

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

April 27, 1989

The third meeting of the University Senate for 1988-89 was convened in 45 Nicholson Hall, Minneapolis campus, at 3:15 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 114 voting members of the faculty/academic professionals, 35 voting members of the student body, 5 ex officio, and 11 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 16

Action (3 minutes)

Approved

II. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS, 1989-90

Information

In the recent election to fill faculty vacancies on the Senate Consultative Committee, W. Andrew Collins (Education), Norman Kerr (Biological Sciences), and Charlotte Striebel (IT) were elected for 3-year terms (1989-92). Continuing members will be Warren Ibele (IT), Lynnette Mullins (Crookston), J. Bruce Overmier (CLA), Ronald Phillips (Agriculture), Kathleen Price (Law), and James Van Alstine (Morris).

Accepted

III. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1989-90

Action (5 minutes)

The constitution provides that a Vice Chair shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring quarter from among its members for a term of one year starting July 1.

Professor Michael Steffes was re-elected.

IV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES, REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE

Action (30 minutes)

The Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance Procedures recommends adoption of the proposed grievance procedures which are set forth below. We have reviewed a number of comments which have been received from members of the faculty, academic staff, adminis-

tration, and students. Where possible, we have incorporated those suggestions into our proposal.

Our proposal attempts to combine flexibility (encouragement of negotiated settlements, the ability to construct panels which are appropriate for an individual case) with firmness (an insistence upon a rigorous timetable, avoidance of completely ad hoc solutions). It seeks to meld the advantages of centralization (expertise with regard to University-wide policies, impartiality, and remoteness from the particular dispute) with those of localized dispute resolution (expertise in the problems of the particular discipline, familiarity with the situation).

The grievance procedures which we propose should be thought of as a last resort or nearly-last resort. We want to encourage all participants to resolve disputes in better ways, but to hold this relatively formal mechanism available when that cannot be accomplished. We believe that this should simplify an overly complex grievance system which now exists. We hope that it will lead to a resolution of many outstanding complaints. We trust that it will bring an improvement to the University.

Amos Deinard
Fred L. Morrison
Charlotte Striebel

MOTION:

That the grievance procedures as outlined below be approved.

GRIEVANCE

SECTION 1. PURPOSE.

1.1 Purpose. The purpose of these rules is to provide a just, efficient, and final resolution of grievances between members of the University community regarding the application of University rules and policies within the limits set out below.

1.2 Use of Informal Procedures. Those who have grievances should seek to resolve them by informal means, before resorting to these formal procedures. They are encouraged:

first, to attempt to resolve the matter directly with the person whom they believe to have violated the University policy or rule, and

second, to seek informal resolution with the assistance of a departmental grievance officer,

before filing a formal grievance under these rules. Use of these informal procedures is not a prerequisite to the filing of a formal grievance. Individuals are cautioned that time limits established by these rules are firm, and that pursuit of informal processes is not an excuse for failure to comply with them.

1.3 Duties of Parties. The party who files a grievance and the party against whom it is filed have the responsibility to present the evidence relating to the controversy. Other members of the University community may be required to attend and give evidence. The grievance officers and committees established by this policy will not conduct independent investigations, but will rather hear and determine the cases on the basis of the evidence presented to them.

1.4 Time Limits. Persons who do not file a formal grievance within the required time period will be considered to have agreed to the action taken. The mere fact that such a person is pursuing informal efforts to resolve the dispute is not a basis for extending the time limits or waiving this rule. (See rules 3.5 and 8.1.)

SECTION 2. COMMITTEES AND OFFICERS.

2.1 University Grievance Committee. The University Grievance Committee consists of at least 9 members appointed by the Senate Committee on Committees with approval by the Senate. A majority of the members of the committee must be members of the regular

faculty. Students, academic professional and administrative staff¹ personnel, and civil service employees are also represented. The Chair is selected by the Senate Committee on Committees. The University Grievance Officer is an ex-officio, non-voting member.

2.2 Standing Subcommittee on Procedure. The University Grievance Committee will form a 3 member Standing Subcommittee on Procedure, and will provide for alternates. The Subcommittee performs the functions described in section 4.29.

2.3 University Grievance Officer. The University Grievance Officer is appointed by the President with the concurrence of the University Grievance Committee. The person appointed should be an individual with recognized stature in the University community, free from direct administrative influence. In the absence of the University Grievance Officer, the Chair of the University Grievance Committee performs the functions assigned to that office.

2.4 College Grievance Committees. Each collegiate unit has a grievance committee. The size and composition of each college grievance committee is established by the college with the approval of the University Grievance Committee, subject to the following limitations:

(a) Each college committee consists of at least 6 members.

(b) One-third of the members of the college committee are "University delegates," who are faculty members or academic staff members from outside of the college, appointed by the Senate Committee on Committees.²

(c) The remaining members are "college delegates," who are representative of faculty, academic staff, civil service employees, and students of the college, appointed in accordance with the college constitution.

(d) The chair of the college grievance committee is named by the University Grievance Officer from among the University delegates.

2.5 Additional Members. If there are insufficient members of the University Grievance Committee or of a college grievance committee to constitute a panel, the original appointing authority may appoint additional members.

2.6 Departmental Grievance Officers. Each department or other academic or administrative unit appoints a grievance officer or committee who will assist in the informal resolution of grievances within the unit and who will provide information about formal grievance procedures.

SECTION 3. JURISDICTION.

3.1 Jurisdiction. The University grievance procedures established by these rules provide an independent review and speedy resolution of all grievances that arise within the University community subject to the following conditions:

(a) The grievant must have been either a student or an employee of the University at the time the grievance arose. In exceptional cases, the President, the Vice President³ or an appropriate dean may refer to this process a grievance brought by someone who has a close relationship to the University, but is neither a student nor an employee.

(b) The respondent must either have been a student or an employee of the University at the time the grievance arose, or be an academic or administrative unit of the University.

(c) The grievance must allege a serious violation of University rules, regulations, policies, or established practices or of state or federal law.

(d) The grievance must involve substantial harm to the grievant as a result of the alleged violation.

¹Hereafter this group is referred to as "academic staff."

²In the case of the Graduate School, the Committee on Committees may appoint persons as "University delegates," notwithstanding the fact that they are also members of the graduate faculty.

³As used in this policy, "Vice President" means the Vice President for Academic Affairs or Provost. The President may authorize the Chancellors to exercise equivalent authority under this policy with respect to their campuses.

(e) The grievance must propose an appropriate remedy which is within the authority of the University to grant. Any dispute about jurisdiction will be decided by the procedures set forth for the hearing of grievances under these rules.

