

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

May 18, 1989

The fourth meeting of the University Senate for 1988-89 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the Assembly meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 111 voting members of the faculty/academic professionals, 16 voting members of the student body, 2 ex officio, and 2 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS
Information

In the April 27 election to fill next year's Twin Cities campus vacancies on the Committee on Committees, George Sell and Barbara Stuhler were elected to 3-year terms, and Ellen Berscheid was elected to a one-year term.

Accepted

II. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE ALLOCATION SUBCOMMITTEE
Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Senate Rules, Article III.2, be amended to add ex officio representation on the Subcommittee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation as follows: Office of the Vice President Academic Affairs; Office of the Vice President, Finance and Physical Planning (the Associate Vice President for Physical Planning and the Director of Physical Plant Operations); Office of the Vice President for Student Development (Scheduling Office); Office of the Vice President for the Health Sciences.

MARK BRENNER
Chair

Approved

III. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

CLASS HOURS-CREDIT RATIO

Discussion (20 minutes)

CLASS HOURS/CREDIT RATIO POLICY STATEMENT

It shall be the policy of the University of Minnesota that there generally be a one-to-one ratio between the number of credits awarded for completion of a course and the number of hours per week that the course meets. In the case of laboratory courses, it is understood that one laboratory meeting per week shall be the approximate equivalent of one credit. This general policy explicitly recognizes that there are sound pedagogical reasons why some courses and some subjects may deviate from the one-to-one standard; this policy does not bar such variations.

In the event that an extra hour is added to courses which presently carry one credit more than the number of contact hours, consideration should be given to using this additional period for non-traditional activities, such as small group discussions, the use of guest speakers, or engagement in field work. In addition, consideration should be given, in the structuring and timing of class meetings, to the patterns of student employment (for example, M-W rather than MTWF).

Comment

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) has discussed at length the proposal that there be a University policy which requires that the number of instructional hours in the classroom per week in a course be equal to the number of credits awarded for that course. With the full recognition of the need for judicious exceptions to this general policy, SCEP is persuaded that the one-to-one ratio is a reasonable and important standard for establishing credit value and in-class time, subject to the following observations.

Although evidence and recall about the change, in 1972, from a three-credit module to the four-credit module are both scarce, it is the view of SCEP that the original expectations embodied in the change have not universally been met. In the judgment of SCEP, the addition of the fourth credit to many courses should have been accompanied by an additional contact hour in the course, although it should have been an hour which would have promoted small-group discussion, or which would have entailed the use of guest speakers or engagement in field work—an activity, in other words, which departed from the norm of the lecture by the faculty member. What appears to have occurred, instead, is "credit inflation": Three-credit courses became four-credit courses without any accompanying changes in the structure or requirements of the course.

A study of current practice across the University reveals general observance of the 1:1 guideline by most colleges, but this does not appear to be the case in some units and in some individual courses. While recognizing that some of the differences (some requiring less, some requiring more, class time per credit given) may result from well-reasoned pedagogical perspectives, others, as noted, appear to have little justification.

SCEP recommends that steps be taken by curricular units to observe the one-to-one ratio as basic policy regarding credit and classroom instruction, but makes the recommendation with two significant caveats. First, the committee does not believe there should be wholesale reversion from a four-credit to a three-credit module (in those instances where four credits are given for classes which meet three hours per week); instead, there should be thoughtful action on the part of the faculty to enhance the quality and diversity of the delivery of course content by careful addition, where appropriate, of an additional contact hour of the nature described in the second paragraph above. Second, the committee calls for consideration of the pattern of student employment and its possible effect on the ability of students to attend a class four times per week rather than three (or five times per week rather than four); attention should be given to the possibility of scheduling classes in blocks of two hours on a Monday-Wednesday, Tuesday-Thursday, or Wednesday-Friday schedule rather than M-

T-W-F or M-W-Th-F. Care must be given, in other words, to the factors which should be considered as realignment with the one-to-one ratio is sought.

SCEP also agrees that attention and support should be given to making exceptions to this guideline in deference to types of instruction which do not fall within the logic of this formula. College and department curriculum committees would appear to be the principal and logical decision-making bodies with respect to the application of the guideline; they also appear to be the groups most able to certify adherence or wise variance from the guideline. Overall administration of the policy should be under the direction of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

SCEP recommends, finally, that the adjustments required to observe the University-wide policy be begun immediately and be completed expeditiously, perhaps in most cases by the end of the 1991-92 academic year.

MARK BRENNER, Chr.
Consultative Committee

JOHN CLARK, Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

See abstract

IV. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

CEE/DAY SCHOOL REGISTRATION

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution regarding funding for computerization of Continuing Education and Extension records to achieve compatibility with day school records:

Whereas the bifurcated system of record keeping, where Continuing Education and Extension maintains one set of records and the regular day school maintains another set,

And whereas the current system used by Continuing Education and Extension is hopelessly antiquated in that paper records are kept both for grades and for registration and records,

And whereas many students register both in day school and Continuing Education and Extension at various times during their academic careers,

And whereas this dual system of records leads to dual transcripts unless the student takes the time and effort to affirmatively request that the CEE course work be transferred to the day school record,

And whereas it is thus frequently difficult or impossible for an advisor to have the complete record of a student available for academic advising purposes,

And whereas this inability to retrieve a combined record from the data base leads to student and agency confusion about whether the credit requirements or other terms for student aid are being met,

And whereas there can be considerable confusion when attempting to merge the separate records of an individual student due to slight variations in names on the records,

And whereas the lack of a computerized data base for Continuing Education and Extension, given the numbers of students being served, makes record-keeping time-consuming and tedious,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy recommends, in as strong a fashion as possible, that the central administration of the University make available as soon as possible sufficient funds to computerize the Continuing Education and Extension records in a way which makes them compatible with, or a part of, the day school records of every student who attends the University.

COMMENT:

Following is the letter transmitting the resolution to the Consultative Committee.

December 20, 1988

Professor Mark Brenner, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
305 Alderman Hall
St. Paul Campus

Shirley M. Clark
Acting Provost and Acting Vice President
for Academic Affairs

213 Morrill Hall
Minneapolis Campus

Dear Mark and Shirley:

I enclose a resolution adopted unanimously by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy at its meeting of December 8, 1988.

The Committee feels very strongly that this is an issue which long ago reached the point of being critical and it warrants serious attention on the part of the University administration. We frankly think it is intolerable to have dual systems of records, the operation of one of which is reminiscent of office procedures which existed at the turn of the century. The current condition of having two separate systems seriously diminishes our ability to deliver high quality and efficient undergraduate education.

We also recommend that the Senate Consultative Committee take up the matter and express its views to the central officers.

Thank you.

Cordially,

/s/

John Clark, Chair
Senate Committee on Educational

Policy

cc: Professor David Giese, Chair, Student Academic Support Services Committee
Professor Warren Ibele, Chair, Senate Finance Committee
Mr. Sam Lewis, Registrar
Dr. James Preus, Coordinator, Student Support Services

The Consultative Committee approved the resolution with the comment that the central administration should regard this as a high priority.

MARK BRENNER, Chr.
Consultative Committee
JOHN CLARK, Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

Approved

V. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE

ROTC ISSUE
Information

The forum on the ROTC question was, in my opinion, very successful. It was what we had in mind in urging that the Senate, through our committee, sponsor such events at which multiple views on controversial issues can be aired in a respectful and courteous manner. There was an audience of about 40 to 50 persons, less controversy than we would have liked (since no representative of ROTC was present), but with both sides of the issue presented and listened to by the audience.

While we are not yet ready to make a recommendation, it is clear that the committee is strongly committed to the existing equal opportunity policies and, further, to action of some sort to resolve the situation. We are also strongly committed to the importance of the ROTC presence on university campuses, and feel that actions leading to termination of ROTC here would be more or less washing our hands of an important issue, rather than taking proactive steps to resolve what appear to be grave constitutional questions, substantially beyond the conflict with our internal policies. We lean, I think, toward asking the institution to take a leadership role in resolving the issue at the national level, perhaps in concert with other institutions who are discussing the same issue.

Our committee continues to work on this critical issue and will send further information on our thinking before the year is out.

COMMENT:

The above report is submitted in response to the request by the University Senate on April 27 to indicate the next steps following the recent forum.

