student	T.A.	8/19/86, Attempt to touch student in sexual manner.	11/13/86, Informal efforts failed. Respondent denies charges. Referred by VP to Sexual Harassment Board.
Temporary Faculty	Tenured Faculty	9/4/86, Inappropriate sexually explicit remarks relating to sexual problems experienced by complainant.	4/13/87, Respondent relinquished participation in research project.
Civil Service	Tenured Faculty	2/18/87, Two incidents (one verbal, one physical) contributed to demanding attitudes of supervisor.	3/30/87, Respondent denied charges; interviewed witnesses; dismissed for lack of evidence.

\*Complainant filed with SDHR subsequently.

INFORMAL

Status of Complainant	Status of Respondent	Date and Issue	Date and Outcome
Civil Service	P/A Supervisor	7/8/86, Remarks about appearance, innuendos about relationships in office.	7/31/86, Meeting with P/A supervisor & dept. head. Communicated perceptions & effect on employees.
Civil Service	Tenured Faculty	10/20/86, Requested personal favors, e.g., massage. Treated employee as personal secretary; comments on physical appearance.	11/4/86, Employee took another job. Experience reported to dean by E.L.O.
Extension Student	Tenured Faculty	11/11/86, Faculty initiated social relationship, had inappropriate conversation, seemed to want sexual relationship. Did not pursue when student said no.	1/12/87, Refunded tuition. Warned faculty as requested by student.
Undergrad Student	Advisor	12/22/86, Expression of affection-mutual at time, later felt was not ok.	2/18/87, Discussed with advisor. Gave warning as requested by student.
Undergrad Student	Visiting Faculty	1/22/87, Approached at onset of class, as social companion. Student declined relationship. No pursuit after 1st week or so. Student did poorly on final.	2/11/87, Exam rescheduled to be graded by other faculty, dept. head's letter to faculty member warns about this and other sexist behavior.
Student	Assistant Professor	1/30/87, In classroom comments are sometimes inappropriate.	3/3/87, Complainant asked that instructor be informed of offensive behavior. Meeting held with instructor and dept. head.
Undergrad Student	T.A. Graduate	2/23/87, Touching and overly attentive attitude by T.A.	3/18/87, Changed her section and met with T.A. for purpose of explaining policy and warning.

REPORTS OF COMPLAINTS FROM OTHER UNITS

Status of Complainant	Status of Respondent	Date and Issue	Handled by Supervisor	Date and Outcome
Civil Service Employee	Student Employee	7/14/86, Sexual advances toward co-workers.		7/14/86, Letter of reprimand. Warning appropriate future discipline termination.

Civil Service Employee	Student Employee	10/7/86, Sexual jokes, innuendo made threatening by isolated working conditions.	Supervisor	10/8/86, Transferred employee. Record of complaint in personnel student's file.
Undergrad Student	T.A. Grad	10/15/86, Wrote sexually explicit letters to student. Requested sexual favors.	Dept Head	10/17/86, Rescheduled student exam. Accepted resignation of T.A. Future employment will take incident into account.
Custodian	Custodian	11/10/86, Attempted sexual assault. (Also reported to police.)	Dept Head	12/1/86, Employee terminated.*
Patient	Hospital Employee	11/26/86, Inappropriate sexual remarks and touching.	Dept Head	1/29/87, Employee resigned.
Civil Service Employee & Graduate Student	Tenured Faculty	12/4/86, Various unwelcome efforts at dating/social relationships and pursuit after notice that they were unwelcome.	Dean & Dept Head	1/27/87, Removed administrative responsibility. Emeritus status to be determined before 6/87.
8 Students	T.A.	12/8/86, Inappropriate remarks and conduct while conducting class.	Dept Head	12/23/86, T.A. resigned. Supervisor in other dept. where T.A. works put on notice.
Undergrad Student	T.A.	2/13/87, Inappropriate physical contact.	Dept Head	2/16/87, Letter of apology. T.A. will not grade student. Warning in student file.
Custodian	2 Custodians	2/10/87, Repeated unwanted requests for dates and very persistent pursuit on and off worksite.	Supervisor	2/12/87, Terminated one employee; other agreed to chemical dependency program.
Student Employee	Student Employee	2/15/87, Requested dates, when rejected made work atmosphere uncomfortable.	Unit EEO Officer	2/26/87, Warning in file for 6 mo. period.
Student Undergrad	Recruiter	2/16/87, Took students to lunch; asked questions; implied ability to get job, then changed.	Dept Head	2/20/87, Complained to company. Sent copy of our brochure

\*Respondent filed with SDHR.

**GARY N. McLEAN**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## XX. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

none

## XXI. OLD BUSINESS

### CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY (CIA) ON CAMPUS

Action (15 minutes)

#### RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS the CIA has violated international law and has committed acts of violence against people and property in many nations;

WHEREAS the University policy concerning recruitment needs to be studied at a Senate committee level;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that it is the sense of the University Senate to discontinue providing University offices and services for the CIA in their interviewing of students on the University of Minnesota campuses.

**BRENDA ELLINGBOE**  
CLA Senator

*Defeated*

## XXII. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

### FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Action (10 minutes)

#### MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following two resolutions:

Whereas the University Senate recognizes the need to protect the right of free speech;

Whereas the University Senate recognizes that individuals have the right to express alternative points of view;

Whereas the University Senate believes in the promotion of full, public discussion of issues;

Whereas the University of Minnesota is a center for open discussion for the advancement of thought on issues important in today's society;

and Whereas the University Senate is a representative body of the University of Minnesota community;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate endorses the development of an ongoing all-University open forum that permits expression of multiple viewpoints on issues, and that the Senate Committee on Social Concerns should develop and report back to the Senate on possible methods of implementation no later than winter quarter, 1988. (MOTION ONE)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University Senate condemns actions that prevent persons invited to speak at the University of Minnesota from expressing their views and also condemns actions that disrupt their presentations. (MOTION TWO)

**ELLEN BERSCHIED**  
Chair

*Approved*

**XXIII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS  
AND STUDENTS  
FACULTY MEMBERS**

**JOHN PATTERSON BRANTNER  
1921-1987**

Professor John P. Brantner was born in Aurora, Illinois, on May 7, 1921. He died in his home in Minneapolis on February 22, 1987. In his role as social commentator and lecturer he had reached such a range of audiences that his passing was noted by the national media.

John's school was atypical; family moves resulted in his attending six different schools in the 10 years between his matriculation at Sidney Pratt in Minneapolis in 1927 and his graduation as valedictorian of a class of 90 from the Tamalpais Union High School in Mill Valley, California, in 1938. After a year of junior college in California he moved to Chicago, where he was an unskilled factory laborer for two years. He served two years in the U.S. Army Air Force. Trained as a cryptographer, he was stationed first in India and for two years in China, and was awarded the Bronze Star.

When his family resettled in Minneapolis, John enrolled at the University, where he majored in psychology; he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and received his B.A., magna cum laude, in 1947. He went on to graduate study in clinical psychology and was awarded the doctorate in 1958; his dissertation was a psychological survey of the homeless men of the "Gateway" district of Minneapolis. During his research he received a modest stipend as clinical director of the Salvation Army's Men's Social Service Center, an agency he continued to serve after his appointment to the Medical School's Department of Psychiatry. He also carried an adjunct appointment in the College of Liberal Arts' Department of Psychology.

His career evolved from his skills and dedication as a teacher and counselor. He resisted the usual pressures to research and publish. His energies flowed into his lectures, delivered essentially *ad libitum* and guided only by a sheaf of notes scrawled in a broad hand on half-sheets of discarded computer print-out paper. His brilliance and challenge as a lecturer were recognized by the medical students who in 1969, the year he was appointed a full professor, and again in 1977, voted him the Outstanding Teacher Award.

Despite the focus of his graduate education and professional training, John eschewed the role of clinical therapist in favor of that of social hygienist. He read widely and intensely, distilled his gleanings into perceptive precis on the human condition and avenues to morale, and made himself ever available to the continuously growing demand for his lectures. Despite his distaste for travel, especially by airplane, he traveled throughout the United States to attend conferences and provide consultation. The honoraria he received were invariably contributed to some charitable cause, or simply not cashed—to the consternation of his hosts.

His avocational interests, in addition to reading, were cooking, carpentry, the church, and music—especially music. Self-taught at the keyboard, he delighted in entertaining musical friends who could enjoy his collection of instruments, some of which he generously loaned out for concerts.

On campus, he was the quintessential "professor"—appreciated by his colleagues in many departments for his willingness to participate as visiting lecturer in their courses, and appreciated by students for his long white ponytail, his self-directed humor, his ready laugh, and his passion for the subject at hand.