3.2 Exceptions. This policy does not apply to the following cases:

(a) Cases involving the removal or suspension of a faculty member or denial of tenure, arising under sections 7, 8, 10 or 11 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, or involving denial of promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor will be considered by the Judicial Committee of the University Senate.

(b) Cases involving the removal or suspension of a member of the academic staff or denial of a continuous appointment to a person who holds a probationary appointment under the Academic Professional and Administrative Staff Policies and Procedures will be considered by the Academic Staff Advisory Committee.

(c) Cases arising under the Student Conduct Code will be considered by the Student Behavior Committee.

(d) Cases arising under the Civil Service Rules or Procedures or the personnel policies of the University Hospital and Clinic will be considered by the bodies established under those rules and procedures. Matters which are made non-grievable under those rules cannot be brought under this policy.

(e) Cases involving academic standing or student performance will be considered by the academic standing committee or equivalent body of the appropriate college. Allegations of student cheating will be handled by the academic standing committee or equivalent body of the appropriate college or by the Student Behavior Committee. Controversies which involve only the assignment of grades in individual courses will be reviewed only to the extent and in the manner provided in the policies of the college in which the course was offered.

(f) Any matter involving non-academic student employment will be referred to the Student Employment Grievance procedure, unless the University Grievance Officer determines that it is part of a complex of issues which arises under this grievance policy.

(g) Any matter subject to a collective bargaining agreement will be resolved in the manner provided in that agreement.

3.3 Sexual Harassment Policy Procedures. The University Policy on Sexual Harassment establishes procedures for the filing and initial review of complaints by an intake officer and the Sexual Harassment Board.⁴ After review of the available evidence, the Vice President may:

(a) Initiate proceedings for the removal or suspension of an employee of the University, pursuant to the procedures in the Tenure Regulations, the Academic Professional and Administrative Staff Policy and Procedures, the Civil Service Rules, or other employment policy; or

(b) Impose a punishment other than suspension or removal, in which case the employee may file a grievance against such action under this policy; or

(c) Initiate a proceeding under section 3.6 of this policy.

In all of the above cases, the Vice President has the burden of demonstrating that the employee violated the Sexual Harassment Policy.

3.4 Concurrent Jurisdiction.

3.41 It is the general policy that, to the extent possible, all grievances arising out of a single set of facts should be resolved in a single forum.

3.42 All grievances arising within the context of a case properly before the Judicial Committee or the Academic Staff Advisory Committee will be resolved by those committees, unless that committee refers specific issues back to these grievance procedures.

⁴If an individual files a grievance under this Grievance Policy which alleges sexual harassment, the University Grievance Officer will inform the individual that the assistance of the intake officer and Sexual Harassment Board is available.

3.43 The University Grievance Officer may refer any collateral disputes arising within the context of a case before any of the other bodies listed in section 3.2 to that body or may refer them to the appropriate grievance committee established by this policy.

3.5 Disputes About Jurisdiction. Any dispute about the appropriate body before which a grievance should be heard will be decided by the University Grievance Officer, subject to appeal to the Standing Subcommittee on Procedure. This decision on jurisdiction is binding, both on the grievance committees and panels established by this policy, and on the other bodies mentioned in section 3.2 (a) through (f) of this policy.

3.6 Time Limits. The person seeking review under these rules must file a written statement of the grievance with the University Grievance Officer within 30 calendar days after he or she has received notice of the action challenged. The Officer may, however, extend the time for filing for review for reasons that seem compelling to the Officer, such as mental or physical illness or serious personal or family problems, or doubt concerning when final action leading to the grievance became known to the grievant.

3.7 Additional Jurisdiction; University Complaints. If the Vice President or a dean has reason to believe that a violation of University policies has occurred and has resulted in serious harm to the institution, the Vice President or dean may initiate a formal grievance on behalf of the institution. The Vice President or dean will designate a person to present the case to the grievance committees and otherwise function as "grievant" under these procedures. In this case, the formal statement of grievance need not request a specific remedy, but may leave the recommendation of an appropriate remedy to the hearing panel. The panel may not recommend termination or suspension of employment, but may recommend that proceedings leading to termination or suspension be initiated.

The availability of this procedure does not affect the authority or power of administrators to act unilaterally, but such actions are subject to grievance by the employee as provided in section 3.1.

Administrators are encouraged to use this procedure, rather than to establish *ad hoc* committees.

3.8 Discretionary Decisions. The grievance process does not review the exercise of discretion. If a University policy delegates discretion to some person or group, grievance committees will not substitute their judgment for that of the person or group to whom discretion was delegated. They will only determine whether the person or group followed established procedures and criteria and acted within the scope of that discretion, *i.e.* acted in a rational and evenhanded way in the exercise of the discretion.

SECTION 4. PROCEDURES.

4.1 The Written Statement of the Grievance. The grievant must file a written statement of the grievance with the University Grievance Officer. The written statement of the grievance must contain the following information:

- (a) The name, campus address, and University status of the grievant.
- (b) The name, campus address, and University status of the respondent.
- (c) A statement of the University rule, regulation, policy, established practice, or state or federal law which the grievant has reason to believe has been violated. A verbatim statement should be included or attached, if possible. If the grievant alleges violation of an established University practice, the grievance must include a clear statement of the facts relied upon to demonstrate the existence of such a practice.
- (d) A statement in plain and simple language of the specific actions of the respondent about which the grievant is complaining.

Except in the case of institutional grievances under section 3.6, the statement must also contain:

- (e) A statement of the harm which the grievant claims to have suffered.
- (f) A statement of the relief which the grievant wishes to obtain.

If the grievant believes that the grievance cannot be fully and fairly heard and resolved by a college level grievance panel, the grievant should state the reason for this belief and should

request either (a) a hearing before a panel of the University Grievance Committee or (b) the formation of a panel with representation from more than one college or other unit.

The written statement of the grievance must be signed and dated.

4.2 Preliminary Actions to be Taken by the University Grievance Officer.

4.21 The University Grievance Officer will forward the written statement of grievance to the respondent and will set a time for a formal answer. The Officer may also forward a copy to any other members of the University whose participation would be necessary in the relief requested and inform them that they may be bound by a decision of the grievance. The Officer will allow them to participate as parties or as *amici curiae*.⁵ The Officer will set a time for a formal answer. The Officer may also, if appropriate, request the Vice President to appoint a representative who will respond for the University, and whose actions will bind all administrative units, or who will appear as *amicus curiae*. The Officer will also notify the Sexual Harassment Board of any case involving allegations of sexual harassment and will allow it to participate as *amicus curiae*.