BARBARA KNUDSON
Chair

VI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
TEACHING AWARDS
Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the following proposals for improvement of the Morse-Alumni Awards for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education be approved:

- The amount of the award should be increased to \$5,000 and awarded for a period of three years.
- Of the \$5,000 awarded each year, one-half should be awarded to the faculty member and one-half should be available to that faculty member for the development of teaching materials and training in order to promote excellence in teaching among all of the faculty.
- There should initially be ten awards; if money is available, through fund-raising or from other sources, the number of awards should be expanded in future years. Funding would come jointly from the Alumni Association and from an endowment raised by the University of Minnesota Foundation.

MARK BRENNER, Chr.
Consultative Committee
JOHN CLARK, Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

Approved

VII. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
REPORT BY THE CHAIR
(5 minutes)

see abstract

VIII. ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The principal work of the committee this year was to revise completely the Handbook on Policies and Procedures governing the activity of this committee. This work was done at

the request of the Regents and was accomplished in consultation with a subcommittee of the Board consisting of Regents Schertler (chair), Casey, and Craig. Ms. Barbara Muesing, the executive secretary of the Regents, provided material assistance in coordinating the revision process.

Along with the revision process, the committee did continue its normal operations of deliberating on the award of various honors and the naming of buildings and areas.

LEO RASKIND
Chair

Accepted

IX. BUSINESS AND RULES COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The Business and Rules Committee was involved most heavily during 1988-89 in the restructuring of the University Senate. This action involved working jointly with the Committee on Committees, the Consultative Committee, and the Ad Hoc Restructuring Committee. These committees, jointly with Business and Rules, submitted the amendments to the University Senate constitution that were debated, amended, and enacted during the past academic year in the University Senate.

In addition, the Business and Rules Committee met on November 3, February 2, April 6, and May 4 to establish the agenda for the University Senate and Twin Cities Assembly. At its final yearly meeting it reviewed committee reports that had been submitted for publication.

With the restructuring of the University Senate, the Business and Rules Committee's role will be subsumed within the Consultative Committee. Thus, this constitutes the committee's final annual report.

JOHN A. FOSSUM
Chair

Accepted

X. COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The committee continued its analysis of academic and administrative computing in the University. In our first report in June 1988, we cited a range of problems and concerns related to policy and planning for increased access and improved resources. The University community received our report at a time of administrative change. Nevertheless, the Consultative Committee endorsed the report and presented it to the Senate and the University administration. The series of recommendations we made about needs in academic computing, especially student and faculty access, and how those needs could be met are still waiting for action. Another major recommendation was to establish a chief information officer in the University to guide solution of these problems and guide the University into the computing future.

The General State of Computing in the University

During the past year, the committee continued to meet with University groups to acquaint them with our findings, seek new information, and follow the changes and programs proposed for computing in the University. As part of the new information we found a major fraction of instructional computing laboratories and central facilities to be inadequate and obsolete. We continued to sense the frustration of a number of groups that have difficulty addressing problems of an interdepartmental and intercollegiate nature, because of the lack of central policies. We believe even more strongly now that the position of chief information officer at the level of a vice provost will immediately reduce and eventually eliminate this

frustration. Several administrative officers from the President down have taken the position that other areas of planning must be addressed first and some other administrative positions must be filled before this post is filled. We strongly disagree. Major computing changes are in process in administrative offices and in academic computing, networking, and telecommunications. We will not improve the computing and communications environment at the University more than marginally without a central officer responsible for planning, administration, and coordination of computing, communications, and information policies of the institution.

Status of Supercomputing

At the direction of the Consultative Committee, we engaged in a more thorough analysis of supercomputing in the University. In our last report, we noted a widespread perception among faculty that this facility was not serving an important University function. After several meetings with personnel from both the Supercomputer Center (MSC) and the Supercomputer Institute (MSI), we conclude that the MSC and the MSI are operating under a well-defined goal to be the best facility at the cutting edge of technology in the country. In major ways they have already succeeded. (The recent CDC/ETA Systems decision might have important implications for keeping MSC at the best facility, due to the effect on capacity to provide enough computing time in the near future, but it is too soon to judge. This problem is under consideration.) The faculty who use the facility have produced a significant number of scientific studies, which are performed with the help of many students, making the MSI an important educational facility. Increased outreach by MSI has gone far to change the negative perception we noted in our previous report. The planning and performance of MSC and MSI can serve as a model for other units in the University concerned with computing.

Conclusion

Access, service, and accountability are important issues in the University. Computing has a role to play in the improvement of all of these areas. Its most important role, however, must be in the educational mission of the University. At the moment, computing is not adequately exploited in any of these areas, because of the lack of planning and coordination. We urge the Senate to take a strong position now to improve the environment of computing and telecommunications and the coordination and administration necessary for it.

ARTHUR L. NORBERG
Chair

Accepted

XI. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

SCEP held its first retreat ever just before classes began in the fall. We briefed new members, heard substantive reports from several faculty governance and administrative officials, and sifted through a long list of issues for our own agenda items with which to begin the year.

SCEP met approximately bi-weekly, 3:15-5:00 Thursdays, and will do so next year. Knowing this standard meeting time prior to accepting service on the Committee should minimize schedule conflicts. Given the nature and quantity of SCEP business, this is a critical matter.

During the year SCEP has engaged in the following major activities:

1. Recommended that the 45 minute class-hour be lengthened to 50 minutes.
2. Recommended that the Academic Vice-President's office appoint a University-wide task force to take a thorough look at the liberal education requirements.
3. Recommended that day school and Continuing Education and Extension records and transcripts be integrated into a single system.
4. Was briefed by Associate Provost Cross on emergent minority programs, by Dr. Darwin Hendel on educational outcome programs and research, and on library conditions and operations by Professor John Howe.

5. Recommended specific enhancements of the SCEP-selected Morse-Alumni faculty awards for excellence in undergraduate education. Negotiations are now under way to support the expanded awards from an endowment fund established by the University Foundation in addition to the contributions from the Alumni Association.
6. Approved and forwarded the ad hoc committee proposal to integrate and strengthen programs for honors and other high ability students.
7. Approved and forwarded the Undergraduate Education Committee's proposal to underwrite the upgrading of resources for large, introductory courses.
8. Discussed at length and recommended that the University's general policy be that the number of credits given for a course be equal to the number of class meeting (hours) each week. The policy is written carefully and permissively to avoid a lock-step and bureaucratic implementation. It was forwarded to the Senate Consultative Committee.
9. Spent considerable time, including two meetings with the chairs of standing committees now reporting through SCEP, in planning a smooth transition into the new Senate committee structure to begin next year. Specific recommendations for this critical period have been made to the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Committee on Committees and to the 1989-90 committee.
10. Discussed the issues surrounding quarter-to-semester conversion with President Hasselmo and Provost Clark. This agenda item was being held by SCEP from last year in deference to the arrival of a new president. After further discussion, a motion to change from the quarter to the semester system was voted on and failed.

Many items remain on SCEP's agenda. At its retreat on September 19 next fall it will again select those which are most urgent for early consideration under the new Senate committee organization.

JOHN CLARK
Chair

Accepted

XII. EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The Extension and Community Programs Committee is one of 19 Senate committees slated for elimination under the Senate plan to streamline its committee structure. With that as our fate, the committee met once in the 1988-89 academic year to determine if there was anything that could be done about our status. We quickly ascertained that there was little we could do to "save" our committee; but we decided to write to President Hasselmo expressing our concern, in essence, that with the elimination of Extension and Community Programs, there was no longer a governance committee which had outreach as its primary focus. We went on to note that this is particularly unfortunate, indeed deplorable, at a major land-grant institution with one of the largest continuing education programs in the United States and with a substantial non-traditional student population.

As a legacy, the committee also outlined a number of concerns and issues which it shared with the President and with Professor Brenner, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee. With that, the committee demobilized, its members free to pursue other interests yet ready to be called back to active duty in the event that there was renewed interest in the University's outreach efforts.

THOMAS McROBERTS
Chair

Accepted

XIII. LIBRARY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

We have been gratified that central administration has accorded high priority to the

pressing space and facilities needs of the University Libraries.

We have devoted much of our effort during the current academic year to assisting in the search for a new University Librarian. We developed a standard set of questions that we used in our interviews with each of six candidates, and we forwarded our recommendations to the search committee.