Between his campus assignments, many of them voluntary, and his activities on the national lecture circuit, John found time for community service. He was a member of the mayor's committee on employment of the handicapped and the mayor's committee on the county workhouse. He served for two years as president of the West River Road Improvement Association. The humanist-futurist focus of his public lectures led to his appointment to the Board of Contributors for the editorial pages of the Minneapolis newspapers.

His special lectures covered topics ranging from the psychology of tattooing and nud-

ism to prescriptions for coping with the decrements that accompany aging. Colleagues and students were frustrated that his wisdom was not available in some permanent form; he was a reluctant and infrequent writer. Fortunately there are a few video-tapes of his more significant lectures.

In his later years, John developed special interest and expertise in the areas of disability and chronic illness. Especially popular were his lectures on aging, dying and death, and the process of grieving. He spoke with special fervor on the individual's right to a death with dignity. True to his philosophical principles and with the courage of his convictions, John chose the time, place, and mode of his own departure.

### **RONALD R. GAUGER** **1939-1987**

Ronald R. Gauger, associate dean of the School of Fine Arts and acting head of the Department of Music at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, died of cancer on April 9, 1987, at the age of 48. He was born in Burlington, Wisconsin. He earned a B.S. and M.S. degree in mathematics education from the University of Wisconsin and M.M. and D.M.A. degrees in organ performance from the University of Wisconsin. He came to the University of Minnesota, Duluth, in 1969.

He taught principally in the areas of organ, organ literature and pedagogy, and music history. He originated and developed many of these courses and was respected by his colleagues and students for his impeccable scholarship. In 1968-69 he was awarded a Ford Fellowship; in 1984-85 he received a Bush Foundation sabbatical fellowship award. While in France, he conducted research on "The Music of Taize, France," culminating in several lecture/demonstrations in this country.

A quiet, witty, kind, and efficient man personally, with a keen mathematical mind, he was dramatic and exciting in his organ performances, events which will be long remembered. He was a member of the American Guild of Organists and was dean of its Arrowhead Chapter for thirteen years. Since 1971, he was organist of First United Methodist Church and music coordinator since 1981. He was organist for the Duluth-Superior Symphony Orchestra since 1976. His yearly recitals were enthusiastically attended; his reputation was extended by performances throughout the state and region, organ dedicatory recitals, and outstanding performances as soloist with orchestras, bands, and choral groups. He was in demand as lecturer as well as a consultant for church groups who were seeking a new organ. His organ students have had significant successes in competitions and recitals and in careers as organists and teachers.

His service to the University and community was exemplary and never-flagging. He was dedicated to raising the standards of church musicians throughout the state by conducting numerous workshops on music for worship in small churches. As assistant dean for student affairs for many years, he aided and advised countless students in their academic mission. He was never too busy for any student.

Dr. Gauger is survived by his wife, Corinne, and two sons, Jeffrey and Johathan, who live in Duluth.

### **MARGARET J. MacINNES** **1926-1987**

Everyone who knew Margaret Joyce MacInnes agreed that she was a shy, gentle, and private person. To her students and colleagues she was, in addition, an extremely learned person whose scholarship and breadth of knowledge in literature, art, music, and philosophy gave meaning and depth to her teaching of humanities, English, art, and music.

Margaret MacInnes ("J" to her colleagues) was born in Minneapolis, Minnesota, on March 6, 1926. Her career in higher education began at the Minneapolis School of Art (now the College of Art and Design) and continued at the Chicago Art Institute and the Art League of New York City. She graduated *summa cum laude* from the University of Minnesota in 1951 with a B.A. in art and philosophy. For her master of arts degree at the University of Minnesota (1953) she majored in English and art history. During the 1954-55 academic year

she studied as a Fulbright Scholar at the Shakespeare Institute at Stratford-on-Avon, England. In 1956 she returned to the University of Minnesota; in 1964 she earned a Ph.D. in English and art history with a dissertation on color imagery in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*. Besides being a creative artist with a specialty in design, she was an accomplished English scholar, as witnessed by her book *Nature to Advantage Dress'd: A Study of Painting, Poetry and Gardening, 1700-1800*.

Her teaching career encompassed the following: 1957-58, instructor in English and humanities (CLA); 1958-59, assistant professor of English at Macalester College (St. Paul); 1964-87, professor of art, music and literature in the General College. The range of her General College teaching included commercial art, instrumental music, vocal music, music of the twentieth century, Scandinavian culture and art, and *Toward a Good Life*. Her latest contribution to curriculum-building at the University was an outgrowth of her interest in murder mysteries as a literary genre. Her course *Murder, Mystery, and Mayhem: Whodunit?* drew record enrollments whether offered in the classroom or over KUOM. In addition, she taught the three introductory courses in humanities (1001, 1002, and 1003) and early Elizabethan literature in Continuing Education and Extension. For the Minneapolis College of Art and Design she often offered a course in art criticism.

Although a "non-joiner" by disposition (except for Phi Beta Kappa), she was a member of a number of conservation groups: Audubon Society, The Nature Conservancy, MECCA, Natural History Society, Minnesota Historical Society, and Smithsonian Institution. In her own field she belonged to organizations associated with the Minnesota Art Institute, the Minneapolis College of Art and Design, Walker Art Center, and the American Swedish Institute.

Colleagues and friends of J will especially recall her many distinctive drawings for brochure and pamphlet covers, her pen-and-ink portraits of faculty (often drawn during committee meetings), and her annual personalized Christmas cards.

Dr. MacInnes died on March 29, 1987, at the age of 61. In her passing, J leaves many friends who (in the words of her beloved Edmund Spenser)

"...thinke

Of that same time when no more Change shall be,  
But stedfast rest of all things firmly stayd  
Upon the pillours of Eternity."

## STUDENTS

**William Stewart Belzer, College of Liberal Arts**

**Charles Joseph Enriquez, College of Liberal Arts**

## XXIV. ADJOURNMENT

**FACULTY LEAVES:** We have not yet reached final agreement about recommendations in this area. We hope to do so tomorrow, but your comments about leave policy received before May 20 would be useful.

**SUPPORT OF THE FACULTY'S WORK:** We will recommend: (a partial list follows)

(1) automation of the purchasing and accounting systems and urge that this automation be coordinated with that in the Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration (ORTTA). This will greatly aid in the management of grants obtained by the faculty;

(2) steps be taken *immediately* to reverse the decline in the quality of the University Libraries;

(3) development of a periodic workshop for department heads/chairs, so that they can benefit from the experience of those who have learned/developed effective techniques for supporting the work of the faculty through such measures as wise management of civil service policies, improved resource management, improved career development counseling, etc.;

(4) development of a handbook for department heads/chairs, providing a reference source for administrative policies and practices;

(5) identification of desired faculty/staff ratios for academic units, incorporation of planning goals to achieve these ratios, and review of ratios when new personnel are to be hired.

**PATRICIA SWAN**  
Chair

*Accepted*

### **III. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

#### **A. FACULTY BENEFITS**

##### **Action (10 minutes)**

#### **MOTION:**

That the Faculty Senate approve the following recommendation concerning additional benefits for the faculty:

Instead of a full-fledged flexible plan, the University should offer two separate packages: dependent care and medical reimbursement. (including supplemental medical insurance).

Each package should have an established ceiling, and faculty members could elect any amount up to that figure: dependent ceiling, \$5,000; medical reimbursement ceiling, \$6,000.

Any funds not spent during a given fiscal year would not return to the faculty member.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Proposed University health care and dependent care reimbursement account plans

Dependent care and health care are plans using pre-tax dollars to help you pay for health care and dependent care expenses. There are no direct employer contributions to this program. You fund your accounts with pre-tax dollars from your own salary much like the optional tax deferred annuity (Mills II), the primary difference being that no contributions are made to the social security system on your reduction by either the employer or employee. If you have earnings that exceed the current social security maximum of \$43,800, and your reduction does not reduce your taxable earnings below the maximum, it would not affect you.

**HOW THEY WORK:** At the beginning of each plan year, you would make a determination of how much you wish to deposit in each account for the following year. The maximum is \$5000 for dependent care by statute, and the maximum for medical reimbursement will be determined. A reasonable minimum will also be established. The money is deducted from your check each pay period in equal amounts. When you pay expenses that qualify under

the plan, you simply submit a claim form, and you will be reimbursed in tax-free dollars from your account.

**SOME ELIGIBLE HEALTH EXPENSES:** Examples of eligible health expenses are: premiums for medical and dental insurance, including amounts paid under the health plan at the University of Minnesota; deductibles and co-payments under any medical and dental insurance; eye exams, eye glasses, contact lenses; hearing exams and hearing aids; out-patient mental health; and any other health expenses that would be deductible under the Internal Revenue Code.

*Note:* If you use the health care reimbursement account plan for these expenses, you cannot take a tax deduction for the same expenses.