4.22 The University Grievance Officer may require any party to provide a more detailed written statement or answer and set a time for response. The Officer may request a more complete written statement before or after forwarding the statement to the respondents or receiving their answers.

4.23 The University Grievance Officer may dismiss any grievance which is outside of the jurisdiction of this policy or which is frivolous. The Officer may act in this way before or after taking the steps set forth in sections 4.21 and 4.22. The decision will be in writing and will give a summary of reasons.

4.24 If a grievance is within the exceptions listed in section 3.2, the University Grievance Officer will forward it to the appropriate body for hearing. That body must hear the grievance in a timely manner and will treat it as having been filed when it was first filed with the Officer.

4.25 The University Grievance Officer may require the parties to appear in order to simplify the issues and to determine matters of procedure. The Officer will also seek to determine whether an informal resolution of the matter is possible and will inform the parties of alternative procedures available to them.⁶ The Officer may appoint a mediator to assist the parties and will do so, if the parties request. In general, the existence of an effort at mediation is not a reason for delaying the scheduling of a formal hearing or other proceedings for more than 30 days.

4.26 The University Grievance Officer will set a schedule for discovery (the exchange of relevant information) and will rule on disputes relating to discovery. In ruling on discovery requests, the Officer will be guided by the standards set forth in section 8.2.

4.27 The University Grievance Officer will normally refer the case to the collegiate grievance committee of the college in which the grievance arose. The Chair of that Committee will designate the members of the Panel. The Officer may refer a case to a joint panel drawn from two or more collegiate committees if it involves actions by two or more collegiate units. The Officer may refer the case to a panel of the University Grievance Committee if it involves a central University office, or if there is no appropriate collegiate committee, or if it appears to the Officer that justice could not be seen to be done if the hearing were conducted in the college. The fact that a dean or other college officer has taken some action on recommendation of a department or other unit is not sufficient, by itself, to cause such a determination. The Officer will set a timetable within which a hearing should be conducted and a report returned.

4.28 In setting time limits, the University Grievance Officer will be guided by the schedule set forth in section 8.1

4.29 Any party may appeal a decision of the University Grievance Officer to the Standing Subcommittee on Procedure. Unless otherwise directed by the Subcommittee, this ap-

⁵See section 5.23 on the role of an *amicus curiae*.

⁶See, for example, n. 4, *supra*.

peal will be decided on the basis of written submissions. It does not suspend other proceedings in the case.

SECTION 5. THE HEARING.

5.1 The Hearing Panel. The hearing is conducted by a panel of three members of the designated Committee. The Chair of that Committee designates the individual members, subject to the following guidelines:

(a) In the case of college committees, the chair of the panel is a University delegate and the other members are college delegates.⁷

(b) The composition of the panel reflects the University status (faculty, academic staff, student, civil service) of the parties.

(c) The University Grievance Officer rules on challenges for cause. If any member of the panel is thus disqualified, a substitute member is designated by the Chair of the appropriate Committee.

5.2 Conduct of the Hearing.

5.21 The Chair of the hearing panel presides over and conducts the hearing.

5.22 The hearing panel conducts the hearing in accordance with principles of academic due process. In particular,

(a) Each party has the right to examine the evidence presented and to confront and cross-examine all witnesses.

(b) The panel bases its decision solely on the evidence presented at the hearing. It does not conduct its own investigation, nor does it consider allegations or statements outside the context of the hearings. It may take notice of those facts which are common knowledge within the University.

(c) The grievant has the burden of proving by the preponderance of the evidence that the action complained of was in violation of a University rule, regulation, policy, established practice, or state or federal law.

(d) The rules of evidence used in courts do not apply. Hearsay evidence may be admitted, but parties offering such evidence are warned that it may be given little or no weight, especially if direct evidence could have been produced.

5.23 An *amicus curiae* may present its views by oral or written presentation, and may comment on the draft written report of the panel. It is not a party and does not present or examine witnesses.

5.3 The Report of the Panel.

5.31 After completing the hearing, the panel prepares a draft written report, which summarizes the evidence and policies involved and recommends appropriate action or affirms the actions taken. In its deliberations it may discuss aspects of the case with the full committee or with the University Grievance Officer, but only the panel members vote on the final report.

The draft report is circulated to the parties and to *amici curiae* and to any administrators whose actions would be necessary to implement the recommendations. They are given a time limit in which to respond in writing.

5.32 After the expiration of the time limits and consideration of timely responses, the panel prepares a final written report containing its recommendations, which it sends to the University Grievance Officer. The Officer sends copies to the parties, to any administrator who is responsible for its implementation, to *amici curiae*, and to the President and Vice President.

5.4 Settlements. Parties are encouraged to reach voluntary settlements. An informal settlement between the parties results in dismissal of the grievance; this prevents any further proceedings with respect to the grievance at a later time. A formal settlement must be in writing, signed by the parties, and must be filed with the hearing panel (or with the University

⁷In the case of the Graduate School, the chair of the panel should be a "University delegate" who is not a faculty member of the graduate program involved.

Grievance Officer, if there is no hearing panel). It has the effect of a final report under section 5.3, and may be implemented as provided in section 7.

SECTION 6. APPEALS.

6.1 Time Limit for Filing an Appeal. Any party to a grievance or any University administrator responsible for implementing a recommendation may appeal a decision of a hearing panel by filing a written appeal with the University Grievance Officer within 10 working days after the mailing of the panel report. If no appeal is filed, the report is final and binding upon the parties and all University administrators to whom it is addressed.

6.2 Recommendations Involving Suspension or Removal. If a hearing panel recommends removal or suspension or involuntary leave of absence of any employee, the Vice President or other responsible administrator must either initiate formal proceedings before the appropriate body within 10 working days after the mailing of the panel report or be precluded from seeking such remedy. If formal proceedings for removal, suspension, or involuntary leave of absence are initiated, the matter will be heard before the appropriate committee (see section 3.2) and there will be no appeal to the University Grievance Committee. In any other case, the Vice President or other responsible administrator cannot impose a sanction more severe than that originally recommended by the panel.

6.3 Scope and Nature of the Appeal. The University Grievance Committee will review the report to determine whether the parties were afforded due process, and whether the panel proceedings were conducted in accordance with these rules, and will also review the interpretation and application of University policies. It will not review the evidence or the panel's findings of fact unless it determines that the panel denied due process or failed to follow these rules. Unless the Committee directs otherwise, the appeal will be conducted on the basis of written statements only.

6.4 Decision. The Committee will make a written report, deciding the appeal. The report will be filed with the University Grievance Officer, who will distribute it to the parties, affected administrators, *amici curiae*, and to the President and the Vice President.