In addition, at our regular monthly meetings we:

- 1) monitored planning for space and new facilities;
- 2) examined the thorny issue of the responsibilities of the Libraries for providing quality study space for students on a predominantly commuter campus;
- 3) were briefed on automated circulation, bar-coding, and the circulation policies of individual units;
- 4) urged the Circulation Services Planning Committee of the Libraries to impose stronger sanctions on patrons who are irresponsible; and
- 5) encouraged the development of faculty advisory committees for individual units of the Libraries, and attempted to maintain effective liaison with these committees.

Other issues that we believe the committee might wish to address in the future include:

- 1) the erosion of funds for acquisitions, staffing, and patron services when the costs of automation are greater than anticipated and budgeted;
- 2) the need for better liaison between subject bibliographers and their clients;
- 3) personal safety in the libraries, especially during late evening hours;
- 4) handicapped access to existing and planned library facilities; and
- 5) the need for improved linkages, especially in telecommunications, with the coordinate campuses and their libraries.

JOHN FRASER HART
Chair

Accepted

XIV. PHYSICAL PLANT AND SPACE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee was active during the 1988-89 academic year with eleven meetings scheduled. The year began by reviewing the University of Minnesota's facilities model, which was a major component of committee activity during spring of 1988. The Physical Plant audit published in August of 1988 was studied by the committee and discussed with Bob Thomas. Many of the issues brought out in the audit were revisited by the committee throughout the academic year. The committee also discussed its potential input and role in the capital request process, concluding that there is need for a more direct method of input into the capital request process.

The committee discussed and reviewed the Framework for Space Planning and Allocation document authored by Bob Kvavik. The committee felt that this was a start in the right direction of physical planning based on academic priorities rather than in an ad hoc manner.

The committee discussed at great length several problems facing the University, which are potential "economic time bombs": (1) the University steam plant is overtaxed and the boilers are living on borrowed time; (2) electrical power use at the University is uncontrolled and, during peak power demands, the University is very close to overtaxing one or more substations; the committee looked into power consumption at the University and the need for establishing guidelines for the University community with respect to use of electricity; (3) the deferred maintenance plan within the University is totally insufficient and there is only enough money to "put patches on a bald tire."

As a response to a letter from Professors Skaggs, Department of Geology, the committee looked into the cost estimating and charging scheme for remodeling projects. Representatives from Physical Planning explained in great detail the charging procedures for unit

construction and remodeling projects. The committee was informed that a department undergoing remodeling would only be charged about 6% of the total estimated project costs during the first approximately 70% of the project time line. The rest of the cost would be transferred only when the bidding begins. If there were coordination in collegiate units or in central administration, there would be a potential of investing approximately 94% of the project cost for a reasonable period of time, rather than having all funds encumbered from the onset of the project. The committee felt that this issue needed to be pursued in the future.

The committee provided input to the Faculty Consultative Committee with regard to restructuring of the Physical Plant and Physical Planning reporting process. It was felt that the separation between Physical Plant and Physical Planning is confusing to faculty and staff and creates ambiguity of who is in charge. It was recommended that Physical Plant and Physical Planning should report to a single individual, solely responsible for these issues.

The committee was informed by Mr. Hewitt that there is a survey under way on the status of University building space with respect to building structure, safety, and quality of space. Many related issues were discussed and need to be followed in the future. The topic of toxic hazards in University buildings was investigated by the committee. Gordon Girtz of Environmental Health and Safety made a presentation to the committee with regard to asbestos abatement at the University. A historical review of policy and potential funding sources for cleanup were discussed. The committee added to its list of potential major problems facing the University the topic of toxic hazards in University buildings. It was felt that a well thought-out plan for hazardous removal must be put in place and funding provided.

The Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee will be a permanent subcommittee of the Finance and Planning Committee next year. This will allow more direct interaction with finance and planning and provide an ideal setting for both monitoring and recommending solutions to many of the problems that were discussed during the 1988-89 academic year.

Committee members were Arthur Erdman (chr.), Anne Erickson, Lael Gatewood, James Hurn, Ed Ney, Joseph Grosz, Jeremy Larson, Dennis Hansen (ex officio), Clint Hewitt, Robert Kvakik, Vilis Vikmanis.

ARTHUR G. ERDMAN
Chair

Accepted

XV. RESEARCH COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The Senate Research Committee addressed a number of issues during the 1988-89 academic year.

Indirect Cost Recovery. The committee completed actions on a proposed set of guidelines for management of indirect cost-recovery funds. These guidelines were submitted to the Senate Consultative Committee for its review. They are intended to provide a supplement to the previously passed Senate policy regarding indirect cost recovery funds. The committee also spent considerable time with the members of administration in reviewing allocation of funds under existing policies.

Research Fraud. A second issue involved reviewing and recommending that the University adopt interim policies regarding research fraud. These policies were developed by a committee appointed by Acting Provost Shirley Clark; the committee was chaired by Dean David Brown. The interim policies were forwarded to the Senate Consultative Committee.

Faculty Fringe Benefits. The committee reviewed policies on charging faculty fringe benefits to research grants during the summer months. It prepared an analysis of cost to grants and contracts for faculty fringe benefits assessed during the summer months and submitted some recommendations to central administration to address this issue.

Office of Research and Technology Transfer Administration (ORTTA). The current space needs of ORTTA were reviewed. The committee recommended to central administration

that serious consideration be given to improving the amount, quality, and proximity of space allocated to ORTTA. We recommend strongly that efforts be made to move ORTTA closer to the center of the Twin Cities Campus.

Graduate School General Research Fund. Professors Thomas Bouchard and Warren Ibele requested that the committee review the adequacy of current funding for the Graduate School General Research Fund. The purpose of this fund is to provide support primarily to new faculty members, support conferences, equipment matching resources, research materials and other areas. Current resources are most inadequate to meet existing needs of faculty, and only a relatively small portion of submitted projects can be funded (a total of 400 proposals were submitted during FY 1988; 52% of the submitted projects were approved for funding; an additional 13% were approved, but not funded due to insufficient resources). The committee recommended to central administration that the budget for the Graduate School General Research Fund be increased in the amount of one million dollars of additional legislative allocation from ICR funds, bringing the total to \$2.8 million.

Faculty Database. The committee addressed a number of issues that are related to improving the management of financial data on funded projects, using software developed by the College of Biological Sciences and the Office of Technology Transfer and Research. It also explored the prospects for developing computerized databases of faculty interests and expertise for use internally and for dissemination to interested parties outside the University community.

Secrecy in Research. The committee reviewed the 1971 Senate Policy on Secrecy in Research. Based upon this review, it is being recommended that the Senate Research Committee review this policy during the 1988-89 academic year.

Miscellaneous. A number of other issues were discussed at meetings of the committee, including the organization of administration for research within the University, electronic bulletin boards to alert faculty and professional staff to the availability of external funding and pertinent regulatory matters, and strategies for increasing the community visibility of research conducted at the University.

ROBERT H. BRUININKS
Chair

Accepted

XVI. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The Assembly discussed general issues in undergraduate education based on a compendium of task force reports gathered by Assistant Vice President Kvavik and "Implementing a Common Entry Point" by Associate Vice President Jeanne Lupton (on behalf of the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee).

The Assembly expressed its hope that the review of liberal education requirements, proposed to be conducted by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly and Academic Affairs, consider and respect changes in those requirements adopted by the Program for Individualized Learning in University College; the College of Agriculture; University of Minnesota, Morris; and University of Minnesota, Duluth. The careful thought and work of faculty, staff, and students which went into these new plans should be built upon and not overtaken.

Recognizing that rewards for teaching and academic advising are relatively difficult to find, the Assembly proposed that the Morse-Alumni and Tate Awards become part of the recipient's base salary. (The Senate Finance Committee has adopted a version of this recommendation for the Morse-Alumni Award and forwarded its proposal to the Educational Policy Committee.)

The Assembly proposed to the Educational Policy Committee and Academic Affairs that the University develop a program for recognizing *departments* which make outstanding contributions to undergraduate education.