**ELIGIBLE DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES:** You can use the dependent care reimbursement account plan to reimburse child or dependent care expenses that are necessary for you or you and your spouse to work outside the home. The maximum deposit each year is \$5000. These expenses include the cost of a day care center, a baby sitter, or a nurse in your home. An eligible dependent for this plan is a dependent under age 15, or a dependent or spouse of any age who is physically or mentally incapable of self-care. The amount reimbursed must not be greater than your income or your spouse's, whichever is lower.

*Note:* If you choose to be reimbursed for dependent care expenses under this plan, you cannot take advantage of the federal dependent care tax credit for the same expenses. It would be true for the state that also has a small credit. You cannot pay one dependent to care for another dependent.

**MONEY LEFT IN THE ACCOUNTS AT THE END OF THE YEAR:** If you have money left in either your health care or dependent care account at the end of the year, IRS rules require that you lose your unused balance. Unused balances from all participants will be combined and redistributed to plan participants in a manner that complies with IRS regulations.

**TONI McNARON, Chr.**  
**Benefits Subcommittee**  
**GEOFFREY MARUYAMA, Chr.**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**

*Approved*

## **B. ACADEMIC STAFF ASSISTANCE OFFICER REPORT**

### **Information**

The following is a report from the Academic Staff Assistance Officer, who reports to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs:

My tenure as Academic Assistance Officer began fall quarter 1986. This position was set up under a Rajender decree settlement agreement. It is a half-time position. So far my time has been divided about half and half between attention to individual grievances and attention to policy and administrative problems which affect grievance procedures generally.

A summary is attached describing the demographics of the individual grievants with whom I have had contact. Each grievance is unique, often covering several subject matters. Classifying them for the purpose of tabulation is quite arbitrary. There is a great deal of overlap. These grievances vary greatly with respect to the amount of time that I have spent on them. Some have required only a few phone calls, other require some research into the facts and dispatch of information on available grievance procedures, while on others I have spent long periods of time in consultation with the client and preparation of required grievance documents.

I am extremely concerned about the uneven and generally unsatisfactory nature of

grievance procedures at the department and college level. While some work well, many do not. They are far too time consuming, with little or no attention to protecting the due process rights of the parties. I have sent to the Consultative Committee a critique of the proposed new grievance procedures. I believe that this document requires considerable revision. I am at present drafting proposed revisions.

Policy issues which I have discussed with the University Attorney's office and other University units include:

- disclosure in a tenure or promotion meeting of facts that are the subject of a pending grievance;
- liability of faculty members in the performance of duties as a faculty advisor in a grievance procedure; and
- effect of the Government Data Privacy Act to impair the ability of grievants to discover the facts necessary to their cases.

The response of the faculty to my request for volunteer faculty advisors has been heartening. I now have an adequate list of volunteers to draw from, some with considerable experience and others willing to learn.

**GRIEVANCES CONSIDERED BY THE  
FACULTY ASSISTANCE OFFICER—CHARLOTTE STRIEBEL  
Between September 1986 and April 1987**

Total number of files prepared	= 26
A file was prepared if the client provided their name and the factual basis of the grievance.	
Men	= 11
Women	= 15
Employment status	
Regular faculty	= 20
Temporary faculty	= 1
P/A	= 3
Student grievance related to employment	= 2
Action taken	
Found an advisor	= 7
Assisted in initiating the grievance process	= 3
Settled	= 7
Decided not to file	= 2
Ongoing at time of contact	= 9
Currently active	= 16
Subject of the grievance	
Tenure decision	= 5
Contract rights (technical)	= 5
Promotion	= 2
Pay	= 9
Academic Freedom	= 11
Sexual harassment	= 2
Assignment of duties	= 8
Sex discrimination	= 6

**CHARLOTTE STRIEBEL**  
**Academic Staff Assistance Officer**  
**GEOFFREY MARUYAMA, Chr.**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**

*Accepted*

## IV. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

### ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87

Membership: Ellen Berscheid (CLA), Chair: Mark Brenner (Ag.); Charles Campbell (IT); Shirley Clark (Educ., CLA), Associate Chair: Richard Goldstein (IT); Joseph Latterell (Morris Campus); Cleon Melsa (Crookston Campus); Paul Murphy (CLA); Ronald Phillips (Ag.); W. Phillips Shively (CLA).

By year's end, the FCC will have held 19 regular meetings, of which eight will have included discussions with President Keller. The FCC Chair and Associate Chair met monthly with the President to prepare agenda for the committee's meetings with him and to discuss matters of mutual concern. In addition, the committee met with the external reviewers of faculty-student governance who visited in February and will have met twice, in an informal setting, with the Board of Regents.

Beyond this, FCC members have accepted additional assignments on a wide range of tasks. Professor Campbell is chairing the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Planning, of which Professors Berscheid and Clark are *ex officio* members; Professor Shively chairs the Senate Finance Committee; Professors Berscheid and Shively are members of the Provost's Committee on Planning; Professor Phillips chairs the FCC's Special Extended Subcommittee on Senate and Assembly representation for the Academic Professional and Administrative class; Professor Murphy is FCC's coordinator for revising the University Grievance Procedures; Professor Goldstein chaired the committee that designed the new Senate Committee on the Faculty Retirement Plan, approved for establishment by the Senate in November.

In addition to its ordinary business and the many immediate issues discussed by the FCC this year, some of which are described later in this report, the FCC began a long-range effort to strengthen the role of the faculty in University governance. Of particular concern to the FCC this year were: 1) strengthening the role of the faculty in academic planning, including the role of the Senate Planning Committee; 2) strengthening the role of the faculty in financial decision-making, including the role of the Senate Finance Committee; 3) strengthening faculty voice to the Board of Regents; and 4) obtaining adequate staff support for Senate committees. Progress on each of these is outlined below:

1. **PLANNING.** In the fall, the FCC discussed with Vice President and Provost Roger Benjamin his "Strategy for Focus" plan and the academic planning process. He and Acting Associate Vice President for Planning Edward Foster consulted closely with the FCC to arrive at a list of faculty to be invited to serve on the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Planning, a group whose general charge is to make recommendations about academic priorities. The specific charges to the task force, the procedures to be followed, and the identity of the chair of the task force were also developed in close consultation with the FCC. The FCC's request that the department of each faculty member should be compensated for approximately fifty percent of the member's time was granted.

Because the work of this planning task force is of great importance to the University, the FCC and the Senate Consultative Committee maintain a close liaison with it through having as its chair an FCC and SCC member and through its three *ex officio* memberships. Moreover, in order to maintain continuity for the work of the task force and its subsequent modifications and implementations by central administration, FCC and SCC nominated Professor Campbell for a second year as *vice chair of the Senate and Assembly*, thereby also continuing his voting *ex officio* membership in FCC and SCC. (The Senate and Assembly re-elected him to that office.) The Advisory Task Force on Planning is due to make its report to the Provost June 15, 1987, at which time the Provost's Committee on Planning will consider it.

To maintain a strong faculty presence in planning, the Provost has invited the chair of the FCC to become a permanent member of the Provost's Committee on Planning and, in the fall of 1987, the Chair of the Senate Planning Committee will also become a permanent member of this group.

2. **FINANCIAL DECISION-MAKING.** The President and the Provost have also been receptive to the FCC's concerns with strengthening the role of the Senate Finance Commit-

tee in financial decision-making. The Chair of the Senate Finance Committee has also been invited by the Provost to become a permanent member of the Provost's Planning Committee and has been meeting regularly with it.

In addition, in November, the Chair of the FCC, the Chair of Finance, and the Chair of SCFA began meeting monthly with the Provost to co-ordinate financial decision-making and planning efforts and to discuss other matters of mutual interest.

3. **FACULTY VOICE TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS.** At its fall quarter meeting with the Regents, the FCC responded to problems the Regents had raised at their meeting with the FCC in June of 1986 about needed improvements in undergraduate education, including improving the communication skills of teaching assistants for whom English is a second language.

At this meeting, the FCC also discussed with the Regents the faculty's role in University governance. In particular, we discussed the value of the present structure for faculty-Regent interaction, which is an informal dinner or luncheon each academic quarter followed by a brief discussion of a topic identified by the FCC and submitted to the Regents for their approval or disapproval several weeks in advance of the meeting. (This custom was initiated approximately ten years ago at the time eight non-voting student representatives were invited to join the four working committees of the Board of Regents.) General concern that the voice of the faculty is sometimes not heard on matters where it should be heard was expressed, and the Regents were informed that we were seeking expert outside opinion on this point as part of a review of the faculty-student governance system. (This service was mandated earlier by the SCC and is discussed in the SCC Annual Report in these minutes.) As a possible alternative to the dinner format and as a stimulus to further discussion, the FCC proposed that the Regents consider inviting one non-voting faculty representative to each of the four working committees of the Board of Regents, with each faculty representative being taken from the elected membership of the FCC. A cordial but frank and vigorous exchange of views followed. The FCC and the Board of Regents agreed to continue the discussion at their June meeting, after external opinion had been secured and after the numerous points raised could be reflected upon by all immediately concerned, including the President and the Provost. It is anticipated that issues raised by the review of the governance system will come before the Senate next fall.