SECTION 7. IMPLEMENTATION.

7.1 Finality of Decision. The decision of the panel (or of the University Grievance Committee, in case of appeal) is a final recommendation to the responsible University administrators regarding the grievance. Those responsible for implementing the recommendation must notify the University Grievance Officer within 30 calendar days of the steps taken to implement it.

7.2 Failure to Implement Decision. If the person responsible for implementing a recommendation fails to implement it within that period, any other party may request the University Grievance Officer to reopen the case. The Officer will give the responsible person 10 working days in which to demonstrate that the recommendation has been implemented, but will not give the person an opportunity to reargue the original case. If the Officer determines that the recommendation has not been implemented by the end of that period, the Officer will forward the recommendation to the President, together with a notation that the person to whom it was addressed has failed or refused to implement it, and a request on behalf of the University Grievance Committee that the President take the necessary steps to implement the recommendation.

7.3 Additional Review. At any time after the final recommendation (mentioned in section 7.1) has been made, but not more than 30 calendar days after the request to the President (mentioned in section 7.2), the President may request the University Grievance Committee to review a decision in light of its impact on University policy, setting forth reasons. Other parties will be given an opportunity to comment. The additional review will be conducted in the same way as an appeal. The University Grievance Committee will prepare a final report and file it with the University Grievance Officer, who will distribute it to the parties, affected administrators, *amici curiae*, and to the President and the Vice President.

7.4 President's Final Decision. Within 30 calendar days after a request to implement a recommendation (section 7.2) or a final report after additional review (section 7.3), the President will either (a) implement the recommendation or (b) set forth substantive reasons in

writing for not doing so, sending them to the parties and the University Grievance Officer. If the President does not fully implement the recommendation or report within the 30 day period, the University Grievance Officer will publish, in the next docket of the University Senate, a summary of the report and recommendation, and any reasons the President has given for not implementing it.

SECTION 8. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

8.1 Time Limits.

8.11 These procedures are intended to provide for the speedy and efficient conclusion of grievances. Parties must comply with the established time limits. If they fail to do so, sanctions may be imposed, including dismissal of the grievance, drawing conclusions adverse to the defaulting party, or the exclusion of certain evidence. The panel or committee may also report the failure to comply with rules and time limits to appropriate administrators and to the University Senate, naming the defaulting party.

8.12 The University Grievance Officer or the panel chair will set specific dates by which the parties must complete certain actions. In setting those specific dates, they will be guided by the standards set forth in the following table. They will, however, bear in mind the fact that members of the University community are generally not available during examination week and quarter breaks, and may not be available during summer vacation. In light of these factors the Officer or panel chair may make appropriate modifications. In each case the specific date set by the Officer or panel chair will apply.

8.13 The following are normal guidelines for time limits:

(a) Time limits set by the University Grievance Officer in preliminary proceedings:

To answer a grievance (§4.21)	10 working days
To provide a more detailed statement or answer (§4.22)	10 working days
To complete discovery	1-2 months
To respond to a dispute about discovery (§4.25)	3 working days
To respond to a request to dismiss a grievance	10 working days but the University Grievance Officer may summarily refuse such a request, or refer the case to the hearing panel, without seeking a response
To conduct a hearing and present a final report	2-3 months

(b) Time limits and guidelines for the panel chair and the panel:

To constitute a panel, notify parties, and schedule a date for hearing	10 working days
To challenge a member of the panel	5 working days
To begin the hearing	30-45 calendar days after receipt of the case
To respond to a draft report	10 working days
To reply to these responses	3 working days

(c) Time limits and guidelines for the Committee Chair and the Committee in cases of appeal and additional review:

For the appealing party to provide a full statement	10 working days
For the other parties to reply	10 working days
For all parties to respond to the draft report	10 working days
To reply to these responses	3 working days

(d) The University Grievance Officer will monitor compliance with these time limitations.

8.14 The officer setting the time limits may alter or extend them, but extensions should be brief and granted only for compelling reasons. The pendency of mediation efforts is not normally a basis for an extension of more than 30 days.

8.2 Discovery. Prompt and fair resolution of grievances that arise within the University community is necessary for the proper operation of University programs. It is University policy to comply with all reasonable requests for information made by parties to a formal grievance procedure. In order to comply with confidentiality obligations of the University, a party may be required to sign and abide by a confidentiality agreement before certain information may be released for the limited purpose of a grievance hearing.

8.3 Duty to Testify. Every member of the University community has an obligation to appear before a grievance panel to give testimony in matters pending before it. Assistance in this regard is an important part of academic responsibility.⁸ Those who fail to fulfill this responsibility may be publicly censured.

8.4 Confidentiality. The University Grievance Officer and the Grievance Committees to which a grievance is referred shall not disclose documents or any information concerning a formal grievance except as is necessary to comply with procedures for conducting the hearing or as is required by these rules or by law.

8.5 Representation. Parties in grievances may be represented by academic advisers/advocates or others.⁹ Representation does not excuse parties from participating in the proceedings.

8.6 Files. The University Grievance Officer will maintain the permanent files of all grievances, including those decided by college grievance committees.

8.7 Recommendations. In addition to the formal recommendations regarding a grievance, a grievance panel, the University Grievance Officer, or a Grievance Committee may make public recommendations to clarify or improve University rules or policies. These recommendations will not affect the outcome of the case before the panel.

8.8 Appointment of Committee Members.

8.81 The Senate Committee on Committees is authorized to appoint members of the academic staff and of the civil service staff to the University and collegiate grievance committees. It will consult with the Academic Staff Advisory Committee and the Civil Service Committee in making these appointments.

8.82 Each college grievance committee is established as provided in section 2.4, and includes "University delegates," appointed by the Senate Committee on Committees. In order to create a pool of individuals who can be appointed as "University delegates," each college is required to supply to the Committee on Committees the names of its own faculty and academic staff members who are willing, able, and qualified to serve on the grievance committees of other colleges. Each college must provide at least as many names for this University-wide pool as it will have "University delegates" serving on its own committee. The Committee on Committees may specify the mix of faculty and academic staff, the standards for nomination, and the precise number to be nominated by each college.

8.9 Rules of Procedure. The University Grievance Committee and the University Grievance Officer may adopt rules of procedure and guidelines for hearing panels, consistent with these rules.

SECTION 9. UNIVERSITY POLICY.

9.1 University Policy. This is a University policy. It supersedes the grievance policies of colleges and departments, including those contained in college constitutions.

⁸Cf. *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure*, section 13.3.