The Assembly regretted that the Common Entry Point Report was not widely circulated before it was adopted. It is important to recognize that the plans it outlines deal with recent

high school graduates, rather than all students who enter the University. Two major concerns arose from the discussion. First, students on the proposed "Exploration" track might be treated as second-class citizens when it comes to entry to courses and access to advisers. Second, the outline of the Exploration curriculum points toward somewhat narrowly-conceived, disciplinary and departmental study. Many students with wide-ranging interests might be better served by considering the many interdisciplinary programs that are available.

Finally, the Assembly made recommendations to Academic Affairs about its role in the selection of the (new) Vice Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, since that person will also be the Dean of University College.

DONALD ROSS
Chair

Accepted

XVII. TENURE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89 (for Faculty Senate)

Under the plan adopted for recognizing and consolidating University committees, the Tenure Committee goes out of business at the end of the 1988-89 academic year, with its functions transferred to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Accordingly, the Tenure Committee essentially performed housekeeping functions during the 1988-89 year, guiding substantive matters to the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration and developing procedural matters to promote an orderly transfer of functions.

PHILIP FRICKEY
Chair

Accepted

XVIII. SEXUAL HARASSMENT BOARD

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The Sexual Harassment Board (SHB) is composed of the following members: Gordon Beavers (faculty), Eric Klinger (faculty), Dorothy Loeffler (faculty), Mariah Snyder (faculty), Frank Wood (faculty), Doris Wiehe (civil service), Dawn Kreft (graduate student), Patty Robinson (undergraduate), and Nora Hall (academic professional/chair). Patricia Mullen, director for Equal Opportunities and Affirmative Action, serves as entry level officer and as a 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.

Attached is a table listing the sexual harassment cases filed and closed between 7/1/88 and 4/25/89. The list has been edited to protect the anonymity of individuals involved. The table summarizes the number of formal as well as informal complaints filed with the entry level officer and the status of such complaints. A listing of inquiries which did not result in formal or informal complaints are included as well. The table also provides data on complaints filed and closed by other units.

The SHB has met as a full board seven times during this academic year. We will hold an additional meeting in June to plan for 1989-90. Our primary focus during 1988-89 has been the development and implementation of the campus-wide sexual harassment survey. The Board, with major contributions from Eric Klinger, has worked closely with the Minnesota Center for Survey Research (MCSR) to develop and administer the survey. To date the response rate has been excellent. A total of 5,909 surveys were mailed to random samples of

University employees and students. At the time this report was prepared survey returns were as follows: academic employees (72%), undergraduates (72%), graduates (80%), civil service (75%).

The SHB has also given significant attention to the revision of the University's grievance procedures. In addition, numerous procedural items have consumed Board time.

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS
FILED AND CLOSED BETWEEN 7/1/88 AND 4/25/89
IN ENTRY LEVEL OFFICE (E.L.O.)**

FORMAL

| <u>Status of Complainant</u> | <u>Status of Respondent</u> | <u>Date and Issue</u> | <u>Date and Outcome</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Graduate Student | Tenured Faculty | 12/4/86, Rejected sexual overture and later experienced retaliation; at that time, filed complaint. | 11/3/88, Resolved academic concerns; warning given to faculty member. |
| Graduate Student | Tenured Faculty | 11/24/87, Inappropriate and overly personal comments and touching; unusual attention with sexual overtures. | 7/12/88, Written agreement; apology; 12 mo. consultation with Dean, 2 years no female advisees; no contact with complainant; pay summer tuition and counseling fees. |
| Undergrad Student | Tenured Faculty | 1/22/88, Student reported being followed, "hang up" calls at home, unwarranted attentions from professor. | 8/10/88, Dismissed, unable to substantiate. |
| Undergrad Student | P/A Employee | 3/18/88, Inappropriate genital contact while hugging. | 7/22/88, Written agreement; treatment program at expense of employee, special supervision and guidelines for job performance, written reprimand. |
| Undergrad Student | Tenured Faculty | 5/17/88, Lewd and suggestive comments during class. | 12/8/88, Written agreement: special evaluation of subsequent class; review by department head; counseling for faculty member. |
| Civil Service | Civil Service Supervisor | 7/6/88, Offensive sexual comments. | 7/8/88, Reprimand letter. |
| Civil Service Bargaining Unit | Civil Service | 7/12/88, Hostile atmosphere, persistent sexual jokes and comments, unequal access to training, equipment, student help. | 9/14/88, Written warning; 3 day suspension; new work policies developed by dept. head. |
| Former employee & contract employee | P/A employee | 11/17/88, Relationship included sexual touching, kissing; unequal status impaired consent. In other case, refusal of sexual overture created hostile environment. | 1/27/89, Recommendation of termination for cause accepted by Provost. Employee resigned before process concluded. |
| Undergrad Student | P/A Employee | 2/16/89, Inappropriate touching during advising session. | 3/24/89, Respondent resigned after being advised of recommendation of termination on basis of this & previous history of complaints. |

INFORMAL

| <u>Status of Complainant</u> | <u>Status of Respondent</u> | <u>Date and Issue</u> | <u>Date and Outcome</u> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Undergrad Student | Tenured Faculty | 5/24/88, Offensive remark by faculty member. | 8/4/88, Meeting with faculty member and E.L.O. to convey "unwelcome" aspect of comment. |
| Undergrad Student | Tenure Track Faculty | 5/25/88, Offensive remark by faculty member. | 9/20/88, Meeting with faculty member and E.L.O. to convey "unwelcome" aspect of comment. |
| Undergrad Student | Temporary Faculty | 6/7/88, Felt sexual overtures were made by faculty and retracted. Subsequently retaliation occurred. | 10/26/88, Written agreement. Tuition refund and negotiated letter of reference. |
| Member of Public | Student | 7/15/88, Suggestive and threatening comment. | 8/16/88, Meeting with student and E.L.O. and another Univ. official about appropriate behavior. |
| Student Employee | Civil Service Supervisor | 12/21/88, Suggestive language, pressure for dates, some unwanted touching. | 2/10/89, Dismissed, could not corroborate. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|--|
| Graduate Student | Tenured Faculty Member | 2/2/89, Attempted kiss/embrace-one instance. | | 2/23/89, Met with faculty member, explained student reaction. Discussed S.H. policy particularly section regarding consent. |
| Graduate Student | Teaching Assistant | 11/9/88, Forcible kissing during tutoring session. | | 3/15/89, Dept. Head reissued S.H. policy statement to all T.A.'s. Warned T.A. Refunded tuition. |
| Civil Service Employee | Civil Service Employee Bargaining Unit | 8/12/88, Leering, inappropriate attention. | Complainant's Supervisor | 8/88, Complainant's supervisor talked to employee and to employee's supervisor and told them the behavior was unwelcome. |
| Civil Service Employees | Tenure Track Faculty | 10/17/88, Inappropriate gestures and remarks. | Department Head | 10/88, Oral warning and explanation of Univ. policy. |
| Civil Service Employee | Civil Service Employee | 1/4/89, Inappropriate personal questions of co-worker & request for relationship. | Director | 2/7/89, Clarified mutual expectations of co-workers about policy & achieved agreement that they could continue to work together. |
| Undergraduate Student Employee | Undergraduate Student Employee | 1/27/89, Obscene gestures & joke (3 occasions). | Manager | 2/13/89, Oral warning. Apology to complainant. File copies to E.L.O. |
| Civil Service | Civil Service | 11/9/88, Harassing comment re sexual orientation & physical contact during confrontation. | Dept. Head | 12/20/88, Written warning. Disseminated policy in office. |
| Civil Service | Clients Using U. Facility | 1/89, Clients use employee facilities and occasionally act inappropriately or harass employees. | Dept. Administrator | 3/30/89, Signs posted re facility use rules. Incident report forms developed for use if inappropriate behavior occurs. |
| Student | Student Employee | 2/19/89, Name calling with sexual reference. | Director of Unit | 3/15/89, Removed employee from assignments. Had mandatory session for others re S.H. & discrimination policy. |

SUMMARY

| | Total | 88-89 | 87-88 | 86-87 | 85-86 | 84-85 |
|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Formal | 36 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 5 |
| Informal | 45 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 14 |
| Other Units | 31 | 7 | 6 | 18 | NA | NA |
| Inquiries | 104 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 18 |
| | <u>216</u> | <u>43</u> | <u>36</u> | <u>61</u> | <u>39</u> | <u>37</u> |

**NORA HALL
Chair**

Accepted

XIX. REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT

(10 minutes)

See abstract

XX. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

See abstract

XXI. OLD BUSINESS

None

XXII. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

See abstract

XXIII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY AND STUDENTS

FACULTY MEMBERS

HAROLD FINESTONE

1920-1989

Most who remember the "Chicago school" of sociology think of the days of Park, Wirth, Thomas, Burgess, Ogburn, and their colleagues in the 1920s and 1930s. For the discipline of sociology, facing the twenty-first century, an even more influential "Chicago school" consisted of those graduate students who studied on the Midway in the fifteen years immediately after the end of the Second World War.