4. **STAFF SUPPORT FOR SENATE COMMITTEES.** The role of faculty in governance would be enhanced considerably if there were adequate staff to support the work of Senate committees. President Keller is sympathetic to the problem, whose dimensions at this time are not precisely known. To learn of the magnitude of the need and to begin to fill it, the President has named a "Co-ordinator of Staff Support for Senate Committees" in Morrill Hall. It is expected that by the time of the Senate Orientation to be held in September, the details of this support structure will be available to the chairs of all Senate committees.

Of the many other matters considered by the FCC this year, the following figured importantly:

A. **SELECTION PROCESS FOR CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS AND REVIEWS OF ADMINISTRATORS.** Concerned about the use of acting appointments to fill major administrative positions, FCC consulted with both President Keller and Equal Opportunity Officer Patricia Mullen. Ms. Mullen provided data which showed that the actual incidence of central administrators moving from an acting to a regular designation is negligible and that such incidence in faculty positions is also very low. However, having an interest in the fairness and openness of all searches as well as the efficiency and the accountability of administrators, the FCC developed for consideration and action at the May 14 Senate meeting "Proposed Changes in Procedures for the Selection of Vice Presidents and Assistant and Associate Vice Presidents, and the Review of Administrators." The motion, published in these same minutes: 1) addresses termination of an administrator's appointment when the superior officer who helped select the incumbent and to whom the incumbent is responsible leaves; 2) makes it a requirement, rather than a suggestion, that the opinion of all interested parties, including the appropriate faculty persons, be solicited for every administrator's annual review; 3) provides search procedure modifications that, in return for greater accountability for administrative personnel, allow the responsible official a more active role in the

search process, while preserving the search committee's right to classify a candidate as "unacceptable"; and 4) is intended to reduce any motivation to use "acting" appointments to delay or evade a fair and open search. It further urges that these procedures be implemented at the college level as well as the central one.

**B. FACULTY LIAISON TO THE LEGISLATURE.** The FCC and central administration were fortunate to persuade Professor Richard Purple, Departments of Physiology and Ophthalmology, to accept the post of Faculty Liaison to the Legislature, a position that had remained vacant for some time. Professor Purple reported to the FCC several times during the legislative session on matters of concern to the University and the faculty.

In March the FCC wrote to all faculty members urging them to contact their legislators to express concern about the University's future. Professor Purple reported to us in mid-April that the legislators had come to understand that the University faculty, on the Twin Cities campus and the coordinate campuses, largely support Commitment to Focus. In our meetings together, President Keller briefed the FCC on continuing responses and activities related to CTF statewide. Attention to the University's internal implementation of CTF occurred in meetings of the Senate Consultative Committee.

**C. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RETIREMENT FUNDS.** Spurred on by the initiative of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and facilitated by recent Regental action allowing faculty greater flexibility in the investment of their retirement funds, FCC brought to the fall quarter Senate meeting a motion to create a Standing Committee of the Senate on the Faculty Retirement Plan, which would report to the Faculty Senate through SCFA. The motion was approved unanimously. That committee made its first report to the Faculty Senate at the April 16 meeting.

**D. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (FDC).** Following Faculty Senate action of June, 1986, which "resolved that the administration and the Faculty Consultative Committee (would) jointly appoint a small committee of faculty and administrators to develop a plan for faculty development over the next decade....," FCC in October submitted to President Keller a double slate of faculty names, suggestions as to the most appropriate administrative officers, and a charge letter to create this important working body. At our request, the Offices of the President and of Academic Affairs agreed to contribute funding to provide staff support to the FDC. Professor Patricia Swan accepted the assignment of chairing the FDC and made interim reports to the subsequent meetings of the Faculty Senate. FDC was scheduled to submit its final report to the FCC on June 1.

**E. DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY SALARY INCREASES.** In response to the President's request that, in addition to SCFA, one Senate committee with a University-wide perspective submit a recommendation on salary increase distribution, the FCC did so in April. It concurred in the SCFA recommendation for wholly merit-based distribution, with the caveat that, if the amount available is less than 5%, the recommendation should be seriously reconsidered.

**F. EXTENDING THE FACULTY MORTGAGE PLAN.** FCC was one of three committees, the others being Finance and Faculty Affairs, that approved the plan's extension, proposed by Vice President David Lilly, to tenure-track faculty and academic professionals on probationary appointments.

**G. THE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL CLASS.** FCC this year has charged two special committees to study questions relating to this class:

1. Evaluation of the Academic Professional Classification. As required for future study by the Faculty Senate at the time it approved the revised tenure code (June, 1984), the FCC has this year named a committee to evaluate the academic professional class with regard to such issues as preservation of academic freedom and willingness to be moved into this classification. Professor H. E. Mason, chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility Appeals and member of the Tenure Committee, chairs this special committee. Although the committee has found its task to be complex, the chair will make an interim report to FCC either this spring or next fall. It will make a final report to the Faculty Senate, through the FCC, in 1987-88.

2. Academic Professional and Administrative Representation in the Senate and Assembly System. Following Senate and Assembly action last spring to extend regular Civil Service membership into several more committees, Mr. Greg Fox, chair of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee, requested consideration of increased eligibility within the Academic Staff for participation in the Senate and Assembly and their committees. FCC member Professor Ron Phillips chairs this committee, which began its work in April.

H. REVISION OF UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES. FCC examined the most recent critiques and recommendations concerning the draft revision and continues to monitor and encourage progress towards full agreement on and adoption of revised University grievance procedures. Professor Paul Murphy of the FCC coordinates this project,

I. DISTRIBUTION POLICY ON INDIRECT COST RECOVERY. FCC engaged, with the President and with others, in numerous discussions of the University's research-related needs at all levels and of the several principles and various practicalities involved in different distribution policies. Following Senate approval last spring of a recommendation for a modification in the Regents policy on a distribution formula, President Keller concluded that although he could abide by the letter of the legislation, he suspected he would be unable to abide by its spirit. As a consequence, the FCC and other Senate committees, principally the Senate Committee on Research, and central administration continue to discuss the matter with the aim of achieving closer agreement on the allocation of these monies. In the meantime, the Senate Committee on Research has requested the FCC to ask President Keller to delay taking last year's Senate resolution and his opposition to it to the Board of Regents (who must finally determine distribution policy) until better agreement is reached. In the meantime, also, the President and the Provost have provided the Senate Research Committee and the FCC with a detailed breakdown of the current allocation of these ICR monies and have agreed to provide this information routinely to all principal investigators, beginning late this spring.

J. COMMUNICATIONS. FCC discussed with President Keller the feasibility of University publication of a small weekly newspaper, to augment "Brief," with communications from faculty governance committees to faculty, faculty opinion pieces, and reports from the administration to the faculty. President Keller agreed to take the proposal to University Relations staff and other associates and to request a report back to the FCC.

Meanwhile, we have continued to appreciate the informative one-to-three line bulletins that appear in "Brief." In addition, we distribute FCC minutes to college consultative committees, chairs of 15 Senate committees, central administrators, and the Regents.

K. REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS FOR CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION. The Committee discussed with the President the revised Peat, Marwick report, and commented on reorganization plans for central administration. FCC expressed concern with burdening the Provost with so much operational oversight as to distract his energies from academic affairs.

L. THE MINNESOTA CAMPAIGN AND MATCHING THE PERMANENT UNIVERSITY FUND. The President and Academic Vice President frequently briefed the FCC on the progress of the campaign and on the distribution of endowed chairs and the pursuit of outstanding quality in the filling of the chairs.

M. THE CONSENT DECREE. Vice President and General Counsel Stephen Dunham kept the FCC informed on proposed clarifications to the Consent Decree. The EEOWC was deeply involved in this matter, as its report will undoubtedly reflect. FCC also discussed with Vice President Dunham the proposed settlements for two petitions filed under the consent decree: that concerning unit-by-unit specificity of standards for the awarding of promotion and tenure, and that concerning the use of the Academic Staff personnel category for University female academic employees.

N. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESEARCH RELATING TO THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE (SDI). Noting the Senate's May 15, 1986, vote to defeat a resolution introduced by Miguel Carter that the University of Minnesota "not accept research projects or grants where the funds are identified as originating with the Strategic Defense Initiative,"

the FCC discussed with the President administrative support for a University forum on the SDI and academic freedom. While holding firm that the Senate's decision must not be undercut, the FCC supported the idea of a high level informed debate of the broad issues, on campus, particularly if it could be sponsored by one or more collegiate units.

O. THE GRADUATE SCHOOL. FCC discussed with Dean Robert Holt the University's improving resources for graduate education and encouraged him to continue his good efforts.

P. EVALUATING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW TENURE CODE. Late in the spring, the FCC asked the Tenure Committee to prepare to conduct an evaluation, during the latter part of 1987-88, of the implementation of the new tenure code.

Q. RECIPROCAL PARKING PRIVILEGES. FCC has, this spring, requested the Assembly Committee on Transportation and Parking to revisit the issue of which lots shall be available on the St. Paul and Minneapolis campuses for reciprocal parking.

R. APPOINTMENTS AND NOMINATIONS. The FCC, in conjunction with the full SCC, fulfilled its obligations to nominate and appoint membership to several committees and boards both within and outside the Senate and Assembly system. However, occupied with an agenda of ever-increasing magnitude and importance, the Consultative Committee has prevailed upon the Committee on Committees, which is better prepared to do this work, to assume many of the appointment and nominating responsibilities of the FCC that have accumulated over the years. Motions to that effect are on the Senate and Assembly agendas. SCC and FCC retain those appointment responsibilities closest to their charge: Finance Committee at-large faculty, students, and chair; Planning Committee faculty, students, and chair; and special committees, sub-committees, and task forces.

Finally, the FCC wishes to thank the chairs and members of all the Senate committees who worked hard and long in faculty governance this year for their superb cooperation, and to thank also the chair, vice chair, and members of the Student Consultative Committee, who helped make doing the work of the SCC a pleasure, not simply a duty.

**ELLEN BERSCHIED**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## **V. JUDICIAL COMMITTEE**

### **ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87**

#### **CASELOAD**

The Senate Judicial Committee began the 1986-87 academic year with seven active cases. Six of these cases had been initiated in the prior academic year; the seventh was accepted during the summer. Of the six cases held over, five were tenure denial cases, and one was a complaint about conditions of employment (removal from a teaching/supervising assignment). The case accepted during the summer involved a faculty member's claim that he was coerced into resigning his position. Of the seven cases, one was from the College of Liberal Arts, four were from Health Sciences, one was from the College of Education, and one was from the Institute of Technology. During the course of the academic year, three new cases were accepted. The first case involved a faculty member's claim that his appeal of improper salary increases for the years 1979-80 and 1980-81 had been handled improperly and in an untimely fashion. The second case involved a faculty member's claim that his review for tenure involved a number of violations of the tenure code. The third case involved a faculty member's claim that he was forced to resign an administrative position and was deprived of income. One of these cases was from the College of Liberal Arts, one was from the Crookston campus, and one was from Health Sciences. With respect to resolution of these ten cases, one case was withdrawn the day before the pre-hearing conference was to be

held, two cases were settled by mediation, and two cases were mediated, with the settlements awaiting final signatures in one case and final review and action by the vice president for academic affairs in the other case. In one case, a full hearing was conducted, with the final findings and recommendations out for review and comment by the parties at this writing, while in another case, the hearing is in progress at this writing. Of these three new cases, the preliminary conference has been held in one case, while the other two cases are in the period of discovery.

#### RULE REVISIONS

Adoption of the new tenure regulations in 1985 made the Judicial Committee's rules of procedure partially obsolete. Early in the current academic year, the committee reviewed a draft of a revised set of rules which were designed to bring the committee's rules into conformity with the new tenure regulations, to clarify them, and to make certain improvements. The committee approved these revised rules and sent them on to the Tenure Committee for review and approval. That approval was granted on April 16, 1987.

#### STUDY OF IMPACT OF JUDICIAL CASES ON COMPLAINANTS AND RESPONDENTS

One of the tasks which the Senate Judicial Committee has actively pursued during this academic year has been the development of a study which will consider the impact of the judicial process on complainants and respondents. The committee is interested in learning complainants' and respondents' opinions on the judicial process and their ideas about possible alternatives to Judicial hearings for resolving conflicts. A subcommittee developed a set of questionnaires which will be administered to complainants who have brought a grievance before the Senate Judicial Committee (those who have won and those who have lost), to respondents, as well as to certain administrators, some faculty members who have not brought a case before the Judicial Committee, and former members of the Senate Judicial Committee. It is hoped that this survey will be completed during the summer, with the data tabulated and a report prepared by the end of fall quarter, 1987.

#### ANNUAL MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENT

The annual meeting with the president was deferred until fall, when it will be possible to discuss with him the outcome of the survey described above.

#### MEMBERSHIP AND MEETINGS OF THE SENATE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

The Judicial Committee had, as of this writing, seven meetings during the 1986-87 academic year; two meetings remain. Panels of the Judicial Committee have also met a number of times to conduct proceedings in particular cases. In addition, the chair of the Judicial Committee has been actively involved during the year in mediating three of the cases. Because of the number of cases before it, there may be need for several meetings during the summer.

The Judicial Committee is an all-faculty committee composed of tenured faculty members. Its members in 1986-87 were: Amos Deinard (Chair), F.R.P. Akehurst, Laird Barber, Carole Bland, Clara Bloomfield, Miriam Cohn, Hans Courant, Adele Donchenko, Timothy Dunnigan, Arnold Flikke, Donna Forbes, Janice Hogan, James Jordan, Norman Kerr, Candace Kruttschnitt, C. Robert Morris, Patrice Morrow, Roger Park, Stephen Prager, Kathryn Reyerson, Gordon Swanson, Paul Waibel, Andrew Whitman, and Frank Wood. The members who served as hearing officers in 1986-87 were: Arnold Flikke (Fischer v. Lukermann), F. R. P. Akehurst (Trollip v. Glenn), Carole Bland (Anderson v. Fahy), Gordon Swanson (Kepner v. Brown), Janice Hogan (Ureata v. Fahy), Laird Barber (Yellin v. Clayton), Arnold Flikke (Livinghouse v. Miller), C. Robert Morris (Tapp v. Lukermann), Roger Park (Sylvester v. Sargeant and Meyer) and Andrew Whitman (Harford v. Duvall et al.).

As the 1986-87 chair, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee for the tireless and diligent commitment they have made to furthering the judicial process and thereby serving the University community.

**AMOS DEINARD**  
Chair

*Accepted*

## VI. ADJOURNMENT

### ABSTRACT

The University Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Kenneth Keller in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus. Coordinate campuses were linked by phone.

*Administrative positions, selection and review.* Phillips Shively, professor of political science and Consultative Committee member, presented guidelines for the selection and review of persons to hold middle management positions. He explained that the Consultative Committee had been concerned for search procedures as well as for making clear the responsibilities of officials for those who worked under them, and enabling them to act clearly and decisively in the selection and review process. The guidelines would also broaden the scope of search committees. There was no discussion and the motion for adoption of the guidelines was approved.

*Committee appointments.* Bylaw amendments and a rules amendment to shift responsibility for naming members to the All-University Honors and Business and Rules Committees from the Consultative Committee to the Committee on Committees were introduced by Shirley Clark, professor of educational policy and administration and Consultative Committee member. She reminded the Senate that every three years the Committee on Committees made a survey of faculty interest in serving on committees which had proved useful in its work so it seemed appropriate for that committee to name all committees except those that came within the purview of the Consultative Committee. The three motions were joined by the chair and approved unanimously.

*Minority programs, Commitment to Focus.* Andrew Collins, professor of child development and chair of the Educational Policy Committee, spoke to his committee's motion for the Senate to endorse the establishment of programs to expand and coordinate recruitment and retention of minority students that were recommended by the Commitment to Focus Special Committee on Minority Programs. He accepted as a friendly amendment from Tim Pratt, student body president, the addition of language to ensure continuance of the program. The motion was then approved unanimously.

*Faculty-student governance structure.* The annual report of the Consultative Committee contained a section on the recent review of the University's governance structure by an external team. Michael Rodriguez, student, asked whether the internal study group would be reviewing the report of the external team. Ellen Berscheid, professor of psychology and Consultative Committee chair, responded that on June 4 that matter would be on the agenda of the Faculty Consultative and Student Consultative Committees when they would meet together. Then next year there would probably be a forum and further discussion in the University Senate. At that time a decision would be made as to whether the original self-survey team should be involved further.

*CIA on campus.* Brenda Ellingboe, student, reintroduced her resolution calling for discontinuance of space and service for Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) interviews on campus. She recalled that the initial presentation of her proposal took place at the November Senate meeting, at which time it was forwarded to the Consultative Committee as an item of new business. That committee had sent it to the Social Concerns and Placement Services Committees for their recommendations. She called attention to the May 11 letter to all senators which was signed by faculty members and students endorsing her proposal. She declared that the issue was not one of free speech and said she would welcome a chance to have the CIA at an open forum to present its views. However, recruiting was a separate issue, she said. The Student Consultative Committee favored the motion, and she believed that the student voice had spoken for the resolution, as well as a number of faculty members who had spoken to her personally. She said such interaction had been very rewarding to her, and the kind of support she had received could not be compared with any issue she had ever worked on before.

Dan Krislov, student, thought such action by the University would not affect CIA recruitment at all—that the motion was simply a symbolic act and would set a dangerous precedent. He said moral choices belonged to the individual student. Hernan Vidal, professor of

Spanish and Portuguese, favored the Ellingboe resolution, saying that it would be making a strong statement in the face of an organization that had taken foreign policy into its own hands. No other recruiting agency was like it, he said. As a native of Chile, he said, he looked on the issue as one involving human rights, in which an agency was involved not just in defense of its country but in making warfare. Steven Schafer, student, spoke against the motion, indicating he was not apologizing for the CIA and was aware of some of its atrocities, but that banning them would be a threat to free speech on campus and would open up a Pandora's box where there could be no end of possibilities. He said students should be able to decide for themselves and that the University would not appear to be endorsing terrorism any more than it endorses corporatism by permitting companies to recruit on campus. He favored the Social Concerns Committee resolution approved by the Senate on April 16, which called for a committee to monitor recruiting, for dissemination to students of information about the CIA and its activities, and a statement that the University does not endorse CIA activities.

Tim Pratt, student body president, reported that the Minnesota Student Association had voted 22 to 19 for the resolution, which he said showed a sense of ownership of the University by the students. He said students found the CIA presence on campus morally reprehensible and he, for example, would not invite the CIA into his own home. Vernon Weckwerth, professor of hospital and health care administration, supported the principle of rights of the CIA. He said the appropriate debate was not their actions; it should not be a matter of piling up arguments. He said the Senate had failed to read the history of intellect if it voted the CIA off campus, that the best way to change policy was by infiltration, not confrontation. At this point a motion to suspend the rules to permit more than the allotted 15 minutes was defeated, 75 yes to 70 no, with two-thirds affirmative needed for suspension. The motion itself failed, 47 to 94, with 3 abstentions.

*Freedom of speech.* Mark Brenner, professor of horticulture and landscape architecture and Consultative Committee member, moved to suspend the rules to take up two resolutions. One called for an ongoing open forum that would permit expression of all viewpoints on issues and a second condemned actions that prevent speakers from presenting their views. He referred to the recent appearance of Vice President George Bush on campus, when his speech was rudely interrupted. The vote to suspend was approved almost unanimously. Naomi Scheman, professor of philosophy and women's studies, addressed the second resolution. She said the right of free speech was also a right to be embarrassed and that no one had a right to a University audience. She said the Bush address could not be considered a full discussion—that the speaker had answered only a few carefully screened questions, and that the University had encouraged passive participation which was "out of sync" with its mission. Roy St. Laurent, Student Consultative Committee chair, maintained that everyone had a right of free speech, including those with unpopular views. Stephen Boland, student, deplored the Senate action in refusing more time for the Ellingboe resolution, calling it a denial of free speech when others wanted to address the issue. Mr. Brenner said people should be given the opportunity to make their presentations without being shouted down; challenges could be made in an orderly way. When asked who would do the inviting in the second resolution, Mr. Brenner said it would be by any *bona fide* organization. The first resolution was approved unanimously and second, 99 to 34.

*Sexual harassment survey.* A motion with respect to a sexual harassment survey was withdrawn by Brenda Ellingboe, one of the proposers.

A motion of commendation for Ellen Berscheid, chair of the Consultative Committee, was offered by Phillips Shively, professor of political science and Consultative Committee member, as he recognized the year's efforts of both Ms. Berscheid and Roy St. Laurent, Student Consultative Committee chair. The Senate endorsed his motion unanimously and enthusiastically with applause. Following a tribute to two deceased students, the meeting was adjourned.

The Faculty Senate was called to order by President Keller following the Student Senate meeting.

*Faculty Development Committee.* A final interim report of the Faculty Development Committee was distributed before the meeting.

*Faculty benefits.* Geoffrey Maruyama, professor of educational psychology and chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented a motion for Faculty Senate approval of a proposal to establish two benefit options for the faculty—dependent care and medical reimbursement—with established ceilings for each. He reported that the proposed ceiling of \$6,000 for medical reimbursement was not yet a firm figure, as David Swanson of Employee Benefits wanted to ensure that the ceiling would be nondiscriminatory. He pointed out that allocations could be made by the faculty member from salary in pre-tax dollars. When asked where funds not spent during a fiscal year would go, Mr. Swanson said his office would encourage faculty members to be careful in their selection in the first place, but that any unused funds would be distributed to participants the following year. He said the plan would include payment of health insurance premiums. Mr. Maruyama added that out-patient mental health coverage, which was dropped last year, would be available. The motion was then approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

**MARILEE WARD**  
Abstractor

# UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

The meeting of the Student Senate was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the meeting of the University Senate. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Check or signing the roll as present were 47 voting members of the student body.

## I. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT

(5 minutes)

see abstract

## II. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

### ANNUAL REPORT, 1986-87

Information (10 minutes)

*Membership:* John Bremer, succeeded in January by Kim Carlson (Waseca Campus); Patrick Durbin, succeeded in January by Jill Gaudette (Twin Cities); Brenda Ellingboe (Twin Cities); Jon Grahek, succeeded in January by Tim Allison (Duluth Campus); Ron Kubik (Morris Campus); Sarah O'Clair, succeeded in January by Don Peterson (Crookston Campus); Roy St. Laurent (Twin Cities), Chair; Andy Seitel (Twin Cities), Associate Chair; Bruce Vandal (Twin Cities).

(Note: Readers may also wish to examine the annual report of the Senate Consultative Committee in the University Senate minutes, and the annual report of the Assembly Steering Committee in the minutes of the Twin Cities Assembly. Much of the activity of the SSCC occurred in one or the other of these bodies.)

The Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) will, by early June, have met regularly seventeen times this academic year including an orientation for new members of the committee to be held on May 28. Three additional meetings were held: an informal breakfast with President Keller and Vice President for Student Affairs Wilderson; a retreat to discuss the Draft Report of the Task Force on Student Services Fees; and a meeting of the Ad Hoc Policy Committee.

**GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND REVIEW.** In the fall of 1985, the student members of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) recommended to the SCC that the committee undertake a review of the University's student-faculty governance structure. An internal self-study was completed in the spring of 1986 and followed by an external review in February of 1987. The SSCC met with the members of the external review team, as well as organizing meetings between the review team and both current and former student leaders from the entire University system. SSCC is currently studying the reports from the review team and the committee fully expects that proposals for improving student governance will be forthcoming early in the fall quarter 1987.

**STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.** During the course of examining a comprehensive revision of procedures and policies governing academic freedom and responsibility grievances for students and faculty, and policies governing administrative grievances for faculty, the SSCC became painfully aware of the inadequacy and confusion surrounding grievance procedures available to students. After meeting with Nicholas Barbatsis (Director of the Special Counseling Office), the committee established a subcommittee consisting of SSCC members Patrick Durbin and Bruce Vandal to investigate the scope of problems students encounter when dealing with grievance issues at the University. Of particular interest to the committee was the area of administrative grievances, i.e., student ability to grieve administrative decisions determining student status or financial aid eligibility. The subcommittee found, and the SSCC concurred, that: students are poorly informed as to their ability to grieve both academic and administrative decisions affecting them; and when procedures do exist, they are often confusing and unjust to the griever. The subcommittee was unable

to bring forward a specific recommendation for change because of the convoluted and confusing policies governing the whole topic of grievances. Rather, the SSCC proposed to the full Senate Consultative Committee that the entire area of student grievances receive a more thorough examination. Further information on this issue may be found in the Annual Report of the Steering Committee in the Twin Cities Assembly Minutes.

**ACADEMIC PLANNING: STRATEGY FOR FOCUS.** The SSCC met in the fall with Provost Benjamin to discuss the overall planning process that has begun with the intent of implementing much of the academic change implicit in Commitment to Focus. SSCC was especially concerned with the priority assigned to undergraduate education. The committee thought it particularly important that the planning process be cognizant of the needs and increased presence of nontraditional students at the University. The SSCC appointed two students to the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Planning: Stephen Kohlmeyer (CLA) and Steven Prince (Grad). The committee is particularly pleased to have Mr. Kohlmeyer serve as a member of the SSCC for 1987-1988, as he will provide a valuable link to the work of the Provost's Task Force.

**STUDENT SERVICES FEES.** The SSCC spent a significant amount of time discussing the Draft Report of the Task Force on Student Services Fees commissioned by the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. The report suggests a number of changes in the fashion in which the fees process is administered on each of the campuses of the University. The SSCC met with Frank Wilderson, Vice President for Student Affairs, to discuss with him our views on the many recommendations in the report. It was clear that on many of the proposed recommendations there was no consensus. Many of the recommendations were felt to be solutions to problems with the fees process on the Twin Cities campus and not appropriate or desirable for the Crookston, Duluth, Morris and Waseca campuses. Because of the widely divergent opinions expressed by students leaders throughout the system on this topic, a two-day retreat was organized by student representatives to the Board of Regents to attempt to facilitate a common response to the draft report and bring forward alternative recommendations for the Vice President's consideration. The retreat was attended by members of the SSCC and many valuable recommendations were brought forward. Subsequently these recommendations were examined by a reconstituted task force, a final report was written, and scrutinized by the SSCC. The committee pronounced itself satisfied with the end product and has conveyed that message to the Vice President. The recommendations from central administration regarding student services fees have been forwarded to the Board of Regents for their consideration. These recommendations are substantially in agreement with the final recommendations of the committee.

**STUDENT LOBBYING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SLAC).** SLAC was constituted in the fall quarter to coordinate the lobbying effort of University students at the state capitol. Initially the SSCC formed the core of the SLAC committee until representatives from the five campuses could be gathered. Further information about SLAC can be found in the SLAC report elsewhere in these minutes.

**UNIVERSITY CREDIT UNION.** The committee forwarded to the Student Senate a resolution supporting the formation of a credit union within the University for use by students, faculty, staff and alumni. The resolution was passed by the Student Senate at the February 19 meeting. It was apparent, however, that student senators from the Duluth campus were concerned with access to the proposed credit union on their campus. Sensitive to this issue, the SSCC met with Roger Paschke, University Director of Investments, to discuss this item. We were informed that initially a credit union office would be put in place on the Twin Cities campus, and automatic teller machines would be available at the four other campuses. The amount of time before an office is opened on the other campuses will depend upon the needs of a particular campus and the willingness of the campus community to support the credit union.

**SDI FORUM.** The SSCC endorsed and proposed that the Student Senate become a sponsor of an SDI Forum being planned for October of 1987. The resolution making the Student Senate a co-sponsor of the event received Senate approval at the April 16 meeting. The so-called SDI Forum will go beyond discussions of the Strategic Defense Initiative to

include broad debate on the entire issue of academic freedom and restriction of research. SSCC member Brenda Ellingboe has taken an extraordinarily active role in ensuring that the forum will be a success.

**AD HOC POLICY COMMITTEE.** The Ad Hoc Policy Committee is composed of the eight student representatives to the Board of Regents and the nine members of the Student Senate Consultative Committee and is chaired by the SSCC chair. The Ad Hoc Policy Committee is charged with overseeing the election procedures governing the student representatives and related issues. The Ad Hoc Policy Committee met in October to consider proposed changes to the election procedures for each of the five campuses. A uniform set of election procedures was discussed and forwarded to the five campuses for the approval of each campus student association or student senate.

**NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.** Most of the nomination and appointment responsibilities of the SSCC are detailed in the annual reports of the SCC and the Twin Cities Assembly Steering Committee. Of particular note, however, is the nomination of the Chair of the Student Senate who is also the single representative of University of Minnesota students to the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) of the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). That nomination will be before the Student Senate at the May 14 meeting.

The Student Senate Consultative Committee dealt with a number of other very important issues that are described in detail in the annual reports of the Senate Consultative Committee and the Twin Cities Assembly Steering Committee. All of the educational policy issues and many of the steering items were discussed in both the SSCC and the SCC (or Twin Cities Assembly Steering Committee). I refer you to the named reports for further information.

On a final note, I would like to thank Mary Jane Plunkett for her years of service as an informal advisor to the SSCC and to student governance generally. Mary Jane has provided us with a valuable resource that all too often students must do without, namely a reference point and wellspring of information regarding "what has gone on before." I join with the entire Student Senate Consultative Committee in wishing her well on the occasion of her retirement from the University.

**ROY T. ST. LAURENT**  
Chair

*Accepted*

**III. ELECTION, CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR,  
STUDENT SENATE, 1987-88**  
(10 minutes)

*Contact with coordinate campuses was lost. Election will take place after nominations are solicited from all campuses, with mail ballots accompanied by a statement from each candidate.*

**IV. APPOINTMENT, CLERK, STUDENT SENATE, 1987-88**  
(2 minutes)

*Marilee Ward was elected.*

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**  
(10 minutes)

see abstract

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

## ABSTRACT

The Student Senate was called to order by its chair, Andy Seitel, following the University Senate meeting. A tentative report of pending conference committee bills and final passage of bills at the Legislature was distributed (on file in Office of the Clerk of the Senate). Mr. Seitel reminded the body that its next chair would be serving an important role on the Student Advisory Committee on the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board. Tim Allison, UMD, and Tim Pratt, Twin Cities campus, were nominated for the position of chair of next year's Student Senate. It appeared that telephone contact with the coordinate campuses had been lost, so Roy St. Laurent suggested that the election could wait until fall or done by mail ballot. The chair ruled that balloting could be by mail but before that he would solicit those campuses immediately for any other nominees for the position. Then each candidate would prepare a brief statement that would accompany the ballots.

David Dahlgren deplored the failure of the University Senate to extend the time for consideration of the freedom of speech resolution, saying that he thought the Senate served to protect minorities and let them be heard and that by its action had deprived him of the right to hear a full debate. Stephen Boland gave special thanks to Brenda Ellingboe for the efficient way she had managed the CIA matter. The meeting was then adjourned.

**MARILEE WARD**  
Abstractor

## APPENDIX A

### ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS, 1986-87

The University Senate met four times during 1986-87.

FACULTY	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Adams, Carl	3	0
Adelman, Ira	3	0
Anderson, Neil	2	1
Aroskar, Mila	3	1
Baizerman, Michael	1	1
Balfour, Henry	2	0
Banerjee, Subir	2	2
Beavers, Gordon	2	1
Benson, Ellis	4	0
Benson, Katherine	3	1
Blinn, Charles	2	2
Bloomfield, Clara	3	0
Bognanno, Mario	2	1
Born, David	3	0
Bouchard, Thomas	3	1
Bruininks, Robert	3	0
Brunning, Richard	3	1
Byrne, Richard	1	2
Cardwell, Vernon	2	2
Cerra, Frank	0	1
Charvat, Iris	3	0
Chou, Shelley	2	1
Christenson, Richard	4	0
Clay, David	3	1
Clayton, Paula	4	0
Coen, Edward	2	0
Collins, Terence	3	0

Congdon, Jean	4	0
Conley, Thomas	0	1
Courant, Hans	4	0
Crisham, Patricia	4	0
Dahler, John	3	0
Dehner, Louis	3	0
Desborough, Sharon	3	0
Dothan, Michael	2	2
Dworkin, Martin	4	0
Dykstra, Robert	3	0
Eaton, Marcia	3	0
Eidman, Vernon	3	0
Ellinger, Linda	4	0
Enfield, Frank	4	0
Erdman, Arthur	4	0
Eustis, Nancy	3	1
Evans, Samuel	3	1
Ferrieri, Patricia	2	2
Foster, Edward	2	1
Freier, Phyllis	3	0
Fuchs, James	4	0
Galambos, Theodore	3	1
Gault, N. L.	3	1
Geisser, Seymour	4	0
Gentry, William	4	0
Giese, Clayton	3	0
Giese, David	4	0
Gillmor, Donald	1	2
Gooch, Van	0	3
Goodman, Lawrence	4	0
Grantham, Marilyn	3	1
Gray, John	3	0
Gray, Virginia	4	0
Hafferty, Frederic	3	1
Haller, Edwin	2	1
Hamilton, David	4	0
Hancher, Michael	2	2
Hein, Andrew	3	1
Hoff, David	3	0
Holum, Katharine	4	0
House, James	1	2
Howe, John	3	0
Hoyle, Karen	2	1
Hsu, Mei-Ling	4	0
Hunter, Alan	4	0
Hurwicz, Leo	4	0
Joeres, Ruth-Ellen	4	0
Johnson, Carol	4	0
Johnson, Robert	4	0
Johnson, Walter	4	0
Keynes, Harvey	3	0
Krivit, William (terminated 4/87)	0	0
Kumar, K.S.P.	4	0
Larson, Roger	2	1
Lehmberg, Stanford	3	1
Lewis, Darrell	2	1
Liu, Benjamin	2	2

Macosko, Chris	2	1
Malmberg, John	3	1
Matheson, John	3	0
McCollister, Robert	3	1
McGinnis, Barbara	4	0
McKeever, Patrick	3	1
McKinnon, Jane	1	3
Mirkin, Bernard	1	1
Monson, Dianne	3	0
Montgomery, Jean	4	0
Moss, Jerome	2	2
Murray, David	2	2
Nelson, David	2	1
Nelson, Joel	2	2
Ney, Edward	4	0
Olson, William	3	0
Orey, Steven	4	0
Overmier, J. Bruce	0	4
Pace, David	1	3
Parker, John	1	3
Peterson, Fred	2	1
Peterson, Kathleen	4	0
Piche, Gene	4	0
Popkin, Michael	3	1
Prell, Riv-Ellen	2	1
Pucel, David	3	0
Purple, Richard	3	0
Quam, Jean	3	1
Ramsay, Norma	3	0
Rasmusson, Donald	2	1
Regal, Philip	4	0
Reyerson, Kathryn	1	2
Ryden, Muriel	3	1
Schultz, Chester	4	0
Shapiro, George	2	1
Sherman, David	3	0
Shier, Thomas	4	0
Silberman, Robert	4	0
Simon, Stephen	1	2
Stefan, Heinz	3	1
Steffes, Michael	2	1
Stein, Marvin	1	3
Stienstra, Ward	1	3
Stuewer, Roger	2	2
Stuthman, Deon	3	1
Swan, Craig	3	0
Swan, Patricia	4	0
Tellegen, Auke	3	1
Tracy, James	1	1
Ulstrom, Robert	2	0
VanEssendelft, William	4	0
Vernier, Robert	3	0
Walser, Mary	2	2
Warner, William	3	1
Waters, Luther	3	1
Weckwerth, Vernon	4	0
White, James	2	0

Williams, Gloria	4	0
Woodward, Jean	4	0
Young, Lynda	2	0
Zaidi, Mahmood	3	1

#### CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Berscheid, Ellen	4	0
Brenner, Mark	3	0
Campbell, Charles	4	0
Clark, Shirley	2	1
Goldstein, Richard	4	0
Latterell, Joseph	3	0
Melsa, Cleon	2	0
Murphy, Paul	0	0
Phillips, Ronald	4	0
Shively, W. Phillips	4	0

#### STUDENTS

Akins, Bobby (appointed 12/86)	1	1
Alexander, Karin	4	0
Arreaza, Sonia	4	0
Bergstrom, Gordon	4	0
Blood, John (resigned 2/87)	1	0
Boland, Stephen	3	1
Brown, Mark (appointed 3/87)	1	0
Carter, Miguel (resigned 11/86)	1	0
Dahlgren, David (appointed 4/87)	2	0
Daniels, Thomas	4	0
Davy, Mary (resigned 2/87)	0	1
Day, Stephanie	3	0
Denn, Ron	3	0
Dewanz, Karen	3	1
Dye, Travis (appointed 4/87)	2	0
Ebnet, Kathy	3	0
Eliason, Wendy	0	1
Ettinger, Mark (appointed 4/87)	2	0
Fink, Jim	2	0
Giese, Anne (appointed 3/87)	0	1
Goodwin, Lisa (terminated 3/87)	0	0
Gordon, Richard	4	0
Guenther, Greg (appointed 3/87)	1	0
Gupta, Prem	2	0
Haley, Daniel (resigned 2/87)	1	0
Halvorson, Wade (terminated 3/87)	0	0
Hartman, Lisa	2	2
Hauser, Libby (appointed 3/87)	2	0
Hochstetler, Kathy (resigned 1/87)	1	0
Hohnstadt, Ivan	2	0
Hollerman, Mary (appointed 3/87)	0	0
Huang, Han Wen	2	0
Javier, Mata (terminated 3/87)	0	0
Jodl, Katie	3	0
Kohlmeyer, Steve (appointed 4/87)	2	0
Krenik, Ed	3	1
Krislov, Dan (appointed 4/87)	2	0
Lacy, Peter	2	1
Larson, Robert	4	0
Lovelace, Thomas	3	0

McCallum, Kris (appointed 5/87)	0	0
Murphy, Shannon	2	0
Myster, Steve (appointed 3/87)	2	0
Nelson, Kirk	2	0
Nelson, Tom (appointed 3/87)	0	0
Nordlie, Eric (appointed 12/86)	3	0
Norton, Doug	4	0
O'Brien, Caroline (resigned 11/86)	1	0
Olson, Jeff	2	0
Pfankuch, Joseph	2	0
Pineda, Roberto (appointed 3/87)	1	0
Piraino, R. David	3	1
Pride, Stan (appointed 3/87)	0	0
Propson, Thomas (appointed 2/87)	2	0
Reddy, Ravinder	4	0
Remwolt, Lisa (appointed 4/87)	1	0
Rodriguez, Michael	4	0
Ruble, Phil	1	2
Sandin, Kara	3	1
Sauer, Jerry	2	0
Saxena, Vivek (appointed 1/87)	1	1
Schafer, Steve (appointed 3/87)	2	0
Schleter, Tom (appointed 3/87)	2	0
Schmit, Tom (appointed 3/87)	0	0
Schulte, Theresa (appointed 12/86)	3	0
Schuneman, Jane (appointed 12/86)	2	0
Shutt, Howard	3	0
Sommerfeld, Thomas	4	0
Steinert, Jennifer	1	1
Sullivan, Linda	4	0
Thomas, Gary	4	0
Trainer, Scott (appointed 4/87)	2	0
Vanstone, Allison	2	0
Weber, Barbara (terminated 3/87)	0	0
Williams, Bruce	2	0
Zweber, Valentine	3	1

#### CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Allison, Timothy (appointed 1/87)	3	0
Carlson, Kim (appointed 1/87)	0	0
Durbin, Patrick (resigned 12/86)	1	0
Ellingboe, Brenda	4	0
Gaudette, Jill	3	0
Grahek, Jon (resigned 12/86)	1	0
Kubik, Ron	4	0
O'Clair, Sarah (resigned 12/86)	0	0
Peterson, Don (appointed 1/87)	1	0
Seitel, Andy	3	0
St. Laurent, Roy	4	0
Vandal, Bruce	4	0

Terminations are due to neglect of meetings.

# FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the University Student Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 117 voting members of the faculty. President Kenneth Keller presided.

## I. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1987-88

### Action (3 minutes)

Student, alumni, and civil service memberships will be reported at the first Faculty Senate meeting fall quarter.

**FACULTY AFFAIRS** Faculty: Geoffrey Maruyama (chr.), Mark Brenner, Lance Brockmam, Frank Enfield, W. Bruce Erickson, Shirley Garner, Willard Hartup, Harvey Keynes, Robert Kudrle, Toni McNaron, Bruce Overmier, Marian Pour-El, Richard Richards (UMM), Stephen Scallen, Mary Walser.

**FACULTY RETIREMENT PLAN** Faculty: Stephen Scallen (chr.), Richard Goldstein, Donald Rasmusson.

**JUDICIAL** Faculty: Amos Deinard (chr.), F.R.P. Akehurst, Carole Bland, Clara Bloomfield, Miriam Cohn, Hans Courant, Adele Donchenko, Timothy Dunnigan, Donna Forbes (UMD), Richard Goodkind, Lawrence Goodman, James Jordan, Norman Kerr, Candace Kruttschnitt, C. Robert Morris, Roger Park, Gordon Swanson, Richard Sykes, Wolfgang Taraba, Phillip Tichenor, Paul Waibel, Arthur Walzer, Andrew Whitman, Frank Wood.

**TENURE** Faculty: Philip Frickey (chr.), Richard Arvey, Daniel Feeney, Miriam Frenier (UMM), Audrey Grosch, H. E. Mason, 1 to be named.

*Approved*

## II. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

### FINAL INTERIM REPORT

#### Information and Discussion (10 Minutes)

**REVIEW OF THE REPORT:** We expect to deliver our report on June 1 to the Faculty Consultative Committee and the President. We assume that the report will then be reviewed, and its recommendations considered, by several Senate committees and by administrative planning, budgeting, and coordinating groups. We hope that committees responsible for faculty planning in colleges will also review the report. The draft version of our report, available about May 22, will be sent to the FCC, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Senate Finance Committee, as well as to the President. This will provide a *brief* opportunity for these recipients to comment about any major concerns before the final copy of the report is submitted.

**FACULTY SALARY PLAN:** We hope that a recommendation on a new faculty salary plan will be brought to the Faculty Senate next fall. The recommendation that we will forward in our report will be based on goals set in relation to salaries in a group of 29 other universities (including both public and private institutions). We will provide an analysis of salary trends in recent years to substantiate our conclusion that Big Ten salaries are lagging behind those of comparable universities in other regions of the country. We will further argue that our competition for resources (faculty, students, research funds) is national rather than regional; hence, our goals must be based on national, rather than simply regional, considerations. We will also report that a more detailed examination of our progress toward goals set by the Senate's current faculty salary plan suggests that we are lagging behind the "catch-up" pace we had set for ourselves.