⁹Parties are encouraged to use faculty advisers who are members of the University community, to reduce the cost of the proceeding. University administrators should not normally be represented by attorneys unless the opposing party is so represented.

9.2 Effect on Other Policies. In order to provide a consistent and uniform procedure for dealing with grievances in the University, this policy replaces all existing University policies which provide for the resolution of grievances through other mechanisms, except as provided in section 3.2.

9.3 Transition. Any matter pending before an existing grievance procedure when this policy takes effect may be pursued to completion through that policy, if all parties agree in writing or if the University Grievance Officer so directs. Otherwise, the grievant must re-file the grievance within 30 calendar days of the effective date of this policy.

9.4 Effective Date. This policy takes effect on a date to be determined by the Senate Consultative Committee.

MARK BRENNER
Chair

Two amendments as follows were approved: Add to 3.2, (f) Any matter involving non-academic student employment will be referred to the Student Employment Grievance procedure, unless the University Grievance Officer determines that it is part of a complex of issues which arises under this grievance policy.

Add new 3.5 as follows and renumber 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7: 3.5 Disputes About Jurisdiction. Any dispute about the appropriate body before which a grievance should be heard will be decided by the University Grievance Officer, subject to appeal to the Standing Subcommittee on Procedure. This decision on jurisdiction is binding, both on the grievance committees and panels established by this policy, and on the other bodies mentioned in section 3.2 (a) through (f) of this policy.

The proposed grievance procedures as amended were approved.

V. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Senate Bylaws, Article III, Section 7, be amended to add a member of the academic professional staff to the Faculty Affairs Committee as follows:

ARTICLE III.7. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Faculty Affairs Committee is concerned with policies and procedures that influence the personal and professional welfare of the faculty and academic professional staff.

Membership

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall be composed of at least 10 members of the faculty, one member of the academic professional staff, one graduate assistant and one undergraduate student, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. The academic professional members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees in consultation with the chair of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee with the approval of the Senate. All other members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To examine all policies and procedures of the University which influence the professional and personal welfare of the faculty and academic professional staff, and to recommend improvements in the design and implementation of faculty and academic professional personnel policies.
- c. To examine and propose University policies and programs associated with faculty and academic staff development.

- d. To examine benefit options and benefit option counseling available for current and retired faculty and academic professionals (with the assistance of the Employee Benefits Department) and suggest alternatives when appropriate.
- f. To monitor any legislation and other policies affecting faculty and academic professional welfare including such matters as faculty tenure and promotion, salary and benefits, and faculty and academic professional staff development.

MARK BRENNER, Chr.
Consultative Committee
N. L. GAULT, Chr.
Faculty Affairs Committee
THOMAS SCOTT, Chr.
Committee on Committees

Approved, 124 to 0

VI. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE INFORMATION

The Senate Committee on Social Concerns has met three times in the 1988-89 academic year, and has an additional meeting scheduled. It will therefore be necessary for the committee to submit a final annual report at the conclusion of the year.

In winter quarter, the committee was asked to investigate and make a recommendation on the issue of inconsistencies between operating policies of the ROTC programs and the affirmative action policies of the institution, an issue brought to the attention of the Consultative Committee in a memorandum from the Student Senate Consultative Committee. To secure input from the University community more broadly, the Social Concerns Committee has scheduled a forum on the topic, following which the committee will discuss the matter further and make appropriate recommendations.

The other major activity of the Social Concerns Committee is its advisory service to the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Physical Planning, with regard to socially responsible employment of the institution's investment portfolio. The major form that advising takes currently is making recommendations for votes on resolutions with social concern content which come before the annual meetings of companies in which the University of Minnesota holds stock. The annual meeting season is in the spring; the committee has recently requested that our proxy ballot be cast in favor of several resolutions asking various companies: 1) to sever remaining economic ties with South Africa; 2) to disclose information concerning use of company funds to support political campaigns through the use of Political Action Committees (PACs); and 3) to support nuclear non-proliferation in this hemisphere through financial encouragement on the part of lending institutions. Other social concern issues remain under discussion; recommendations will be made later this month for proxy voting in company meetings scheduled in May.

Committee attendance has been a consistent problem in the committee's work this year. Regrettably, students and alumnae participation has been minimal, with better attendance and contribution on the part of faculty and staff members of the committee.

BARBARA KNUDSON
Chairperson

Accepted

VII. REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT (10 minutes)

see abstract

VIII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

see abstract

IX. OLD BUSINESS

none

X. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

see abstract

XI. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

REGINALD T. BUCKNER

1938-1989

Dr. Reginald Buckner, jazz pianist and associate professor in the School of Music and the Afro-American Studies Department, died of cardiac arrest February 4, 1989.

Dr. Buckner received his bachelor's and master's degrees in music education from the University of Kansas at Lawrence and his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. He became a faculty member in 1971.

Dr. Buckner was a founder and board member of the Twin Cities Jazz Society. Among the many awards bestowed upon him was the 1988 Black Music Award for Outstanding Jazz Artist, and the 1989 Martin Luther King, Jr. Humanitarian Award in the Arts by the Governor's Council.

Dr. Reginald Buckner believed that the art of jazz was the appropriate means for opening young minds and hearts to the art of music, and that such work must begin with the preparation of music teachers. His educational legacy is his success in moving jazz to a central place in the musical life of our community and school. His influence will be felt in generations of music teachers and students to come who receive this education.

PAUL W. BULLEN

1912-1989

Paul W. Bullen, retired Assistant Professor of Mechanical Engineering, died of heart failure January 12, 1989. He was preceded in death by his wife LaVerne and is survived by his son and daughter-in-law, David and Susan Bullen of Burnsville, and four grandchildren, Eric, Shannon, Tracy and Michael.

Paul was born in Richland Center, Wisconsin, and then lived in Waukesha. He received a B. S. in civil engineering from the University of Wisconsin in Madison. He joined the faculty of the University of Minnesota as an instructor in the Department of Drawing and Descriptive Geometry in 1940. That department was merged with the Mechanical Engineering Department in 1957, where Paul remained until his retirement in June of 1977.

Paul spent many years as a member of the planning commission of Brooklyn Center, his town of residence, where his engineering background and very practical mind were valuable assets in planning the city's parks. He was a valuable and honored citizen of that town where he spent his entire married life. He and LaVerne had dreamed of retiring to Door County, Wisconsin, not far from his boyhood home, but those plans were dashed when LaVerne was diagnosed as having Parkinson's disease. So the last twelve years of their lives, until LaVerne died in February of 1988, were spent in caring for one another.