Among these scholars, not the best known but ranking in importance for those who learned from him, was Harold Finestone, who passed away on May 9, 1989, after many years of poor health. He was a beloved member of the University of Minnesota Department of Sociology for twenty-three years, having previously taught at the University of Chicago and McMaster University. Hal was particularly valued by those cohorts of graduate students to whom he dispensed advice and criticism. That Minnesota has been known for the quality of its qualitative training of graduate students is due in large measure to the graduate courses that Harold Finestone offered in design of qualitative research and in symbolic interaction. He was also a mainstay in the criminology and deviance area of the department, teaching criminology and juvenile delinquency. Hal was generous with his insight and was unfailingly kind to those who sought his advice.

Most of his colleagues in sociology and criminology know Harold Finestone for his classic article, memorably entitled "Cats, Kicks, and Color," one of the first qualitative studies of heroin addicts, an article reprinted numerous times and for which he received a citation by the Helen L. DeRoy Award Committee for writing in the field of social problems. His 1964 doctoral dissertation, "A Comparative Study of Reformation and Recidivism among Italian and Polish Adult Male Criminal Offenders," received the Susan Colver-Rosenberger Prize for the best thesis written in the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago. Portions of this dissertation subsequently appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology*. He also published a book, *Victims of Change: Juvenile Delinquents in America*.

His gentle insight and courtly disposition will be missed by all those who knew him.

MULFORD Q. SIBLEY

1913-1989

One of the most beloved of colleagues died on April 19 following a heart attack. His intellectual and personal integrity were models for academic performance at Minnesota and for the national community of scholars as well. The care for learning and teaching which came so naturally to him was also at the core of his critical concern for the University. For him there was no segregation of the ideals of open, responsible scholarly criticism from the norms of community conduct, not at Minnesota nor in the world at large.

An Oklahoman by birth and education as far as his master's degree, he earned his Ph.D. in political science at the University of Minnesota in 1938. After ten years at the University of Illinois, he returned to the University as associate professor of political science in 1948. His research and teaching included political philosophy, classical, medieval and modern, American and European. His intellectual-moral journeys included Eastern Asian

philosophy, society, nature and science, para-psychology, and philosophy of pacifism. Anyone who observed his roving mind understood that he was a seeker, in a very classical sense. In teaching political philosophy he acknowledged that he was a Platonist rather than an Aristotelian. Rather than treading the commonplace byways of phenomena, his search was always for the ultimate source of enlightenment. This route often led him in directions other than the norms and prescriptions for worldly academic success. Certainly the trapings of academic status left him cold.

A list of awards received would not describe his quest or his profounder talents: winner of the Franklin D. Roosevelt prize of the American Political Science Association for co-authoring the "best book on the relation of government to human welfare" (1953), Rockefeller Fellow in Political Philosophy (1959-60), and, of course, Distinguished Teaching Award (1961). He served as editor for a number of professional political science associations, including five years for the American Political Science Association with his wife Marjorie. He also was elected to the executive council of that organization in 1975.

Aside from his teaching and research in the Department of Political Science, Mulford was co-chairman of the former Social Science Program and co-edited a comprehensive text in the social sciences along with such faculty members as Arthur Naftalin and Andreas Papandreou. From 1975 until his retirement, he served the American Studies Program as director of Graduate Studies. His work in American Studies yielded a special joy for him which was reciprocated by students and colleagues. The multitude of his interests are reflected in the books and many published articles and his renown is reflected by his itinerary over the years as a visiting professor to many academic institutions.

At his death the local press recalled his public persona: his courageous defense of free expression and an open society even against popular movements for repressive action. Yet these were only reflections of his most precious gifts, his total respect for the mind of the other—the student, the colleague—during those private moments when he and the other could find a clearer path together out of the dark wood.

STUDENT

Daniel Herbert Gall, Medical School

XXIV. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The Senate meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. by President Nils Hasselmo in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, with coordinate campuses linked by telephone.

Physical Plant and Space Allocation Subcommittee. Mark Brenner, professor of horticultural science and landscape architecture and chair of the Consultative Committee, presented a proposal to provide for ex officio members on the Physical Plant and Space Allocation Subcommittee under the new committee structure. It was approved unanimously.

Class Hours/Credit Ratio. In presenting a recommendation for a one-to-one ratio between the number of credits for a course and the number of hours per week that the course meets, Mr. Brenner reported that his committee had suggested that the item be first discussed by the Senate then acted on at the fall meeting.

John Clark, professor of sociology and chair of the Educational Policy Committee, opened the discussion, explaining that the proposal stemmed from some anxiety about the discrepancy between credits given and hours met. Also, he said, the Academic Priorities document under Commitment to Focus contained it as one of the proposals to upgrade the undergraduate education experience to standards of peer institutions. Last year his committee had approved it in principle but had tabled it in deference to the quarter/semester issue. There was some fear that the policy would be blindly or partially implemented, but otherwise he thought the proposal as outlined addressed all other issues. He said it had a permissive tone in that it encouraged exceptions if they were determined by the curriculum unit as being appropriate, and it suggested that specifically nontraditional pedagogy be considered. Most colleges, he concluded, were now conforming to the policy.

Mr. Brenner said that his committee had commented that a comparison of peer institutions with four-credit courses with the University showed they meet for 200 minutes a week while University classes meet for 135 to 150 minutes and deliver the same amount of material. On the other hand, he noted, higher education is moving into an era of variable ways of delivering instruction which may not all have to take place in the classroom. With computerization and other techniques a real characteristic in delivering effective education, he said, there should be a degree of flexibility. A counter argument noted by him was the danger of over-doing flexibility in making exceptions. His committee wanted to learn more of the sentiments of other segments of the faculty before the final vote was proposed.

Norman Kerr, professor of genetics and cell biology, suggested what he called a valuable addition, that is, a clarifying statement to recognize that how much time a student spends in class in part depends on how much the student spends out of class. For example, time spent in a language lab should count, he said.

Bruce Vandal, student, asked what process would be taken to look at the present four-credit classes and whether there would be a chance for student input. Mr. Clark responded that the determination of course content and the exact configuration and judgments would be controlled by the local units. As to student involvement, that too would depend on the unit policy.

Ed Ney, Regents' professor of astronomy, thought that, if the policy were adopted, then class roll should be taken, also that the speed of the instructor's delivery should be checked. He said it was just a little too much formality, a remark that was greeted by applause.

Roland Guyotte, associate professor of history, Morris, and member of the Educational Policy Committee, said he opposed the recommendation, then yielded to Eric Klinger, professor of psychology, who also opposed it on the grounds that it was unnecessary and unwise—unnecessary because the Senate had already legislated a standard for the meaning of a credit, as Mr. Kerr had pointed out. He thought it was unwise because no one was better equipped to judge how hours are best spent than the individual instructor. While the proposed policy was described as a general one allowing for exceptions, he noted that it mandated mechanisms for enforcing the one to one in the absence of special pleading. He thought it would impose on the faculty a wasteful and demoralizing bureaucratic process and would limit the academic freedom of the faculty to design courses according to their individual best judgments. He suggested that, if the Senate needed to act, it should mandate a monitoring process for assuring that its existing rule of three hours of effort per week per credit was honored uniformly throughout the University.

Paul Holm, associate professor of arts and sciences, Crookston, called attention to the effect the recommendation would have on the two-year units of the University, where a change would mean that a few of the technical courses would have to be either reduced in credit or perhaps eliminated. Mr. Clark said the effect on those units had not been considered.