Paul was an excellent and conscientious teacher with a very practical creative mind. A patient man with a quiet sense of humor, he was well liked by his students as well as his colleagues. Paul's quietness hid a great native intelligence and an unusual understanding in a broad range of technical areas. Beyond his unusual insights, he had the ability to explain concepts in terms simple enough to help those less gifted. In many ways, he was a man not properly appreciated.

While on the staff, he actively participated in several experimental studies to improve undergraduate teaching, some of which were adopted. He also co-authored a text on descriptive geometry, published by Allyn and Bacon of Boston, as well as several problem books. In short, he was a man whose life was largely devoted to teaching.

TIMOTHY B. KNOPP

1935-1989

Professor Tim Knopp collapsed and died during one of his favorite pursuits, running, on the afternoon of March 23, 1989, in St. Paul. Dr. Knopp was a member of the faculty of the Department of Forest Resources, College of Natural Resources, University of Minnesota. He was well known in the University and in the region for his teaching, advising, and service to outdoor recreation and environmental interests.

Dr. Knopp was born on August 23, 1935, on a farm near Winona, Minnesota. He attended the University of Minnesota and obtained a bachelor's degree in forestry in 1957. Subsequently he attended the University of Arizona and earned a master's degree in wildlife management in 1959. He obtained a Ph.D. degree in forestry from the University of Minnesota with an emphasis on forest recreation in 1970. His work experience included employment in California, Arizona, and New Mexico. He was employed as a game management biologist for the state of Montana from 1962 to 1965 and he became an instructor in the College of Forestry at the University of Minnesota in 1968. He rose to the rank of professor in 1987.

Dr. Knopp was active in the conduct of the Recreation Resources Management Curriculum and the Resources and Community Development program and, in recent years, directed both of these programs. He taught courses on outdoor recreation design, planning and management, outdoor recreation behavior and policy, and he directed numerous seminar courses on these topics. He was also a very dedicated advisor to the students in these programs. He was active for many years on University committees concerned with student affairs and social concerns. He was the author of numerous popular and technical articles on recreation, notably works dealing with trail planning, wilderness use, user behavior patterns, and recreation resources management and policy.

Dr. Knopp was an avid outdoor recreationist, participating in running, cross-country skiing, hiking, and canoeing. He was an active participant in the Nature Conservancy, a director of the Voyageurs National Park Association, a director of the North Country Trail Association, and an advisor to numerous other groups. He was a frequent consultant to outside groups on trail and recreation area planning. Students will miss his many extra efforts on their behalf and faculty will miss a very helpful and concerned colleague.

Dr. Knopp is survived by his wife Kajsa, son Erik and his sister Judy Romine. Memorials were directed to the Voyageurs Regional National Park Association and the University of Minnesota College of Natural Resources Tim Knopp Memorial Fund.

WILLIAM F. POHL

1937-1988

William F. Pohl, professor of mathematics, died suddenly December 9, 1988, at the age of 51.

Pohl received an S.M. from the University of Chicago in 1958 and his Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley in 1961. After a postdoctoral fellowship at MIT and positions as instructor and assistant professor at Stanford, he joined the Minnesota faculty in 1964, becoming a full professor in 1970.

Pohl's thesis, published as "Differential Geometry of Higher Order," is still cited as one of the seminal papers in the topology and geometry of jet bundles. His interests soon turned to problems in more classical differential geometry, the theory of space curves, to which he brought the modern tools of topology and integral geometry. Subsequently he wrote a series of important papers on what are called "tightly embedded" surfaces.

With his expertise in the theory of linking and writhing numbers for space curves, Pohl became suspicious of some of the early claims about the geometry of the DNA molecule. He studied the relevant biology, and his criticisms led to more refined experiments and a better scientific basis for the currently accepted models.

He was a frequent visitor to Europe, and was guest professor at the University of Bonn in 1980-81. For many years he held NSF research grants. His influence on students, both as teacher and example, was considerable. He directed nine Ph.D. theses. He brought a rich appreciation of philosophical questions to teaching future teachers, to nurturing graduate students, and to his research. He was fond of quoting Aristotle's dictum, "Philosophy may begin in wonder, but it should end in some contrary state." Apply the phrase to mathematics and you have one facet of William Pohl's approach to science.

In the community extending beyond the University, Pohl is remembered for his interest in nature and music. An accomplished photographer of flowers and birds, he was a member of the Minnesota Ornithological Union. He was a cofounder of the Concentus Musicus Renaissance Ensemble, started a Gregorian chant choir at St. Agnes, and directed the choir at St. Anne's. Singing countertenor, he toured European cathedrals with a St. Agnes group specializing in older church music. Besides playing modern keyboard and brass instruments, he also became proficient on several Renaissance and Baroque ones.

He is survived by his wife, Hildegard, daughters Annetta, Agatha, and Agnes, sons Lawrence and John, his mother, Helen Pohl, and a brother, Dr. Steven Pohl.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was convened in 45 Nicholson Hall, Minneapolis campus, following the University Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 114 voting members of the faculty. President Nils Nasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 16

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

TENURE COMMITTEE

TENURE REGULATIONS

MOTION:

That the language of the Tenure Regulations be amended to recognize the transfer of the functions of the Tenure Committee to the Faculty Affairs Committee in accordance with recent legislation passed by the University Senate reducing the number of committees in the Senate structure:

Section 16.1 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure to read:

16.1 Membership. The Tenure Committee is composed of at least seven members of the faculty and such other persons as the University Senate Bylaws shall provide. The manner of appointment is governed by the University Senate Bylaws. The composition and manner of appointment of the Faculty Affairs Committee are governed by the University Senate Bylaws.

Section 19 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure to read:

These regulations are subject to amendment by the Board of Regents. Proposed amendments from any source will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for its advice and recommendation before final action by the Board of Regents. The Faculty Senate will solicit the recommendations of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Judicial Committee, ~~and the Tenure Committee~~, before giving its advice and recommendation.

In all other provisions of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, the term "Tenure Committee" is deleted wherever found and replaced by the term "Faculty Affairs Committee."

This amendment takes effect on the date on which the reorganization plan for University committees approved during the 1988-89 academic year takes effect.

COMMENT:

Under the reorganization of committees recently approved by the Senate, the Tenure Committee will be abolished, and its functions will be transferred to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The proposal amends the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure to conform to this reorganization. Amendments to the regulations must be approved by the Board of Regents upon the advice and recommendation of the Faculty Senate.