Warren Ibele, professor of mechanical engineering, recalled that prior to 1968-72 the predominant class module on the Twin Cities campus had been three credits, involving three class periods per week. The shift was made to a predominantly four-credit module primarily at the request of students, he said, because they felt that their effort and concentration, in being divided between five three-credit courses had been fragmented. The faculty had agreed. There was, however, some unevenness with which the intent was carried out, he said, with some faculty and departments simply taking the same three contact hours and awarding four credits, resulting in a sheer inflation of credits. In other departments there was a conscientious effort to follow through with the spirit of the policy, he said. The way in which the University operates, he explained, was under an agreement with the Board of Regents as to what constitutes a credit, that is, three hours per week of student effort. However, he thought there should be good quality controls if different strategies for complying were set up. He thought there was much merit in having re-examined the question and suggested it should not be put aside before a decision was made about how to measure the quality of the academic effort.

W. Phillips Shively, professor of political science, said he appreciated the sentiment that lay behind the proposal and he recognized that there had been credit inflation. However, he was not certain that the proposal was getting at the matter the right way; in some

ways it was going after "tidiness for tidiness' sake," he said. He thought re-examination of how well the University was meeting the definition of a credit would make sense. Some of his reservations had to do with addressing the issue through the assignment of one credit to one hour of work. He had found that most students had a good, solid 50-minute attention span, and he preferred five-credit, five meetings a week classes. He said he did not see any pedagogical advantage in having two meetings a week of 50 minutes each. It would not be a problem for the faculty in making the shift, but he thought there probably would not be any gain in terms of learning. He maintained there were other problems with equating the one-to-one relationship with quality of instruction. For example, in the College of Liberal Arts a three-credit graduate seminar often meets for two hours, and he was not sure that adding a third hour of sitting and talking would improve that experience; in fact, he said, most graduate students were working far more than three hours per week per credit. He predicted that the cumbersome machinery for granting exceptions would not bring about pedagogical gains. He suggested, as a more useful way to approach the problem, a course-by-course review by all colleges of the actual amount of student effort going into each course, the results of which might be revealing and probably indicate some credit inflation.

The time having run out, the President urged that further comments be directed to Messrs. Clark or Brenner.

CEE/Day School Registration. Mr. Brenner introduced a proposal to computerize Continuing Education and Extension records to make them compatible with day school records. Currently, he said, it is very difficult to pull together a transcript for students enrolled in both units, so funds were being requested to unify the system. Both the Consultative and Educational Policy Committees endorsed the recommendation. Mr. Clark added that the Management Information Systems administrative committee had it high on its list of priorities after "the money rolls in." A senator wanted to know when the money would roll in; he was told that the legislative conference meeting was even then in session. Chris Macosko, professor of chemical engineering and materials science, asked whether it would eliminate the problem of an Extension student registering for a day class and getting a substantial tuition break. Mr. Brenner said that was a separate issue, one of several such anomalies with respect to tuition. The resolution was then approved.

Teaching Awards. Mr. Clark recalled that for 24 years the University had given faculty awards in the amount of \$2,000 for outstanding contributions in undergraduate education. His committee had considered a proposal for a lifetime award similar to that given Regents' professors, but eventually decided to recommend \$5,000 to be awarded annually to ten faculty members for three years, with one half going to the faculty member's department for his or her use to further enhance undergraduate education. He said the Alumni Association had indicated possible support of \$25,000 for the first year (they now provide \$18,000), and the University of Minnesota Foundation was considering establishment of an endowment which would be around \$3 million at maturity and would provide the other \$125,000.

Edward Cushing, professor of ecology and behavioral biology, asked whether consideration had been given to recognizing exceptional teachers by making the award to them more than once. Mr. Clark said there was interest in that proposal but it had not been included because it was decided that there were so many fine instructors at the University that it would be unfair. There was not complete agreement, however, and he thought that in the future the policy might be changed. When asked what the half going to the department was intended for, Mr. Clark said that the only specification was that the recipient would make the decision as to its use in furthering undergraduate education.

Eric Huang, student, asked whether any consideration had been given to maintaining the departmental portion over a longer period of time because development of a project might not be continued for lack of funds after such a short period. Mr. Clark said that had not been discussed. He added that a truly significant project would surely be picked up by the department. The motion was then approved.

Consultative Committee. Mr. Brenner reviewed briefly the activities of his committee over the past year, including participation in the presidential search process, advice to central administration with regard to its organizational structure, identification of faculty members to serve on search committees, lobbying at the legislature, participation in a traveling

"road show" throughout the state on behalf of the University (a very productive venture which he hoped would continue), and meeting with the Governor and scheduling his visit to the Faculty Senate. He paid tribute to the University's legislative liaison officer, Irwin Rubenstein, professor of genetics and cell biology, who had done a remarkably effective job and had created a biweekly newsletter sharing University accomplishments with that body. He added that Mr. Rubenstein and Geoffrey Maruyama, professor of educational psychology, had spent many hours at the legislature representing the interests of the faculty and students.

The committee had responded to recommendations from Finance Vice President Donhowe on issues of fund distribution and had endorsed his recommendation that funding should follow the Academic Priorities document. With regard to salary funds and the Academic Priorities document, the committee had pointed out that salaries were related to the individual's productivity and marketplace but not necessarily to the priorities of an academic unit. It had endorsed inclusion of a portion of available funds for retention in the amount of \$500,000. Further, it strongly endorsed continuation of salary distribution on the basis of merit, with a component for marketplace adjustment on the basis of comparative salary and retention data.

He said the committee heard a Research Committee recommendation for a working agreement on the distribution of indirect cost recovery funds and had requested some clarification of the document in the expectation of an agreement with central administration by next fall. He reported creation of two major task forces during the year—one chaired by Richard Goodrich that was completing a very thorough report and included many constructive recommendations with regard to University service units. The second task force chaired by Stephen Scallen, he said, would look at the implications of the uncapping of mandatory retirement. In the matter of extending the probationary period which had recently been proposed, he said his committee had decided that a task force should be established to determine whether it should be limited to the Medical School, which had initiated the request, or be extended to the whole University. Finally, as an outgrowth of the Academic Priorities document, he said, the committee would soon be identifying members to serve on a task force for liberal education.

Social Concerns Committee/ROTC. The President called attention to a reply from the Social Concerns Committee concerning the query raised at the last meeting as to next steps following the ROTC forum. The committee reported a continuing interest in the issue and hoped to report to the Senate at an early date next year.

The President then noted a number of annual reports from Senate committees submitted for information.

President's Report. The President thanked Mr. Brenner and his committee for a constructive and productive relationship, which he said had been very helpful in establishing the organizational structure and assisting in the various searches. He paid personal tribute to Mr. Brenner for his leadership over the past year; the Senate applauded enthusiastically. Included in further comments were the appointment of four new Regents and initiation of a process involving presentation of position papers on certain policy issues to the Regents. Each month, he said, he would issue a President's Report to the Regents, which would be available on request. He listed three recent major issues: tuition, where a position paper had been presented to the Regents and would be developed in the next few months into a strategy; enrollment, where in June the Regents would receive a position paper indicating that the implications of the targets that had been established should be reviewed for the purpose of developing a plan. He explained that the position papers were intended to encourage broad participation and he urged anyone interested in any of the issues to contact central administration. The third issue, he said, had to do with Commitment to Focus, and he called attention to a summary that was distributed at the meeting, providing background information and actions to date. He cited and congratulated Professors L. E. Scriven and George Wright, recently named Regents' professors, and two new members of the National Academic of Sciences, Professors Paul Gassman and Christopher Sims. He noted Regent recognition of the University team that won the National College Bowl and of the accomplishments of some outstanding student athletes, as well as civil service staff, and writers from some of the University publications.

The legislature was working toward resolution of its remaining differences, he said, so it appeared that the University's appropriation would be in the mid-90s, which he interpreted as a signal that the legislature and the state leadership were behind the University's goal of quality improvements as envisioned in the *Commitment to Focus* and its support had not been strictly on an enrollment-driven basis. With regard to enrollment, he said he wanted to ensure that the University provided access where it had the capability to do so without hindering the quality improvements which were the reason for introducing some enrollment limitations.

Ed Ney, Regents' professor of astronomy, suggested that one of the mistakes of the previous president had been to punish the *Minnesota Daily* by refusing to meet with its staff to patch up their differences, and he thought that inclusion of the President's monthly report in the *Daily* might serve to rebuild that relationship. President Hasselmo said he had met with the staff and reporters to establish a good working rapport.

Intercollegiate Athletics. Richard Purple, professor of physiology and former chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, had asked whether the recently announced plan for priority seating at athletic events had been approved by the committee; if so, would it have been a reversal of its stand. The President pointed out that Intercollegiate Athletics was basically a self-financing enterprise, and that he had made it clear to Director Rick Bay that he did not intend to go to the legislature to ask for state funding, given the academic priorities of the University. Thus, the director had to finance the enterprise, he said, and had decided that football priority seating (4,700 out of 63,000) was necessary to provide the financial base for the future, a move which the President supported. He said Mr. Bay had been careful to protect student, faculty, and staff seating. He admitted it was a difficult but necessary choice. Deon Stuthman, professor of agronomy and chair of the committee, said that committee opposition to priority seating must have been a matter of history because it had not been opposed within the last two years.

Another question from Mr. Purple concerned the fate of a committee resolution asking for integration of the Men's Intercollegiate Athletics Department into the general University budget. President Hasselmo responded that given current priorities he could not justify going to the state for direct support. He thought it possible that in connection with the development of athletic facilities there could be found a combination of facilities for intercollegiate athletics and recreational purposes where it would be legitimate and he could justify a request for some portion of funding to be combined with private fund-raising and athletic events' income. He said that when Mr. Bay recommended priority seating he did that against a backdrop of a projected \$800,000 deficit. Fortunately, because of the success in basketball, the deficit would be considerably reduced, but it served to illustrate the fragility of the financing of the program, he concluded.

Computing and Information Systems Committee. Michael Hancher, professor of English, called attention to the annual report, which cited a number of problems affecting telecommunications and computing, and which recommended appointment of a chief information officer to coordinate computing needs. It also urged that the Senate take a position in support of improvement of the environment for telecommunications and computing, he said; a similar College of Liberal Arts committee had strongly endorsed a similar proposal.

President Hasselmo said the appointment had been discussed when the structure of central administration was considered and, because of the large number of existing administrative vacancies, the decision was made not to act on it. The same was true of the proposed vice president for research position. Those issues would be raised later, he said, and he suggested that the Consultative Committee add the item to its agenda. He said the matter would not "fall into oblivion."

Council of Graduate Students. Bruce Vandal, student, reported that the Council of Graduate Students had been contacting certain departments about separating themselves from the Minnesota Student Association and creating a new governing structure with representation on the Consultative Committee and other bodies. He urged that before any formal decision was made the opinions of the MSA Forum should be sought and consideration given to the implications of giving a privilege to one specific school of the University. Mr. Brenner said he had been contacted by the COGS leadership and had agreed that it would

be appropriate for them to make a presentation to his committee on June 1. He assured Mr. Vandal that nothing would come in the back door.

Class Hours/Credit Ratio and Tuition. Eric Huang, student, had been doing some calculating. He said that, given the information on three hours of work per credit per week and the approximate 8 percent anticipated rise in tuition, he had figured that students would have to work about 1½ hours extra per week in order to raise the additional \$60 to \$80 a quarter they would need, which would mean they could take about one-half credit less per quarter. Also, he hoped that in the future in the formation of tuition policy there could be increased student involvement. The President said that the tuition task force that was being reactivated would have further strengthened student participation.

After a silent tribute to a deceased faculty member and a student, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

The fourth meeting of the Student Senate for 1988-89 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the University Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 16 voting members of the student body.

I. REPORT BY CHAIR

(5 minutes)

see abstract

II. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

REPORT BY CHAIR (5 minutes)

see abstract

III. ELECTION OF 1989-90 CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

(5 minutes)

Rod Jorgenson was elected chair; Matt Kirkwood, vice chair

IV. NEW BUSINESS

(3 minutes)

none

V. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The Student Senate was called to order at 4:35 p.m. by Chair Bruce Vandal in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, with coordinate campuses linked by phone. He reported that the legislature was winding down and that some of the student interests had been addressed there through the offices of the Student Lobbying Advisory Committee. He announced that old and new members of that committee would meet the next week for orientation and urged student body presidents and other participants from all campuses to attend.

Carrie Simenson, chair of the Student Consultative Committee, reported the names of the newly elected student members to the Consultative Committee.

Mr. Vandal reviewed the duties of the chair of the Student Senate, after which Rod Jorgenson was nominated to serve for next year, the nominations were closed, and he was elected unanimously. Ms. Simenson nominated Matt Kirkwood for vice chair; there were no further nominations, and he was elected.

Mr. Vandal hoped that next year the Senate could work toward becoming a little stronger and more committed to getting things accomplished, and he adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

APPENDIX A
ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS, 1988-89

The University Senate met 4 times and the Faculty Senate met once during 1988-89.

| <u>FACULTY</u> | <u>Attended</u> | <u>Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate</u> |
|----------------------|-----------------|---|
| Amram, Fred | 4 | 0 |
| Anderson, John S. | 3 | 1 |
| Argento, Dominick | 3 | 1 |
| Aroskar, Mila | 3 | 2 |
| Ballou, Mercedes | 3 | 1 |
| Bantle, John | 2 | 1 |
| Bayman, Benjamin | 2 | 0 |
| Benson, Ellis | 2 | 3 |
| Berryman, Glenn | 3 | 0 |
| Biesboer, David | 2 | 1 |
| Bloomfield, Clara | 2 | 2 |
| Bodley, James | 5 | 0 |
| Bohling, Raymond | 4 | 0 |
| Boylan, William | 5 | 0 |
| Brewer, Maria | 2 | 2 |
| Burkhardt, Dwight | 3 | 0 |
| Burkhart, Ann | 2 | 3 |
| Busta, Frank | 2 | 1 |
| Byrne, Richard | 1 | 2 |
| Caplan, Arthur | 2 | 1 |
| Cavert, Mead | 5 | 0 |
| Chou, Shelley | 2 | 2 |
| Christenson, Richard | 5 | 0 |
| Clark, John | 5 | 0 |
| Clay, David | 2 | 2 |
| Clayton, Paula | 1 | 3 |
| Clayton, Thomas | 2 | 3 |
| Coen, Edward | 3 | 0 |
| Connolly, James | 1 | 1 |
| Cornelius, Steven | 3 | 1 |
| Cotter, James | 5 | 0 |
| Chrisham, Patricia | 3 | 1 |
| Cushing, Edward | 5 | 0 |
| Daniels, Charles | 2 | 1 |
| Dehner, Louis | 2 | 0 |
| Deressa, Solomon | 2 | 1 |
| Dickhaut, John | 2 | 0 |
| Donahue, James | 4 | 0 |
| Downing, Stephen | 4 | 0 |
| Dworkin, Martin | 3 | 0 |
| Dykstra, Robert | 3 | 0 |
| Eaton, Marcia | 4 | 0 |
| Edwardson, Sandra | 5 | 0 |
| Eidman, Vernon | 3 | 1 |
| Einsweiler, Robert | 3 | 0 |
| Elde, Robert | 1 | 2 |
| Erdman, Arthur | 5 | 0 |
| Feeney, Daniel | 3 | 0 |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Gadberry, Glenn | 5 | 0 |
| Galambos, Theodore | 3 | 0 |
| Gaston, Judith | 4 | 0 |
| Gault, N. L. | 3 | 2 |
| Giebink, G. Scott | 2 | 0 |
| Giese, Clayton | 2 | 1 |
| Giese, David | 2 | 0 |
| Gillmor, Donald | 3 | 1 |
| Goetz, Fred | 4 | 1 |
| Goldstein, Richard | 4 | 0 |
| Gray, Virginia | 4 | 1 |
| Griffin, Edward | 3 | 2 |
| Guyotte, Roland | 4 | 1 |
| Haller, Edwin | 4 | 1 |
| Hamilton, David | 2 | 2 |
| Hancher, Michael | 4 | 0 |
| Hart, Nathaniel | 3 | 1 |
| Hearn, James | 3 | 2 |
| Hoff, David | 4 | 0 |
| Hogenkamp, Henricus | 5 | 0 |
| Holm, Paul | 4 | 1 |
| Holum, Katharine | 4 | 0 |
| Hostetter, Margaret | 2 | 2 |
| Howe, Robert | 4 | 0 |
| Hoyle, Karen | 3 | 2 |
| Hunter, Alan | 3 | 0 |
| Hupp, Susan | 2 | 2 |
| Jacob, Harry | 1 | 2 |
| Joeres, Ruth-Ellen | 3 | 1 |
| Johnson, Dennis | 5 | 0 |
| Jones, Richard | 4 | 1 |
| Kareken, John | 1 | 1 |
| Kaveh, Mostafa | 3 | 0 |
| Kelly, Richard | 2 | 3 |
| Kerr, Norman | 5 | 0 |
| King, Robert | 4 | 0 |
| Kittleson, David | 4 | 0 |
| Kitts, James | 3 | 0 |
| Krislov, Sam | 4 | 0 |
| Krivot, William | 0 | 2 |
| Lee, E. Bruce | 3 | 0 |
| Lehmberg, Stanford | 3 | 1 |
| Lewis, Darrell | 3 | 1 |
| Lilley, Karen | 5 | 0 |
| Little, James | 5 | 0 |
| Luker, Mark | 2 | 0 |
| Macosko, Chris | 2 | 0 |
| Maitland, Ian | 2 | 1 |
| Malzer, Gary | 5 | 0 |
| Mandel, Jack | 3 | 0 |
| Marshall, Byron | 2 | 1 |
| Martin, Frank | 2 | 1 |
| Mason, H. E. | 2 | 2 |
| Mazzoni, Timothy | 4 | 0 |
| McKeever, Patrick | 4 | 0 |
| Moller, James | 1 | 1 |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Montgomery, Jean | 5 | 0 |
| Munholland, J. Kim | 5 | 0 |
| Murray, David | 2 | 2 |
| Nelson, David | 3 | 0 |
| Ney, Edward | 2 | 2 |
| Nitsche, Johannes | 3 | 0 |
| Olson, William | 3 | 0 |
| Orey, Steven | 2 | 0 |
| Perry, James | 3 | 1 |
| Peterson, Kathleen | 5 | 0 |
| Pijoan, Carlos | 3 | 0 |
| Poppele, Richard | 2 | 2 |
| Pour-El, Marian | 2 | 2 |
| Prager, Stephen | 4 | 0 |
| Pucel, David | 4 | 1 |
| Quam, Jean | 3 | 0 |
| Quie, Paul | 3 | 1 |
| Reed, Peter | 4 | 1 |
| Reynolds, Paul | 4 | 1 |
| Roering, Kenneth | 2 | 2 |
| Ruttan, Vernon | 4 | 1 |
| Savaiano, Dennis | 3 | 2 |
| Schultz, Chester | 3 | 2 |
| Sell, George | 1 | 1 |
| Serfass, Robert | 5 | 0 |
| Shur, Michael | 3 | 0 |
| Silberman, Robert | 4 | 0 |
| Simon, Stephen | 2 | 0 |
| Sonkowsky, Robert | 4 | 1 |
| Staba, John | 5 | 0 |
| Stein, Marvin | 2 | 1 |
| Storvick, David | 3 | 1 |
| Stuhler, Barbara | 4 | 1 |
| Stuthman, Deon | 5 | 0 |
| Sullivan, Constance | 2 | 1 |
| Swanson, Bert | 4 | 0 |
| Tellegen, Auke | 4 | 0 |
| Tirrell, Matthew | 2 | 1 |
| Wambach, Cathrine | 2 | 1 |
| Wang, Yang | 4 | 0 |
| Ward, Gil | 2 | 2 |
| Warner, William | 4 | 0 |
| Warren, Barbara | 3 | 0 |
| Weyhmann, Walter | 4 | 0 |
| White, James | 4 | 0 |
| Yust, Becky | 5 | 0 |
| Zimmerman, Kenneth | 3 | 2 |

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Brenner, Mark | 5 | 0 |
| Ibele, Warren | 3 | 1 |
| Mullins, Lynnette | 4 | 0 |
| Overmier, J. Bruce | 0 | 5 |
| Phillips, Ronald | 2 | 0 |
| Price, Kathleen | 2 | 0 |
| Shapiro, Burton | 1 | 0 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Shively, W. Phillips | 5 | 0 |
| Steffes, Michael | 4 | 1 |
| Van Alstine, James | 4 | 1 |
| STUDENTS | | |
| Alsamsam, Iyad | 3 | 0 |
| Baxter, Tom | 4 | 0 |
| Benke, Bruce (forfeited membership 4/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Boland, Stephen | 2 | 2 |
| Born, Bob | 3 | 0 |
| Breyen, Mark (forfeited membership 4/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Brose, Mark | 2 | 0 |
| Campion, Tim | 2 | 0 |
| Christopherson, Todd (resigned 1/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Coffey, Ellen (appointed 1/89) | 3 | 0 |
| Davis, Becky (appointed 1/89) | 2 | 0 |
| Eull, Karen (resigned 2/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Fisher, Scott (forfeited membership 4/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Flaa, John | 3 | 0 |
| Globus, Mark | 3 | 0 |
| Grishen, Carol (appointed 2/89) | 2 | 1 |
| Groves, Mark | 2 | 1 |
| Hansen, Dennis | 2 | 0 |
| Hedberg, Anne | 3 | 0 |
| Johnson, Brian (appointed 1/89) | 1 | 1 |
| Johnson, Karlene (appointed 1/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Kennedy, Marianne | 3 | 0 |
| Kirkwood, Matthew | 4 | 0 |
| Klein, Ann | 4 | 0 |
| Koker, Michael (appointed 1/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Kvasnik, Alan (forfeited membership 4/89) | 0 | 0 |
| Larson, Derek (forfeited membership 4/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Leuty, Peter (resigned 4/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Mandel, Lynn | 1 | 0 |
| Mitchell, Mark | 2 | 0 |
| Monserrate, Alberto | 3 | 0 |
| Moore, Steve | 4 | 0 |
| Morrison, Dwight | 2 | 0 |
| Mukherjee, Joia (forfeited membership 4/89) | 0 | 0 |
| Nguyen, Tam Khac | 2 | 0 |
| Niskanen, Lora | 2 | 0 |
| Okongwu, Steven (forfeited membership 3/89) | 0 | 0 |
| Olafson, Paul (resigned 12/88) | 1 | 0 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Olson, Miriam (forfeited membership 4/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Peterson, Jeffrey (forfeited membership 2/89) | 0 | 0 |
| Peterson, Melanie | 3 | 0 |
| Pilhofer, Aron | 3 | 0 |
| Poul, Tom | 3 | 0 |
| Punches, Jeanette (appointed 1/89) | 2 | 0 |
| Ray, Thomas | 3 | 0 |
| Richardson, Diedra (forfeited membership 4/89) | 0 | 0 |
| Roos, Anne (appointed 1/89) | 2 | 0 |
| Russell, Wendy (forfeited membership 4/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Schammel, David (forfeited membership 4/89) | 0 | 0 |
| Schloegel, Sarah | 3 | 0 |
| Shuker, Iain | 3 | 0 |
| Sorokie, Tina | 2 | 0 |
| Speakman, Kristen | 1 | 2 |
| Steiner, Cathy | 3 | 0 |
| Stelmach, Gregg | 3 | 0 |
| Stenberg, Adam (appointed 4/89) | 0 | 1 |
| Sullivan, Linda | 3 | 0 |
| Sumstine, Edward (forfeited membership 4/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Swick, James | 2 | 0 |
| Swierzcek, Joseph | 3 | 1 |
| Tanimoto, Rockee (resigned 2/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Thompson, Judy | 3 | 0 |
| Thul, Kristen | 1 | 2 |
| Tuomela, Wade (appointed 1/89) | 1 | 0 |
| Zimmerman, Michelle | 2 | 0 |

STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Castillo, Alfredo | 0 | 0 |
| Erickson, Tim | 2 | 0 |
| Faraci, Paula | 3 | 0 |
| Grams, Christine | 1 | 0 |
| Huang, Eric | 4 | 0 |
| Jodl, Katie | 2 | 0 |
| Schoon, Jim | 1 | 0 |
| Simenson, Carrie | 4 | 0 |
| Tackett, John | 3 | 0 |

Forfeiture of membership is due to neglect of meetings.