MARK BRENNER, Chr.
Faculty Consultative Committee
N. L. Gault, Chr.
Faculty Affairs Committee
PHILIP FRICKEY, Chr.
Tenure Committee

Approved

III. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The President called the Twin Cities Campus Assembly to order at 3:15 p.m. in 45 Nicholson Hall and recognized Mark Brenner, professor of horticultural science and chair of the Assembly Steering Committee, who moved a change in the sequence of the ensuing meetings to accommodate the presentation by Fred Morrison, professor of law, who was in Washington, D.C., and would be connected by phone to discuss the proposed grievance procedures with the Senate if that item could be taken up early. Mr. Brenner proposed the following order: University Senate, Faculty Senate, Twin Cities Assembly, and the Student Senate. His motion was approved, and the Senate meeting began with the approval of the February minutes.

Vice Chair election. Michael Steffes, professor of laboratory medicine and pathology, was nominated for a second term as vice chair of the Senate by Mr. Brenner, and he was elected unanimously.

Grievance procedures. Mr. Morrison explained his unavoidable absence and hoped that the telephone hook-up would not limit the discussion. His committee, he said, had attempted to simplify and consolidate grievance procedures to prevent overlap and create some consistency, and its preliminary report had been brought to the Senate in February. An attempt was made to combine flexibility with firmness, to encourage negotiated settlements, and to encourage mediation to resolve disputes rather than letting them continue forever. The committee had attempted to combine expertise and impartiality and to provide centralization for records. There were two goals: a system which not only reaches the correct result for the individual and the University but reaches the correct result for all to see, and a procedure that would bring about a final resolution of a grievance.

He called attention to two clarifying amendments that had been added to the docket version, which were quickly approved, and the main motion as amended was approved. Mr. Morrison expressed appreciation to the Senate for its cooperation.

Faculty Affairs Committee. Mr. Brenner presented a bylaws amendment to add a member of the academic professional staff to the Faculty Affairs Committee, which was approved without debate.

President's report. The President said he had asked for this opportunity to comment on some current issues, rather than to give a speech, and asked that it be a standing feature of

the meetings, as long as it would be considered useful. Having been on the job for 117 days and able to communicate rather widely throughout the state, he noted, he had not had an opportunity to interact directly with the Senate. He had structured his presentations in the state around five issues.

First, he said, he had tried to convey how good the University is—the breadth and depth of the institution, which speaks to the quality of the faculty and staff. Second, he also tried to get across the message that the University cannot rest on its laurels and the state cannot rest in the comfort of past achievements in providing educational opportunity in the state in the face of an international, national, and statewide situation where the University is going to have to run fast in order to maintain its position. Thus, it is important to define priorities, which is the purpose of the planning effort that has been going on for at least a decade and the basic purpose of Commitment to Focus. He labelled as precarious the national situation where there is a mismatch between the resources available to higher education and the tasks and challenges that lie ahead. This fact was widely recognized at a recent meeting of the Association of American Universities in which he had participated. In some disciplines there are severe faculty shortages, he said, due to forthcoming retirements and the numbers of students expected in the middle and late 1990s. He called for national, state, and University agendas that can address that situation.

He then addressed the matter of accountability, recalling that in the recent past there appeared to be miscommunication between the administration and the Board of Regents, with the legislature and, to some extent, with important constituencies in the state. He said the University is now setting up what must be one of the richest systems of audit that any institution in the country has. Questions had been raised in the blue ribbon commission's report and by the legislative auditor concerning the ability of the University to manage its affairs, especially financial management, he said. Whether people liked it or not, he pointed out, the University is an academic institution that is also in financial and management terms a major enterprise, with almost 20,000 employees, 55,000 students, and a budget of well over \$1.2 billion in an environment of decentralization. However, he noted, that decentralization adds to the complexity of management. He asked for senators' participation and help in achieving effective management and with reduced bureaucracy.

The third issue brought to the state was that of mission. Commitment to Focus lays out the principles that have to do with defining the University's special responsibilities within the higher education system and with matching responsibilities with resources. It is often misunderstood, he said, and he wanted to clarify his views. First of all, as far as his administration is concerned, its basic purpose of achieving an even stronger position nationally and in the state in research, teaching, and service is still valid. He thought the enrollment question was the one that has caused the greatest amount of misunderstanding. The original statement called for reduced enrollments. He explained that may be the overall result, but the essential reality would be a mixture of increases in enrollment, stable enrollments, and reduced enrollments. He preferred "enrollment management," which would make it possible to achieve the quality improvements that are at the heart of Commitment to Focus. He said there had been some positive signals at the legislature concerning the directions in which the University is moving that make it appear that the legislature may not fund strictly on an enrollment basis but on functional terms to achieve quality improvement. However, the University must continue to clarify its objectives and the means for reaching those objectives.

He said that perhaps the greatest confusion concerning the implications of Commitment to Focus have arisen in regard to undergraduate education. The University's responsibilities as the only research institution in the state are to many people perfectly clear, and in graduate and professional education there are clearcut responsibilities. However, in undergraduate education the University must show what it can provide that is, if not unique, at least special to the University. He said he starts with the assumption that undergraduate education is special at the University because it is given in the context of research, scholarship, artistic activity, and public service. He hoped that from those principles there could be derived the definition of the special kind of undergraduate education that could be communicated effectively to the state, and he hoped he could work with the Senate on it.

Finally, he said, the approach to resources is a combination of the appeal to the state and trying to ensure that the resources which the University has are used as effectively as

possible, and that involves reallocation. Commitment to Focus was combined with a plan for reallocation of academic resources, he said, which is proceeding now, difficult as it is. He asked for the Senate's understanding and indulgence with the negative effects and expressed the hope that working together through the effective representational system of faculty, staff, and students, the right kinds of decisions could be made over the next three years.

He stated again his commitment to a top priority for faculty and staff salaries; a salary structure that meets contemporary needs and the basic requirements of fairness better than the existing structure must be provided. He thought there were some encouraging signs that the legislature would fund an amount above inflation, and every effort would be made to distribute the appropriation in a way that would meet the needs of the institution and the requirements for fairness. Here again he hoped to work through the representational system for the best possible solutions. The Senate applauded his remarks.

Hiring procedures. A question had been submitted to the President regarding the apparent inconsistency between his professed commitment to open hiring procedures and his disregard of the search committee recommendations in the hiring of the financial affairs vice president. The President said he had found compelling reasons to go with a person with very special qualifications. He had discussed the decision with the leadership of the Consultative Committee, where he received strong, positive reactions. Also, the appointment was made in consultation with the affirmative action director and with a clear understanding that there would be a full, national search within a year. He recognized that there were complications but, given the circumstances, felt that this was the best course of action.

Vice president for research. Another question concerned his announced intention to elevate the dean of the Graduate School to be a vice president for research without a search. President Hasselmo said he had consulted extensively and had received some strong support for the position but he also received some conflicting recommendations and a diversity of opinion as to how the function should be structured. Given the fact that a half dozen vice presidents were being recruited, he decided to put creation of the position on hold. He said that the dean of the Graduate School now sits on the Provost's Council, which deals with Twin Cities matters, as well as on the President's Cabinet as a representative of graduate education—all with no change in responsibilities.

Women faculty and professionals, settlement. President Hasselmo said he had received a series of questions concerning women faculty and professionals in a salary settlement. He described it as a situation in which there are different views as to how to approach it and, in order to avoid a very expensive and not very desirable process of litigation, it was prudent to work out a compromise and try to reconcile sometimes very different views and interpretation. He and the Board of Regents had had a number of briefings on the settlement, and a process had been initiated for participation by representative bodies and others in the review of the proposed settlement. But there is not an agreement yet, he said. As for the funding of the agreement, the understanding is that, if the agreement is reached, the funding would come off the top of the entire appropriation from the state, that is, it would have some effect on the salary budget as well as on all other budgets. Given the fact that the matter is still unsettled and still subject to discussion between the lawyers of the two sides and others, he was reluctant to comment further. He emphasized the importance of identifying such lingering issues and making every effort to resolve them, operating as a community within the University.

Summer input. Another questioner asked what procedures the administration would employ to get input from faculty, students, and staff during the summer. The President acknowledged that there exists some feeling that the administration might try to make certain important decisions in the summer. He assured the Senate that there was no such intention. With regard to the searches an attempt would be made to finish searches and consultation before people disappear from the campus and, where that is not feasible, the decisions would be postponed until fall. In the case of the vice presidents for health sciences and agriculture, forestry, and home economics, most faculty and students in those areas are on 12-month schedules, he explained. However, he realized the importance of not making decisions when consultation could not take place.

Average cost funding. A question was raised as to the administration's reaction to the Regents' resolution to reduce the University's contribution to the average cost funding model. He said the issue had been reviewed with the Regents at their last meeting, and they had expressed strong concern about the increases in tuitions that would be driven by the appropriation that is being discussed at the legislature. The issue is of concern to him and his colleagues, he said, and they are making a specific effort to alleviate the pressures created by the funding formula which specifies that tuition must cover one third of the cost of instruction. The effort involves the very high professional schools' tuition that would be affected by the formula and where historically the University has not been able to charge the full one third, which meant that students in lower cost programs have been subsidizing students in higher cost programs. The University is asking the legislature for specific relief in regard to those high cost professional programs. A "white paper" is being developed, the preliminary draft of which would be shared with the Regents in May, and it would identify not only the issues that were brought forward in the discussion at the recent meeting but would begin to address other questions that have been raised. The document would then be developed over the next few months in consultation with the Regents into a full-fledged plan for dealing with the tuition question in the future. He hoped by the next biennium to have a more coherent tuition policy. He expressed the problem as being torn between the need on the one hand to get the resources to improve the quality of education while keeping tuition at a level that is manageable for students and does not keep them out of the institution.

Rosemount incinerator. A final question concerned the possibility that the University might allow Dakota County to use the Rosemount Research Center land for building a garbage incinerator. President Hasselmo responded from a paper that was provided by a colleague to the effect that Dakota County must solve its solid waste problem through its elected representatives. The University property is one of several options, and the University is not in a position politically to respond "no." He said the University has as great a concern about the environmental impact of an incinerator as anyone else, since the Agricultural Experiment Station is located next door. The county commissioners are the elected representatives of Dakota County and it is expected that they will make a decision based on an appropriately conducted environmental impact statement. The University has an intense interest in the outcome of that statement, he concluded.

Textbook prices. Gladstone Natala, student, complained about the price of one of his textbooks, only half of which was covered in the course. He cited an instructor in another course who had written up the material to be used, duplicated it, and sold it to his class at a reasonable price. He hoped the faculty would be sympathetic.

Social Concerns Committee/ROTC. Steve Boland, student, called attention to the Social Concerns Committee report on the agenda in which the chair had observed that student participation on the committee had been minimal. That was due, he said, to the fact that fewer students are now paying more tuition which means that they are working more hours and do not have as much time to participate. He said student government expected to have a proposal for either financial or academic compensation for involvement in the processes.

He also noted that the committee had held the forum on the issue of ROTC compliance with the University's affirmative action statement. He asked whether any committee member could comment on the next step. The Minnesota Student Association is anxious for a resolution of the issue, he said. The President referred the query to the committee for its action.

Following a silent tribute to deceased colleagues, the body adjourned.

The Faculty Senate was called to order and previous minutes approved.

Tenure regulations. Mr. Brenner introduced a proposal that would recognize in the tenure regulations the transfer of functions of the Tenure Committee to the Faculty Affairs Committee. It was approved without debate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

The third meeting of the Student Senate for 1988-89 was convened in 45 Nicholson Hall, Minneapolis campus, following the Twin Cities Campus Assembly meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 35 voting members of the student body.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 16

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. REPORT BY CHAIR

(5 minutes)

see abstract

III. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

REPORT BY CHAIR (5 minutes)

see abstract

IV. NEW BUSINESS

(3 minutes)

none

V. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The Student Senate was called to order by its chair, Bruce Vandal, following the Faculty Senate meeting. Minutes were approved. He reported that the election of next year's chair would take place at the next meeting and he urged current senators to consider the position. Its responsibilities include presiding over the Student Senate, sitting on the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), and chairing the Student Lobby Advisory Committee (SLAC). There is a significant time commitment when the lobbying efforts are needed, but next year is not a biennial request year. One of the outstate senators urged that the new chair visit all the coordinate campuses.

Mr. Vandal announced that SLAC would meet next week, and coordinate campus representatives could attend either in person or by phone. He then gave a brief summary of activity at the legislature. There is a move to put a rider on the appropriations bill that would make a commitment to keep sports on campus. As to the TA training bill, he said it had been put into the appropriations bill in the House in the amount of \$300,000 for training, with the University matching that amount. It appears that the Senate will support that proposal. Other items on the House side included funding for academic computing, advising, reduction of class size and/or offering more sections.

Carrie Simenson, SSCC chair, announced that the election of next year's Twin Cities representatives on the Consultative Committee would be held on May 4, and interested persons should talk to her. The main issue for the committee is formulating a policy for students sitting on search committees by organizing a pool of students interested in serving and scheduling a workshop to train them early next year. The committee is also working toward adding a line for a student member on the University form that lists members of search committees. She reported that orientation for all new members of the SSCC would be on May 11.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor