

WAIT
UNA

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES

February 15, 1990

The second meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly for 1989-90 was convened in 25 Law Center on Thursday, February 15, 1990, at 3:15 p.m. Checking or signing the roll as present were 112 voting members of the faculty/academic professionals, 30 voting members of the student body, 2 ex officio, and 8 nonmembers. Vice President Michael Steffes presided.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 16

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

COMMITTEES OF THE ASSEMBLY, 1989-90

Action (2 minutes)

Additions to those listed in the November 16 Assembly Minutes:
 STUDENT BEHAVIOR—Students: David Artman, Brian Larsen.
 SUPPORT SERVICES—Students: Daniel Lackas.

Approved

III. STEERING COMMITTEE

NOMINATING COMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Action by Faculty Assembly (3 minutes)

MOTION:

That the following persons be approved as members of a nominating committee to provide a slate from which the Faculty Assembly will elect 1990-93 members of the Committee on Committees: Vernon Cardwell, chr. (Agriculture), Andrea Hinding (CLA), Henricus Hogenkamp (Medical School), Robert Pepin (IT), and Anne Pick (Education).

WARREN IBELE
Chair

Approved

**IV. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
FOR THE TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
Action by Faculty Assembly (3 minutes)**

MOTION:

That the Faculty Assembly approve the following slate: Amos Deinard, Lael Gatewood, Donald Rasmusson, Thomas Scott.

INFORMATION:

The Special Nominating Committee (approved by the Assembly on November 16) to fill two 1990-93 Twin Cities faculty terms on the Senate Consultative Committee presents the following four names, from which two are to be elected by mail ballot by the faculty of the Twin Cities campus:

AMOS DEINARD: 1969*, Associate Professor of Pediatrics, Medical School and Director of the Community-University Health Care Center. He has served or currently is serving on the following: Senate Judicial Committee (chair); Assembly International Students Committee; Senate Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee; Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance Procedures; Task Force to Discuss Extension of Probationary Period for Tenure Track Faculty; Task Force on Mandatory Retirement; Medical School Admissions Committee (co-chair); UMHC Outpatient Committee (chair); UMHC Board of Governors Joint Conference Committee; UMHC Quality Assurance Steering Committee; Department of Pediatrics Educational Policy Committee.

LAEL GATEWOOD: 1967*, Professor of Lab Medicine and Pathology and Director of Health Computer Sciences, Medical School. She has served or currently is serving on the following: University Senate; Senate Finance and Planning Committee; Senate Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee; Senate Educational Policy Committee; Senate Instructional Materials and Media Committee; Senate Library Committee; University Computer Services Committee (chair); Health Sciences Graduate School Policy and Review Council (chair); Medical School Educational Policy Committee. Other: Medical School representative to Central Administration MIS Staff Group; former Assistant to Vice President for Academic Affairs.

DONALD RASMUSSON: 1958*, Professor of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, College of Agriculture. He has served or currently is serving on the following: University Senate; Senate Faculty Affairs Committee; Senate Faculty Retirement Plan Committee; Senate Consultative Committee; Senate Select Committee; Committee to Facilitate the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty; Search Committee for Vice President for Finance and Operations (chair); College of Agriculture Faculty Consultative Committee (chair); Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics Consultative Committee (chair); College of Agriculture Dean's Selection Committee; Graduate School General Research Advisory Committee. Other: Director of Graduate Studies.

THOMAS SCOTT: 1962*, Professor of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts and Director of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. He has served or currently is serving on the following: University Senate; Senate Committee on Committees (chair); Senate Physical Plant and Space Allocation Committee (chair); Senate Finance Committee; Committee to Revise Senate and Assembly Committee Structure (chair); University Computer Services Committee; CLA Consultative Committee; Law School Dean Review Committee (chair); Urban Studies Committee; Search Committee for University Lobbyist (chair); Search Committee for Vice Provost. Other: former department chair.

The Assembly Steering Committee serves as the executive committee of the Assembly and forms the Twin Cities membership of the Senate Consultative Committee. Additional nominations, certified as willing to stand for election, may be made by (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculties, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly the day before the Twin Cities Campus Assembly meeting

(2) nominations on the floor of the Assembly. The faculty representatives of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly shall reduce by vote the slate to twice the number to be elected.

Currently serving with terms continuing at least through next year are W. Andrew Collins (College of Education), Warren Ibele (Institute of Technology), Norman Kerr (College of Biological Sciences), J. Bruce Overmier (College of Liberal Arts), and Charlotte Striebel (Institute of Technology).

The terms of Ronald Phillips (College of Agriculture) and Kathleen Price (Law School) expire at the end of this academic year.

**W. PHILLIPS SHIVELY, Chair
RUTHERFORD ARIS
LARRY BOWERS
WILLIAM BOYLAN
SHIRLEY CLARK**

*Date of initial appointment at the University

Approved

V. STEERING COMMITTEE

SUPPORT SERVICES COMMITTEE

Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the Rules of the Assembly, Article III, Section 2, Ex officio Members of Assembly Committees, to add members as follows to the Support Services Committee:

Support Services—Office of the Senior Vice President, Finance and Operations; Office of the Vice President, Student Development (Coordinator, Student Support Services); Associate Vice President, Physical Planning; Assistant Vice President, Support Services and Operations.

COMMENT:

The intent of the change is to place on the committee those individuals who are directly responsible for the major support services with which the committee will regularly deal. There are other support service units (Physical Plant, Athletics, etc.) who work directly with other Assembly and Senate committees and thus deal less frequently with the Support Services Committee. There are also other support service units which will work with the Support Services Committee (such as Police, Bookstores, etc.) but will do so on a less frequent basis and need not therefore be formal ex officio members of the committee.

**WARREN IBELE
Chair**

Approved

VI. STEERING COMMITTEE

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That Article III, Section 3, Assembly bylaws be amended to add to the duties and responsibilities of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee as follows:

POLICY SETTING

To initiate, review, and vote on all legislative matters affecting changes in pertaining to rules and regulations; policies and procedures controlling the eligibility of students for participation in intercollegiate athletics; and such other policies and proceduress as it deems necessary and appropriate to govern affecting the conduct of intercollegiate athletics on the Twin Cities campus.

New section following ADMINISTRATIVE:

JUDICIAL

- a. To determine the eligibility for participation in intercollegiate athletics of student-athletes who are alleged to have violated any rules of athletic governing organizations, and to determine, within the limties permitted by those rules, the appropriate scanction if it is determined that the violation(s) occurred.
- b. To retain final authority over the determination of eligibility of a student for participation in intercollegiate athletics irrespective of the cause or locus of any dispute which casts doubt on his or her eligibility.

Add new Section c to REPORTING:

- c. To report all policy adoptions and changes to the Assembly Steering Committee.

Add new section following REPORTING:

GENERAL

Notwithstanding any other provisions to the contrary in these bylaws, to promulgate any such policies and to take any such actions that it deems necessary and appropriate to ensure that intercollegiate athletics are conducted in a fashion suitable for the students, faculty, and staff of the University of Minnesota, for the University of Minnesota generally, and for the people of the State of Minnesota; it is to be understood that this is a plenary grant of authority subject only to review by the Faculty Assembly and to the final responsibility of the president and the regents for the governance of the University.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

The following amendment was proposed and defeated: "The Twin Cities Campus Assembly of the University of Minnesota does not consider the working qualifications and remuneration of athletic performers to the academic matters. For this reason it serves notice that as of March 1, 1991, it will cease to pretend to exercise control over the major sports and will no longer empower its committees or representatives to do so." The main motion was defeated 29 to 64.

VII. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The Assembly Committee on Student Affairs met eight times during the 1988-89 year. Our discussions involved a broad range of topics, touching on many issues in student affairs.

Summary of Major Items of Business

1. Senate Task Force Review of Support Services. We were involved in early organizational meetings of this task force. We met jointly with the task force in March to discuss those service units which have oversight committees presently organized under ACSA (Housing, Transportation and Parking, Health Services, Bookstores).
2. AIDS. A major share of our time was spent in a discussion of the role the University should assume in educating our community about AIDS. A subcommittee drafted a survey

instrument in the expectation that it would be given to all new students. We determined that it is necessary to be knowledgeable about the extent of sexual activity among students and to be able to assess their awareness and understanding of sexually transmitted diseases, if we are to develop effective educational programs.

Condom Distribution. We unanimously supported Vice President Wilderson's plan for the distribution of condoms on the Twin Cities campus.

Common Entry Point. We were asked to review the proposal for a common entry point for freshman students at the University. Several concerns were raised:

- Will this simplify or complicate entry to the University?
- What would be the advantages of choosing the common entry point rather than admission to a college?
- Will there be additional money to address the serious problems identified in providing adequate advising for entry students?

Study Space. We reviewed the report of the Student Study Space Committee. The problems we identified can be categorized as follows:

- a) The University's inventory suggests that a good deal of study space exists on the Twin Cities campus. Some of the designated spaces appear to be questionable for study purposes. These spaces need to be assessed and made more visible to students. Many students do not even know where study spaces are located.
- b) The primary problem appears to be *quality* rather than *quantity* of available study space.
- c) Commons/lounge space appears to be insufficient for student needs.
- d) Additional money is needed to renovate study space.
- e) Is it appropriate to use student fees for the maintenance of study areas in the three student unions on campus?
- f) Security should be provided in late night study areas.

Parking and Transportation. The Transportation and Parking Committee submitted a report with the following recommendations supported by ACSA:

- a) Additional handicap parking areas are needed on the campus.
- b) Bus Route 73, serving a predominantly residential area on the perimeter of the Minneapolis campus, should be designated a dime zone route.
- c) The Blegen-Jones inter-campus bus should be re-routed during winter quarter to provide bus service to Dinkytown students.
- d) The University should be encouraged to investigate the real costs of the problems of limited parking and transportation access to the Twin Cities campus (lost revenue from University events, failures in student recruitment and retention, etc.).

Unfinished Business. Several agenda items slated for discussion were not addressed because of lack of time. We recommend these items to the 1989-90 Assembly Committee on Student Affairs:

- Review of SODC policies; the SODC Policy Manual contains numerous references to very specific oversight responsibilities of ACSA. In the interests of time and efficiency it would appear that some of these responsibilities should be transferred to staff in the Vice President for Student Affairs' Office. ACSA could be retained as an appeals body and as the committee for reviewing and approving major policy issues.
- Review of the University's recycling program.
- Review of U of M student conduct code. Is there a need for revision to deal with disruptive students and the behavior of the mentally ill?
- Current use of bookstore profits.
- Status of the new Alcohol Policies Regulations and Guidelines for the Office for Student Affairs. How is it being implemented? Do these policies affect faculty and staff?

- Update on the University's postering policy; a fall, 1990, report is expected.
- Update on the new sound amplification statement and revised forms.

KATHLEEN PETERSON
Chair

Accepted

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

none

IX. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

See abstract

X. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The February 15 meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was called to order at 3:15 p.m. in 25 Law Center by Michael Steffes, vice chair. Minutes of the last meeting and additions to committees were approved.

Nominating Committee. Membership of a nominating committee to fill faculty vacancies on the Committee on Committees for next year was approved.

Steering Committee slate. A slate of faculty members to run for next year's vacancies on the Steering Committee was approved without dissent, after presentation by W. Phillips Shively, professor of political science.

Support Services Committee. Warren Ibele, professor of mechanical engineering and chair of the Steering Committee, introduced a rules amendment to add to the ex officio membership of the Support Services Committee officers whom he described as being appropriate for service. The motion was approved without debate.

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee. Professor Ibele likened his position as a presenter of a motion that was narrowly defeated at the last meeting to that of a student who, regardless of how well he does in the second time around for a class that he has failed, would be under the impression that his grade would be not likely to be more than "c." He described the motion as enabling legislation for the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (ACIA) so it could exercise judicial functions in the area of eligibility of players, which is an educational concern, emphasizing that the faculty has a right and a responsibility on behalf of the institution and on behalf of the student athletes.

Hans Weinberger, professor of mathematics, introduced a motion to remove from the Assembly all exercise of control over major sports by March 1, 1991, because working qualifications and remuneration of athletes are not academic matters. He said the University is aiding and abetting a fraud on the public by representing itself as a place where students come to learn and then decide to go out for one of the major sports for a little glory. The Assembly pretends to talk about eligibility in the mistaken belief that it is in control and is trying to make the public believe it, he continued. He said the motion, if approved, would not stop the perpetration of fraud nor stop participation in sports, but simply the academic community would not take part in it any longer. He thought the time until the deadline could be used to make alternative arrangements such as having the Minnesota Vikings change their name to the University of Minnesota Gophers, or a farm system could be set up.

Professor Ibele explained that the responsibilities of the ACIA include educational matters and not grants in aid in support of the students nor any other conditions other than academic qualifications. John Clark, professor of sociology and former ACIA chair, said that in his experience there had been no more important function for faculty members on the com-

mittee than to help establish standards for academic performance of students prior to their involvement in athletics and to help make judgments as to whether those standards were being violated. He said that the fact that most of the student athletes' qualifications are quite comparable to any other distributions of students should not be overlooked.

Professor Ibele said that he and Professor Weinberger were not far apart in terms of the ends they were seeking but parted company on the means. He called attention to recent publicity from the AAUP about the increased willingness of faculties across the country to take a more active role in policing intercollegiate athletics. He noted that President Haselmo was providing leadership, and the Regents had appointed a special committee to review athletics on the campus. If the University were to take the most radical action of affiliating with a professional team, he wondered whether anyone really thought that it would escape the blame in case of various types of misbehavior, such as DWIs that have occurred in connection with the Vikings. He cited the University of North Carolina, where a faculty committee has taken action in this area and has urged its chancellor to take an active role in the conference to persuade other institutions to adopt the points they have raised. They have set a five-year limit after which they would take action unilaterally. He recommended that kind of pressure as a way to bring intercollegiate athletics under control.

Solomon Deressa, associate academic administrator, University College, hoped that Professor Weinberger meant his amendment more humorously than cynically because there appeared to be no logic behind it—by inference anything that is not academic, such as studio arts, dance, and music might also be excluded from the University's activities. He took the position that athletics properly followed is definitely part of the University activity and student development. Charlotte Striebel, associate professor of mathematics, favored the amendment, maintaining that the arguments used in opposing it were actually consistent with the amendment. She said all of Professor Ibele's suggestions could be taken into account, but within a given time frame. She resented the statement that the amendment was not the proper means for achieving the end and asked precisely what the proper means would be for the Assembly to go on record as being opposed to the status quo.

At this point a motion to extend discussion time was voted down, and the Weinberger amendment was defeated. Byron Marshall, professor of history, said he had seldom seen an issue that had generated more heat and less light than this one. He said he experienced a growing anger at the disparaging remarks made about the motivations of those who opposed the amendment. He noted that Rick Bay, director of men's intercollegiate athletics, had been quoted as indicating that only a small minority of the faculty was anti-athletic. Professor Marshall said it was an issue that covered the whole spectrum of athletics and reached from players and coaches on park boards to high schools and into the pro game. He recalled Professor Ibele's comment at the last meeting that the Assembly was reacting to the Darville case, which was in the news at the time, but he said he had given up his basketball tickets some five years ago because the fraud and mendacity was getting in the way of his enjoyment of the sport. Professor Weinberger's proposal went beyond what was needed, he said, but he urged defeat of the original motion until such time as the president's newly appointed athletics committee would bring forward a report. That would ensure the hearing that he said was promised last time. The motion was then defeated 29 to 64.

Sexual Violence Program. Suzanne Denevan, student, CLA, called attention to the presence at the meeting of a group of students representing a coalition seeking to restore the University's sexual violence program. She then yielded to Gwen Mueller, student, CLA, who reviewed a list of demands that had been drawn up following a confrontation in the president's office when he refused to negotiate with them, she said. Officials in Student Development had suggested that a task force be reinstated to review the demands, a response which she termed inadequate. The demands focused on full restoration of the program with student control and peer counseling and education. Other demands were in the area of education, protection of women, penalties, a task force to enact a strategy to end sexual violence, and dropping of the charges against the seven students arrested in the occupation of the president's office.

Ms. Denevan noted that the program had been established in 1986 primarily as a public relations tool for the University following the Lee trial. Now, she said, certain services were being taken away, especially the 24-hour crisis line which used trained counselors. She

suggested that those wishing to hear Irene Green, the program director who felt she had been in effect discharged following termination of the elements of the program that she worked on, could do so on February 22 at noon.

President Hasselmo called attention to a recent letter he had written to the Board of Regents and had shared with the *Minnesota Daily* and University committees. It emphasized that the program's budget had not been cut, that the orientation of the program had been changed from in-house peer counseling to peer support and referral to professional counseling, and that the program would have a more educational role, the latter recommended by the professional responsible for the program. He enumerated budget allocations of some \$1,700,000 for improved lighting, telephones, and capital improvements. Last year, he said, the escort service answered 3,233 calls at a cost of \$81,920, of which \$29,000 was for training, and he quoted statistics on the number of alleged offenses reported to the University police. The program had provided individual counseling to 81 persons in the areas of sexual violence, sexual harassment, and concerns not related to specific incidents. In addition, he said, the program provided group counseling for 15 persons. He emphasized that the University has special obligations for effective prevention, protection, and treatment. The basis for the action, he said, was the November 1985 MPIRG women's task force proposal, when an administrative task force was appointed to deal with the general problem of violations of personal rights on campus. That group includes a number of University professionals, and he said he did not want to interfere with their work. However, he said he had accepted the suggestion made to him by the student representatives to the Board of Regents that he appoint a new task force that would include some representatives from outside the University from the professional community who are concerned with related issues in society. The task force was being put together now, he concluded, and his expectation was that it would ensure that the University is doing the right and most effective thing. He would also make recommendations for further steps to make the University a secure community. He said he shared the concerns of the group that presented its demands but he could not exercise the professional judgment to instruct the program to use one particular approach to counseling and must rely on the available professional advice in structuring the program.

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

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

WALT
UNA

1989-90

1000

No. 2

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

February 15, 1990

The second meeting of the University Senate for 1989-90 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 121 voting members of the faculty/academic professionals, 43 voting members of the student body, 2 ex officio, and 8 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 16
Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1989-90
Action (2 minutes)

- Additions to those listed in the November 16 Senate Minutes:
- COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS—Students: Dave Leland.
 - SOCIAL CONCERNS—Students: Charlotte Demarais (UMC).
 - STUDENT AFFAIRS—Students: Eric Pederson.

Information

- ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS—Faculty: Judith Younger. Students: Christi Adams (UMD), Michael Hirman.
- COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES—Students: Brian Forss, Karen Hietala (UMD), Dana Klipsch, Lisa Noponen (UMD), Woody Skjervan (UMC), Cory Wagner (UMM).

Approved

III. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

NECROLOGIES

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Senate bylaws, Article I, Section 6, be amended to add the academic professional category to the list of those for whom memorial statements are included in Senate minutes as follows:

"It shall be the function of the clerk of the University Senate to obtain after convenient intervals but at least once annually from the University Department of Employee Benefits or other official sources a complete list of (1) those faculty members of any professorial rank who held tenure, whether they were active or retired, and (2) those members of the academic professional staff who have died during the preceding interval. The clerk of the Senate shall request the departments or units of the University in which the deceased faculty members and academic professionals served to prepare suitable memorial statements and send them to their respective deans to be forwarded by the deans to the clerk of the Senate. At convenient intervals the clerk shall include such memorials in the agenda of the Senate for adoption by it, and shall supply copies of the same to the president."

COMMENT:

The proposal by last year's Business and Rules Committee was approved unanimously by the Consultative Committee.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

Approved, 152 to 0

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(15 minutes)

See abstract

V. REPORT BY SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

(20 minutes)

See abstract

VI. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Report by Professor Fred Morrison (10 minutes)

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE POLICY

This is a memorandum of understanding regarding the adoption, implementation, interpretation, and intent of various provisions of a revised grievance policy which has been approved by the University Senate (hereafter referred to as the "Grievance Policy"). The parties to this memorandum are the Senate Consultative Committee, on behalf of the University Senate, and the President, on behalf of the University administration.

The parties jointly recommend that the Board of Regents adopt the Grievance Policy in the form passed by the University Senate subject to the following understandings:

1. The Grievance Policy is subject to state and federal laws and will be administered in accordance with such laws. Where there is a conflict between the law and the Grievance Policy, the law shall control.

2. The policy will be provisionally brought into force on September 16, 1990. It is the intention that there be thorough review of the operation of the policy after approximately two years have passed, so that any problems or difficulties can be dealt with. If necessary, however, earlier action might be taken to remedy problems which are seen by any of the parties to this understanding.

3. No later than January 1, 1992, the President and the Senate Consultative Committee will appoint a committee composed of faculty, administrators, professional staff, and students to review the Grievance Policy and recommend changes in the Policy.

4. Under the Grievance Policy, it is agreed that the final decision-maker shall be the President or the President's designee and that a grievance panel's (or the University Grievance Committee's) report, findings, or recommendations are not binding on the President or the designee, as is provided in Section 7.4.

5. The President may designate the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs as the President's designee for all matters under the Grievance Policy. If the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs is a party to a grievance, the President may designate another senior officer as substitute delegee or may perform the functions personally. The final decision-making authority cannot otherwise be sub-delegated.

6. The University Grievance Policy does not, and is not intended to, create any legal rights for faculty members, students, staff, or other persons and is not part of any contract between the University and its employees or any other individual. The intent of the Policy is simply to improve internal mechanisms for addressing grievance matters and for providing recommendations to responsible administrators on such matters.

7. Understandings with respect to specific sections of the Grievance Policy include the following:

(a) Section 2.3 University Grievance Officer

The University Grievance Officer will be a faculty or staff member who is independent of direct administrative control or direction with respect to individual cases, but who is subject to performance review by the President or the President's designee and the University Grievance Committee. The initial Grievance Officer will be appointed on a part-time (release time) basis for a two-year period. Staff and support arrangements will be determined by the University President, or the President's designee, in consultation with the University Grievance Committee and the Grievance Officer.

(b) Section 3.8 Discretionary Decisions

The University Grievance Policy provides only limited review of discretionary decisions. The grievance panel will determine only (1) whether the particular exercise of discretion was within the scope of discretion or (2) whether it was taken in accordance with relevant University policies, procedures, and criteria as well as applicable provisions of this Policy, and (3) whether it was taken in a rational and evenhanded way. The third criterion would be satisfied if there is a rational basis for the decision, even if the grievance panel or committee themselves would have decided the issue differently as a matter of first impression.

(c) Section 4.26 Discovery

In ruling on "discovery requests" under this Policy, the University Grievance Officer will adhere to the requirements of state and federal law, particularly the Minnesota Data Practices Act and the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

(d) Section 6.1 Time for Filing an Appeal

It is understood that the final recommendation of a panel (or of the University Grievance Committee) to the responsible University administrator is a final recommendation only. If the responsible administrator declines to implement the recommendation, the petitioner can ask that the matter be forwarded to the President (or the President's designee) for final administrative action as provided in Section 7.4. The President (or designee) can request

"special review" of such a recommendation as provided in Section 7.2 of the document.

(e) Section 7.1 Final Decisions

The President (or the President's designee) is not bound to follow the recommendation of the panel (or of the Grievance Committee), but if the President or designee deviates from that recommendation, the final decision must be in writing and must include the substantive reasons for that action, as provided in Section 7.4.

FOR THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE
COMMITTEE ON BEHALF OF
THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

FOR THE UNIVERSITY
ADMINISTRATION

Warren Ibele, Chair

Nils Hasselmo, President

Dated: _____

Dated: _____

See abstract

VII. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

1989-90 AGENDA ITEMS

Information

The primary focus of SCEP since last spring has been on the quality of undergraduate education. Although under the new committee structure SCEP is responsible for other ongoing affairs, its agenda for this academic year is crowded with a variety of important items related to the improvement of undergraduate education. The committee is most supportive of the appointment of the Task Force on Liberal Education and is not focusing our own efforts on matters which are to be addressed by the Task Force. There is close communication on this matter between SCEP and the Consultative Committee and the Provost's office.

Agenda items for SCEP currently include: inclusion of study space in the Minnesota Facilities Model, clarifying the University policy for changing grades after initially issued, timely completion of degrees, unification of honors program requirements, impact of the single point of entry plan, separation of graduate and undergraduates in 5xxx-level courses, measurement of improvement in undergraduate education, using courses in which a grade of "D" was received as fulfilling the prerequisite for subsequent courses, up-grading an undergraduate review program, implementing the recommendations of the Task Force on Diversity, reviewing the progress of TA training programs, and considering policy related to how curricular changes made at local unit or college level (but which have University-wide implications), are to be handled.

In addition to specific discussion/action items, the committee will receive briefs from the President, Provost, and other administrative and academic officials. SCEP wishes to communicate as broadly and thoroughly as possible during its deliberation on issues in order to bring action items to the Senate/Assembly which have been collectively constructed. Your input is welcomed.

JOHN CLARK
Chair

VIII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) met 12 times during 1988-89; two of the meetings were called specially, one in September (jointly with the Senate Finance Committee) to discuss the biennial request and one in May (jointly with the Task Force on Support and Service Units) to discuss the task force report. The committee met seven times with the

President (twice with Interim President Sauer and five times with President Hasselmo); it also was joined by Acting Vice President and Provost Shirley Clark at six of its meetings.

The items taken up by SCC during the year can be broken into several broad categories. They are:

Finance and Budget: The committee devoted lengthy parts of several meetings, as well as the special meeting in September, to a discussion of the biennial request, legislative priorities (in particular, coordination of the request with academic priorities), criteria for capital request items, the impact of the biennial request on tuition, the decentralized budgeting proposal, and the tuition task force recommendations. In each instance the discussions were held with the President or other senior administrators or both.

Searches: The committee began the year by clarifying what its role in the presidential search would be (separate meetings of faculty and students with the finalists for the presidency). At the request of President Hasselmo, it also agreed that the faculty and the students would separately nominate individuals to serve on the numerous vice presidential search committees which were appointed. It also discussed but did not reach final conclusions about a formal recommendation on the appointment of students to search committees. Committee members also met with the finalists for the University librarian position and for senior vice president for finance and submitted comments to the President.

Governance: SCC reviewed and kept tabs on the changes to the Senate structure which were to be implemented during 1989-90. It also heard from graduate students seeking to clarify their status in the governance structure. Several amendments affecting the way the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics is to conduct its business were also approved and forwarded to the Assembly.

Educational Policy: The committee dealt with a number of items forwarded from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, including integration of day and CEE records, the ratio of credits to class hours, improvement of large introductory courses, a task force on liberal education, TA training, enhancement of the Morse-Alumni teaching awards, and semesters.

Administrative Organization: The committee early informed the President about the Senate policy providing for automatic termination of administrative appointments when new administrators are appointed, the importance of the position of vice provost for the arts, sciences, and engineering, the role of a possible vice president for research, and the role of the chancellors in decision-making.

Other: The committee also turned its attention to recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty, recreational sport facilities, the MSPAN report, the new grievance procedures, and the conduct of University public relations.

Many of the items discussed by the committee were sent to the Senate; others remain on the agenda and will be taken up during 1989-90.

MARK BRENNER
Chair

Accepted

IX. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

The information age is producing massive demands and shifts for both learning and research endeavors for both faculty and students. For years there has been a need for a new coordinated information, computer and data system at the University. When do you expect to appoint a Chief Information Officer as recommended by each of the several studies over the past decade and what next steps do you expect, with a time frame, to assure our information leadership as an education and research University?

VERNON E. WECKWERTH
Senator

See abstract

X. OLD BUSINESS

none

XI. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

See abstract

XII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS AND STUDENTS FAULTY MEMBERS

FRANK H. KAUFERT

1905-1990

Frank H. Kaufert, dean emeritus of the College of Natural Resources, passed away on February 17, 1990, at the age of 84 after a lengthy illness. Kaufert was a member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota from 1945 and served as director of the School of Forestry from 1947 and as dean of the College of Forestry (now the College of Natural Resources) from 1970 until his retirement in 1974.

Frank was recognized nationally as an exceptional leader and spokesperson for the profession of forestry, and for forestry education and research. A native of Princeton, Minnesota, he was awarded all three of his degrees from the University of Minnesota, with the Ph.D. degree in forest pathology and forest products being awarded in 1935. In 1936, Frank joined the research staff of Dupont Corporation in Delaware, where he worked in the field of wood preservation. From 1942 to 1945, he worked at the USDA Forest Products Laboratory, instructing at the U.S. Air Force School of Wood Inspection and conducting research on wood adhesives. He was involved in much of the early work on both urea and phenolic resins. Kaufert returned to the University of Minnesota as a professor and assistant director of the then School of Forestry. Known as an outstanding instructor of forest products and natural resources conservation, he was named director of the School of Forestry in 1947. Through his leadership, the School of Forestry became the College of Forestry in 1970. From 1957 through 1971, he successfully led the effort to establish the Kaufert Laboratory of Forest Products and Wood Science. He retired in 1974.

He was well known throughout the United States for his leadership in a wide spectrum of professional endeavors. Frank was instrumental in development of the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Research Act, which continues to provide critical funding to universities for forestry and forest products research nationwide. He served briefly as the first USDA administrator of the McIntire-Stennis program in the mid-1960s. Additionally, he played an active role in the establishment of both the Forest Products Research Society (FPRS) and the Society of Wood Science and Technology, serving as an early national president of the FPRS. Frank was a national leader as well in the Society of American Foresters (SAF), chairing a number of national committees and serving as a member of the SAF Council. He helped found the Forestry History Society, an organization which he later served as president. His long record of accomplishments includes roles as president of the National Council of Forestry School Executives, president of the Foundation for Professional Forestry, and president of the Association of State College and University Forestry Research Organizations.

Frank published over 150 scientific, technical, and general interest articles and books. He served as editor and associate editor for various journals. Most importantly he exercised exceptional influence on the development of academic and research leadership in forestry nationally over a generation of his activity as a teacher and mentor. He took great pride in the accomplishments of those who were students and graduates of the University of Minnesota, in aiding in furthering their careers, and in recognition of their achievements.

As recognition for his outstanding contributions to the forestry profession, he received numerous awards, including the prestigious Gifford Pinchot Award of the Society of American Foresters, the American Forestry Association Outstanding Achievement Award, and the University of Minnesota Outstanding Achievement Award.

Frank is survived by his wife Ione; a son, Joseph, of Winnipeg, Manitoba; a sister, Lena Minks, of Beach, North Dakota; brothers Emil of Monticello, Minnesota, John of Milaca, Minnesota, and Louis of Princeton, Minnesota; and a granddaughter.

The memorial service was held February 22 at the St. Anthony Park United Church of Christ, St. Paul. Memorials may be made to the Frank H. Kaufert Education Fund, established in the College of Natural Resources through the University of Minnesota Foundation.

NATHAN LIFSON

1911-1989

Nathan Lifson, professor emeritus of physiology, died from coronary artery disease at the age of 78 on December 31, 1989.

A native of Minneapolis, he entered the University of Minnesota in 1928, received his B.A. *summa cum laude* in 1931, and completed pre-medical courses in 1933. Four years later, he received his M.D. from Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York City. After a year of internship at San Diego County General Hospital, he returned to Minnesota in 1938 to begin graduate work in physiology. He was appointed instructor in 1941, received his Ph.D. in 1943, and in the following year was promoted to assistant professor. With the exception of a one-year sabbatical in England in the Department of Biochemistry at Oxford University in 1955-56, he continued his contributions to teaching and scientific research at this University for more than a half century to the day before his untimely passing.

Lifson was internationally recognized as an outstanding scientist. He made major contributions in the early use of the stable isotopes of oxygen, hydrogen and carbon in experiments on both metabolic activities and transport processes in living structures. Indeed, the work that he and colleagues, Harland Wood and Victor Lorber, carried out in the 1940s on carbohydrate metabolism with compounds labelled with these isotopes provided much of the proof that the tri-carboxylic acid cycle formulated by Krebs actually operated in the living tissues of the whole animal.

He received Great Britain's prestigious Rank Award for Nutrition in 1987 for the development of a simple method for determining the total number of calories consumed by an individual in normal daily activities. All that is required is the drinking of a glass of water containing doubly-labelled water molecules and the collection of two urine samples, one at the beginning and the other at the end, of the period of interest (which can be hours, days or weeks). This technique is now widely used by other scientists in the determination of the energy expenditure by such diverse subjects as the wandering albatross in its flights across Antarctica or malnourished infants recovering from famine conditions in Africa.

In general, he had a very high standards for research and his colleagues frequently sought his review and advice on a manuscript or research grant proposal, knowing that if it received his approval or was revised in accord with his recommendations, it was ready to go forward to the journal or granting agency. These tough standards he applied especially to his own work and led him, in the opinion of many of his colleagues, to underestimate its importance. He was a superb teacher. His lectures and seminar presentations were models of clarity and logical development of a topic. The graduate students and post-doctoral fellows who received their research training in his laboratory all retained a tremendous respect for him and for the critical approach to research that he taught them.

Although Nathan's first loyalty was to science, he also had a great interest in music, in the world of literature, and in the humanities in general, and he enjoyed lunch-time discussions on topics from such sources. He took great pleasure in playing golf, despite the fact that the prediction and control that a scientist seeks in his work was all too frequently not achieved in this activity.

He is survived by his wife, Helen; son, Benjamin; daughter, Matti; three grandchildren, Jacob Lifson, Hannah Lifson, Joshua Marrow; two brothers and a sister. He will be missed by many others as well.

EDGAR M. TURRENTINE

1924-1990

Edgar M. Turrentine grew up in Ness City, Kansas, and graduated from the University of Wichita after serving as a sergeant in the Army Air Force during World War II. He taught music and directed band and choir in public schools in Kansas and Fairfax County, Virginia, from 1948 to 1956. He earned his master's degree from Oberlin Conservatory in Ohio in 1952, and the Ph.D. in Music at the University of Iowa.

He moved to Lawrence College in Appleton, Wisconsin, in 1956, where he was an associate professor of music. He taught music education methods as well as serving as instructor of brass instruments. Many of his brass students at Lawrence were outstanding and have gone on to top professional positions in colleges and symphony orchestras.

He enjoyed twelve successful years at Lawrence. Then the opportunity came to move to the University of Minnesota, a large institution with the potential to develop a strong graduate program in music education. He immediately redesigned the Ph.D. program, bringing it in line with national practice. After his arrival, the graduate enrollment quickly grew as his reputation spread throughout the state. He was appointed to the board of directors of the Minnesota Music Educators Association as their first state research chairman, a position he had similarly held in Wisconsin.

He was director of graduate studies in the School of Music for several years and was particularly interested in historical research, brass instruments, and music for winds and percussion. He was especially proud of being named national chairman of the Music Education Research Council of the Music Educators National Conference. For several years he guided that organization through major changes in structure and focus. Through these activities and his steady contribution of research articles, his presence and influence became national in scope.

His accomplishments will live on—through his family and friends, through his students, and through his writings. His commitment, dedication, and enthusiasm for music and art in the Twin Cities was an inspiration to his students and colleagues.

ROBERT PENN WARREN

1905-1989

Robert Penn Warren, a professor of English at the University from 1942 to 1950, died of cancer at his Vermont summer home on September 15 at age 84. The next day news of his death was reported on the front pages of newspapers throughout the country, on radio and television, and on media throughout the world. The obituary in *The New York Times*, starting on the front page, ran for the space of almost an entire page, including photographs and extensive quotation from his prose and verse.

Warren was a major figure in literary, academic, and intellectual worlds. In his *New and Selected Essays*, published a few months before his death, a note "About the Author" states that his publications include "ten novels, sixteen volumes of poetry, and a volume of short stories; also a play, two collections of critical essays, a biography, three historical essays, a critical book on Dreiser and a study of Melville, and two studies of race relations in America." Among his many honors and awards were three Pulitzer Prizes, one for *All the King's Men* (1946), his best and best known novel, and two for volumes of his poetry (1957, 1979). In 1986 he became the nation's first Poet Laureate, and in 1987 he received a National Medal of Arts.

Even more impressive than the long catalogue of his official awards is the copiousness and variety of his achievements. In addition to his many novels, short stories, and volumes of verse, Warren was editor or co-editor of several textbooks and anthologies. He prepared editions, containing his own long introductions, of the poetry of John Greenleaf Whittier and Herman Melville. Both of these volumes were published by the University of Minnesota Press. Throughout his career, Warren was a formidable literary critic, contributing major critical essays on Coleridge, Hawthorne, Twain, Conrad, Hemingway, Faulkner, Frost, and Ransom. Of special significance is his role as co-editor with Cleanth Brooks, who was his colleague at Louisiana State University before he came to Minnesota, and at Yale after he left Minnesota. Their impact was of two kinds: 1) as editors of the quarterly magazine, *The*

Southern Review, for the length of its existence, 1935-1942; 2) as editors of the textbook, *Understanding Poetry*. To name some of the contributors to *The Southern Review* tells much about its character and its editors: W. H. Auden, John Berryman, Kenneth Burke, T. S. Eliot, William Empson, James T. Farrell, Ford Maddox Ford, Sidney Hook, Aldous Huxley, Randall Jarrell, Mary McCarthy, Katherine Anne Porter, John Crowe Ransom, Delmore Schwartz, Wallace Stevens, I. F. Stone, Allen Tate, Mark Van Doren, Eudora Welty, Ivor Winters. Jarrell, McCarthy, and Welty are examples of writers whose earliest publications were in *The Southern Review*.

As for *Understanding Poetry*: published in 1938, it became the symbol, model, and instrument of the so-called New Criticism. (A second edition, revised, appeared in 1950.) Its example of the close reading of poetry and of critical evaluation challenged and eventually displaced (as the "establishment") the modes of historical and biographical scholarship and pedagogy. *Understanding Poetry* provided the prevailing point of view in colleges and high schools during the forties and fifties, and beyond, while the New Criticism remains a standard of reference and difference for more recent theories and perspectives, in some cases called the New New Criticism.

It was during his years at Minnesota that Warren published the novels *At Heaven's Gate* (1943), *All the King's Men* (1946), and *World Enough and Time* (1950), as well as *Selected Poems, 1923-1943*. Some of the courses he taught as a professor here are Interpretation of Poetry, Technique of the Novel, Literary Criticism, and Creative Writing. Busy as he was with his own courses and his own writing, Warren had a demanding appetite for a festive social life. To a large circle of friends, both town and gown, and indeed all his life, he was called Red—Red Warren—because of his red hair. He and his first wife Cianina (Emma Brescia) entertained frequently, and were entertained as often. Red was famous as a friend and as a personality for his many "parts." He was a conversationalist, a raconteur, a listener, a letter writer, the cause of conviviality in others. For those who knew him, images of the man remain vivid. He and Joseph Warren Beach, the department chairman who brought him here, were both strong swimmers—in the St. Croix River. Red had the amazing gift of being able to lean against a fence or a piano and doze for a few refreshing minutes. Having posed for photographs in earlier years as a man who smoked a pipe, in the mid-forties he was struggling to give up cigarettes. He belonged to the Minneapolis down-town YMCA, where he regularly worked out lifting weights and running around the indoor track.

On October 8 a memorial service was held at the Stratton Church in Vermont, and at Warren's grave in the churchyard. Some of those participating in the service were Cleanth Brooks, C. Van Woodward, Ralph Ellison, Saul Bellow, R. W. B. Lewis, Arnold Stein, John Hollander, and Joseph Blotner. Blotner is the author of a two-volume biography of William Faulkner and has for several years been working on a biography of Robert Penn Warren.

Warren is survived by his wife, the author Eleanor Clark, a daughter Rosanna Scully, a son Gabriel, and three grandchildren.

STUDENTS

MARVIN O. MECHELKE, CLA
CHERYL JEAN SYLLA, CLA

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the University Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 121 voting members of the faculty. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 16

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

CASE FINDINGS

Information

Pursuant to Rules 14.4 and 15.5 of the tenure code, if the President's decision in a case brought before the Judicial Committee is less favorable to the complainant than the panel's recommendation, the President must give substantive reasons in writing for that decision. The tenure code then calls for the full text of the President's written statement to be printed in the Senate docket unless the faculty member requests confidentiality, in which case a summary of the relevant considerations must be so published without identification of the faculty member.

Following is the full text of the President's written statements in each of the cases of *Krauthammer v. Crouch and Infante*, *Treleven v. Ross*, and *Kroll v. Brunning*. In each case, the President's decision was less favorable to the complainant than the panel's recommendation. In each case, the complainant has given his permission to publish the full text of the President's written statements.

October 13, 1989

Professor Theodor Krauthammer
Pennsylvania State University
Department of Civil Engineering
212 Sackett Building
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Professor Steven L. Crouch
Head, Civil and Mineral Engineering
122 Civil and Mineral Engineering

Dean E. F. Infante
Institute of Technology
105 Walter Library

RE: Senate Judicial Committee Matter of Krauthammer v. Crouch/Infante

Dear Colleagues:

Please excuse the delay in responding to the Senate Judicial Committee report in the above grievance. Simply stated, a number of procedural questions involving consultation between the Judicial Committee and the President required resolution before final action could be taken. With the completion of such matters, I now render the following determinations:

First, I agree that Dr. Krauthammer's tenure candidacy should be reexamined and the new review should be conducted from the point of the CME faculty vote in 1987.

Second, I agree that the examination should be conducted by faculty who did not participate in any previous review of Dr. Krauthammer. I do not, however, agree that the review committee should be appointed by the Provost or should exclude faculty members of the Institute of Technology. Such would be inconsistent with applicable professional, University, and/or Institute peer review standards and policies as well as the findings in this matter. Instead, the new review should be conducted by the Institute's current Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee with the recusal of any member who participated in a previous review of Dr. Krauthammer's candidacy.

Third, I agree that Dr. Krauthammer's tenure file should be reassembled consistent with Recommendation 3 of the Panel's Report (see p. 21). I further agree that the new committee should be instructed to base its review of Dr. Krauthammer's scholarship on his record through 1987 and should discuss the weighting of the 1986-87 and 1987-88 letters in his file.

Fourth, I agree that the review committee should reexamine Dr. Krauthammer's candidacy as expeditiously as possible and its recommendations should be sent directly to the Provost for final action. Consistent therewith, as well as with Rule 15.6 of the University's Tenure Code, I am requesting the Provost and Academic Vice President to undertake supervision of the reconsideration. Should you have any questions regarding the above, please contact the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Cordially,

Nils Hasselmo (Signed)
President

c: Professor L. Greenberg, Advocate for Complainant
Associate Dean G. Beavers, Advocate for Respondents
Professor M. Dothan, Advocate for Respondents
Leonard V. Kuhl, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Professor P. Frickey, Chair, Tenure Committee
Richard W. Davis, Attorney for Complainant
Professor Amos Deinard, Chair, Senate Judicial Committee

October 12, 1989

Professor Mark Treleven
School of Business
John Carroll University
University Heights, Ohio 44118-4581

Professor Ivan Ross
Marketing and Logistics Management
Carlson School of Management
1247 Management/Economics
West Bank

RE: Senate Judicial Committee Matter of Treleven v. Ross

Dear Colleagues:

I have reviewed the Final Findings and Recommendations of the Senate Judicial Committee in the above matter. I have also examined the written comments of the parties on the Panel's report. I delayed, however, sending my final response in order to resolve a question of Presidential consultation with the Judicial Committee. In the meantime, Dr. Treleven indicated that he did not wish to have the Judicial Committee and the President discuss his case absent representation. His wishes were respected and a response might now be rendered.

Specifically, I accept the Panel's conclusion that Professor Treleven's tenure candidacy should be reexamined. I also endorse, with two exceptions, the Panel's recommendations as proposed on pages 14-15 of its report, regarding the re-review. Those exceptions involve 1) the proposed timetable, and 2) the proposed procedures for absentee voting and review of the candidate's tenure file.

At this point, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to meet the review schedule recommended by the Panel. Some of the proposed deadlines have already passed; others would require special meetings of reviewing bodies and the entire School of Management faculty. Accordingly, I have determined that Professor Treleven should be reexamined according to the 1989-90 School of Management schedule for tenure candidates and to the extent possible, his review should be afforded priority status in terms of scheduling and completion.

I also disagree with the Panel's recommendation that every SOM tenured faculty member who will be absent from the tenure review meeting but who wishes to vote should be sent a ballot and a complete copy of the candidate's tenure file. Such would require the sending of personnel information to all parts of the world. It would also impose a policy regarding the dissemination of files and absentee voting upon a collegiate unit which has neither developed nor endorsed the policy. Instead, I am directing the School of Management to establish its own policy regarding absentee balloting and tenure file review, to publicize that policy to the SOM faculty, and to implement that policy as quickly as is possible.

In summary, with the above exceptions and understandings, Professor Treleven's tenure reexamination should commence and be completed as expeditiously as possible. Moreover, consistent with Section 15.6 of the Tenure Code, I am requesting the Vice President for Academic Affairs to undertake supervision of the reconsideration.

Cordially,

Nils Hasselmo (Signed)
President

c: Amos Deinard, Chair, Senate Judicial Committee
Hans Courant, Hearing Officer, Senate Judicial Committee
Leonard Kuhl, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Timothy Nantell, Acting Dean, School of Management
Charlotte Striebel, Faculty Adviser to Dr. Treleven

October 9, 1989

Professor Jerome L. Kroll
Department of Psychiatry
Box 393 Mayo

Professor Richard D. Brunning
Director, Hospital Labs, Hematology
Box 298 Mayo

RE: Senate Judicial Committee: Kroll v. Brunning

Dear Drs. Kroll and Brunning:

Please excuse the delay in responding to the Senate Judicial Committee report in the above grievance. Simply stated, a number of procedural issues involving consultation between the Judicial Committee and the President required resolution before final action could be taken. With the completion of such matters, I now render the following determinations:

1. I agree with the Judicial Committee's recommendation that Dr. Kroll should receive a new review by (and commencing with) the School of Medicine's Promotion and Tenure Committee in order to assess his qualifications for promotion to full professor. I also concur that the collegiate review should be conducted by faculty members who were not present at either of the previous promotion and tenure meetings at which Dr. Kroll's candidacy was addressed.

I do not agree that the Promotion and Tenure Committee should include a representative from the Department of the History of Medicine. To impose such representation could set a new precedent requiring at least one member of a promotion and tenure committee to have special expertise in and familiarity with a candidate's scholarly field.

At the same time, I want to remind the School of Medicine of the rights, under the University Tenure Code, of faculty members to determine scholarly fields of research and of departments to assess and endorse those pursuits and contributions. In this matter, special care should be taken that standards appropriate to Dr. Kroll's discipline are considered, that the Department's assessment of his scholarship is recognized, and that his review is conducted in full accordance with the provisions of the Tenure Code.

I further agree that prior to the new review, the Department of Psychiatry, in consultation with Dr. Kroll, should reassemble the candidate's tenure file to strengthen the vita and supporting documentation. As this is a promotion as opposed to tenure matter, the file may be both upgraded and updated as recommended by the Senate Judicial Committee's report. (See SJC Report Recommendation Section at paragraph 4.)

3. I agree with the Senate Judicial Committee's recommendation that if the Dean of the School of Medicine disputes departmental recommendation, he should give substantive reasons in writing for his determination.

By copy of this letter, I am asking Dr. Paula Clayton (or her designee) to meet with Dr. Kroll so that the review might be expeditiously undertaken. I am also requesting the Vice Presi-

dent for Academic Affairs, consistent with Section 15.6 of the Tenure Code, to undertake supervision of the reconsideration.

Cordially,

Nils Hasselmo (Signed)
President

c: David Brown, Dean, Medical School
Paula Clayton, Head, Department of Psychiatry
Louis Dehner, Advisor to Respondent
Amos Deinard, Chair, Senate Judicial Committee
Martin Dworkin, Advisor to Complainant
Larry Huus, Panel Member
Candace Kruttschnitt, Hearing Officer
Leonard Kuhi, Vice President and Provost, Academic Affairs
Rosemarie Park, Panel Member

AMOS DEINARD
Chair

Accepted

III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1988-89

The committee began the year with two special meetings, held jointly with the Senate Finance Committee (one of which was also with the full Senate Consultative Committee) to advise the administration of its views as the biennial request was being developed. Each of those two meetings involved lengthy discussions of all major elements of the University's request.

During the 1988-89 academic year the Faculty Consultative Committee met a total of 22 times; it met 14 times with Acting Vice President and Provost Clark and also met once with Interim President Sauer and five times with President Hasselmo. In addition, it met twice with Senior Vice President Donhowe and twice with Acting Vice President and General Counsel William Donohue. A number of other senior administrators joined the Committee for discussion of specific items.

The Committee dealt with issues which fell into several categories.

1. Administrative structure: FCC spent long parts of three meetings, after President Hasselmo was elected, developing its advice to the President on how he might capitalize on the many vice presidential vacancies to restructure the central administration of the University. Included in talks with President Hasselmo were attention to the importance of the vice provost for the arts, sciences, and engineering and the difficulties which would be encountered as he contemplated a vice president for research.
2. Searches: FCC developed a list of questions to be asked of presidential finalists; the chair of the committee sat with the Presidential Search Advisory Committee when it interviewed the finalists for the presidency. FCC served as the nominating body for the search committees for the six vacant vice president/vice provost positions and advised the President on later changes in those search committees; it also supported the President's decision to appoint Gus Donhowe as Acting Senior Vice President for Finance. The committee members met with the candidates for vice president for academic affairs and provost and made its views known to the President. The committee also advised the President on the position descriptions for the vice presidential vacancies, including concern about the possible overlap in responsibilities between the student affairs vice president and the arts, sciences, and engineering vice provost. The committee also expressed dismay that the position description for the assistant vice president for academic affairs (for faculty personnel matters) had not been provided to it for comment.
3. Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity: The committee discussed at several meetings a draft policy on spousal hirings (exemptions from normal search procedures) and

endorsed the policy adopted by Academic Affairs even though it was narrower in scope than FCC had wished. It attended to search guidelines for faculty of color, and it spent several meetings discussing the Minnesota Plan II (increased hiring and support for women faculty) and, in closed sessions, advised the administration of its views on the class settlements being proposed for Rajender pay petitions.

4. Faculty Affairs: The committee reviewed the new grievance procedures and the need for all-University tenure review committees for units which have no collegiate equivalent to large units. It also approved a change in the faculty retirement plan (because of tax reasons), discussed possible guidelines in the distribution of indirect cost recovery funds, and criticized changes in the financial awards for Bush sabbaticals (which were subsequently revised). Changes in Judicial Committee procedures were discussed and endorsed. The implementation of an administrator training program was also endorsed by FCC. The committee also inquired why a new faculty assistance officer had not been appointed (which it subsequently was). In conjunction with the vice president for academic affairs the committee appointed a task force to examine the implications of the elimination of mandatory retirement in 1993; it also began discussion of the possibility of lengthening the probationary period.
5. Faculty Salaries: FCC had lengthy discussions with Vice Presidents Clark and Donhowe about salaries, especially how considerations of market conditions should be incorporated in decisions on distribution of salary funds to the colleges. Also discussed were principles which should guide the award of salary increases, the cost of fringe benefits, and whether there should be minimum increases for all faculty (no). The committee was generally supportive of the proposals made by the central administration. FCC urged that attention be given to the development of an appropriate peer group for faculty salary comparisons which would get away from exclusive reliance upon the Big Ten schools.
6. Legislative Request: The committee spent much time discussing with the President and with Vice President Heydinger the legislative request, especially the University's response to the low initial recommendation which came from the Governor. The committee met with a representative of the Governor's office; it also arranged for Governor Perpich to meet with the Faculty Senate. Several members of the committee, and additional faculty, met with the Governor and with key members of the legislature to discuss the University's request and to urge support for it.
7. Athletics: The committee heard reports on faculty control of athletics (or lack thereof) and also advised Interim President Sauer of its views on his decision to remove the Men's Athletic Director. It also, acting as the Assembly Steering Committee, recommended to the Assembly several changes in the constitution and bylaw provisions governing the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and reappointed the 1988-89 ACIA members to continuing terms pending designation of 1989-90 members.
8. Other: FCC examined external relations, financial management (and reaction to the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission report), goals and objectives of the President and vice presidents, guidelines on the termination of graduate assistants, calendars, enhancement of the Morse-Alumni teaching awards, enrollment limitations (which it endorsed), variations in tuition paid by students enrolled in different collegiate units, the status of graduate students in the governance structure, the relationship between the President and the Judicial Committee.

Many of these items are recurring discussions (the budget, the capital request, the biennial request and faculty salaries); many others will continue to be addressed by FCC during 1989-90.

MARK BRENNER
Chair

Accepted

IV. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The Senate meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by President Hasselmo, with coordinate campuses linked by phone. Minutes of the last meeting and committee membership additions were approved.

Necrologies. Warren Ibele, professor of mechanical engineering and chair of the Consultative Committee, brought a bylaws amendment to add the academic professional category to the list of those for whom memorial statements are included in Senate minutes, which was approved without discussion.

President's Report. President Hasselmo expressed appreciation to Professors Morrison, Striebel, and Deinaud for their efforts in behalf of the grievance procedures, which are to be in effect in September for a two-year trial period, if approved by the Regents, and then reviewed by an appropriate mechanism which will include the Senate. Procedures would be set jointly by the Consultative Committee and the administration.

With regard to intercollegiate athletics, he shared the concerns that were expressed in the Assembly but believed that a somewhat different strategy would be best in light of the national movement under way for change. At a recent NCAA convention its executive director proposed a reform agenda which he called a substantial step in the right direction. Also, he said, several recommendations from the national commission of presidents were adopted which had been favored by the University delegation after consultation with the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (ACIA). In addition, the Big Ten is working on a reform agenda, and later in the month athletic directors and faculty representatives would meet at the request of the presidents for the purpose of addressing that agenda. The presidents, he said, who now constitute the board of directors, felt a strong sense of urgency and he thought it was a real opportunity for reform to take place. The Big Ten commissioner, he said, was also philosophically aligned with the agenda and was working toward a national coalition for reform. He said he would report to the ACIA, the Consultative Committee, and the Senate as the agenda moves along. He hoped that the committee appointed recently by Regent Casey and himself would arrive at a strong mandate for support of the reform agenda. He predicted that, if those efforts would not bear fruit in the way of change, in a lessening of the pressures on young men and women to participate in competition and to make a richer educational experience possible, and a lessening of financial pressures on programs to produce winning teams, then reform would not be achieved.

Next, he talked about the decision to highlight for the Regents what is called the initiative for excellence in undergraduate education. The reason for the initiative, first, was that, as the University and other institutions had become over-extended and over-crowded, undergraduate education had suffered. Also, in competition with the very important responsibilities that universities have in research, graduate and professional education, and public service, undergraduate education had not received the full attention that it required. Finally, the University had a unique opportunity under the agreement with the legislature to hold enrollments stable or in some areas reduce them slightly without losing enrollment-related funding. The University owes it to the state, he said, to prove that it can make some substantial improvements in the undergraduate experience.

The initiative is not new in substance, he said, but new in the sense that it lends full institutional support to the concept. Resources for its development include work that had been done by faculty and students on all of the campuses and on recommendations from various task forces and faculty-student committees. In conclusion, he said the agenda is being taken very seriously in budget-making; deans were being asked to count on only 98 percent of the base budget for next year, so some resources could be freed up for reallocation, part of which would be used for faculty and civil service salaries. He said he had been heartened by the support received from faculty and students. It should result in enhancement of advising and special attention to the quality of undergraduate teaching in the reward system, in promotion and tenure, and a strengthening of preparation standards and recruitment and admissions procedures. He said that the office of the president of a university like Minnesota had been described as being the navigator of a glacier and advised that it would take a lot of oars to turn the glacier around. He noted the recent appointment of a liberal education council by Vice President Kuhl and Professor Ibele to help ride herd on developments.

In regard to the legislative session, he said discussions had begun on the bonding bill and a strong case was being made for the need for facilities envisioned for quality undergraduate education and the important research work being carried on. Copies of the priorities outline for the legislature were available in his office, he added. He went on to observe that the financial news from St. Paul was not encouraging, and it appeared that additional allocations would be hard to come by in the face of a projected revenue shortfall, but it was important for the legislature to weigh the needs of higher education against other items that they have passed.

He warned of three things that might be of future danger to the University. The first would be to be timid and hesitant when it comes to institutional change, because the University faces conditions in the 1990s and later that are going to require new models for meeting needs in teaching, research, and public service. The second danger was that changes might create disunity among competing interests within the institution in making requests. Third, he was deeply concerned about misinformation, as a result of which he said he spends an inordinate amount of time at the legislature setting the record straight. He explained that sometimes it is simply a matter of jumping to the conclusion that a decision had been made when in fact the issue is merely being discussed and various options and hypotheses being considered in an open manner.

Woods Halley, professor of physics, asked the president to explain a press account of an observation by an administrator that the program would involve pain that would come early and that there would be some surprises. The president said that, if it were the senior vice president for finance who was quoted, he could offer assurance that he and Vice President Donhowe were looking everywhere for ways in which to identify resources for reallocation, and he reported that some opportunities outside the academic area had been found. He was not sure what was meant by surprises, but said there was no intent to spring on the institution ideas or changes that came out of left field; there would be a systematic planning process. The 98 percent may have been a surprise, but a guideline had to be laid down for starting the discussion with deans, he concluded.

Vice President and Provost Report. Leonard Kuhl, senior vice president and provost, presented his first report to the Senate. He said one of his assigned duties was to decide whether the University would close down under its emergency procedures in case of an outstanding snowfall and, coming from California, he might have to soon put it to the test. He said his first impression of the University was that it is an incredibly large and complex place, one that reaches all aspects of the citizens of the state, with a large collection of high quality programs and complex networks. He said that working in such a system which is so individually democratized is a challenge in which he was delighted to take part. As to the undergraduate initiative, he said it called for an effort on the part of everyone to improve the quality of undergraduate education.

He called attention to the fact that the preparation standards due in 1991 had already resulted in a big improvement in the preparation of the students coming to the University; 80 to 90 percent had met all of the requirements. There had also been a significant improvement in the preparation of minority students. As to admissions, the common entry point was being studied and the procedure was to be simplified. More advisors would be needed and more faculty involvement in advising and counseling.

On undergraduate tuition, he called attention to the report of the task force calling for uniform tuition, which he said was long overdue. As a corollary, he said, the task force students insisted that better access to courses was needed, even outside the student's college. The Liberal Education Task Force led by Professor John Howe, he noted, would take up the description of a liberal education and what a graduate should have in order to be fully educated. The task force would explore the possibility of a core curriculum, and look at degree requirements, the role of professional schools, and the importance of the research component. He said there would be no prejudgment on the outcome of the task force's deliberations in spite of various articles appearing in the *Minnesota Daily*.

One of the most serious issues facing the University on which he wanted to focus was the salary structure. He described it as being in principle a merit-based system which does not operate that way due to inadequate funding. His preference was for an annual cost-of-living increase for all and enough funding provided for increases for merit and promotion to

higher rank. He said a study is being made as to the best system for the University and that would be used in developing the issue as a top priority for the next biennium. He said there is a decreasing supply of replacement faculty and increasing competition for the best and brightest, and the University cannot maintain its national ranking as a first class research university with its present salary and benefits programs.

Another issue is in the area of diversity, where there are goals that must be met—ethnic diversity of the faculty, staff, and student body. He called it everyone's responsibility to work toward diversity; it must become a part of the fabric of the everyday lives of the University community. It is the role of Associate Vice President Delores Cross to help in the effort, he said, but it is the faculty who ultimately do the hiring, who do the teaching, and who would have to change some of its ways.

This spring, he said, review of administrators would take place from department chairs up as a uniform system of appraisal is introduced, including assessment of performance, both as a manager and as a leader, from the point of view of the department or college and from the central administration. A pilot program would be put in place first in the president's office and in his own office and in one or two colleges. Terms of appointment for recently appointed administrators have been changed to start with three-year initial terms, then subject to annual reappointment thereafter. As to the salary structure, reviews of faculty performance, and the reward system, he noted that much of the recognition in terms of salary increases is focussed on research, which is an important consideration, but other areas, including service in the attainment of the University's goals and, in the light of the undergraduate initiative, improvement in the quality of undergraduate teaching, must be taken into account. Also to be considered is the result of abolition of mandatory retirement in a few years. One of the recommendations of the committee studying that matter is to have some kind of "post" full professorship review on a regular basis.

An area of interest recently in the news, he said, is the Minnesota Postsecondary Access Network (MSPAN). MSPAN-1 deals with the corridor from St. Cloud to Rochester, and MSPAN-2, with the rest of the state. He said there are issues that are intimately related among the state's systems of higher education and the rest of the state. The Higher Education Coordinating Board's (HECB) projected reports would deal with both 1 and 2. In trying to anticipate the report for MSPAN-2, a committee had been appointed that included himself and Robert Carlson, UMD, to develop a mission delineation of roles among the individual campuses of the University and the roles among the various systems of higher education in the state. He would emphasize that in the public higher education system, the University should have the sole role in producing doctorates. He and Vice Chancellor Carlson would also discuss access—access to graduation, access to the University, and access for special populations, including nontraditional students. In this connection he said they would work closely with the community colleges so as to get away from the emphasis that is so strong about *coming* to the University as freshmen and being more concerned with students *graduating*, and that would mean more cooperation with the other systems. Also of concern, he said, were the metropolitan area needs in the upper division area, the doctoral and master's degree programs, funding issues, duplication of programs, maintenance of programs, expansion of programs, and accountability. The final issue was that of quality. With all systems trying to move up the ladder, he said, each should be concerned with the quality of its programs and, in that connection, the HECB must play a bigger role in the state.

Finally, he reported that his office was being reorganized, including establishment of a campus information officer to deal with computers and networking, so its diffuse nature could be clarified. Thus, it was hoped, the image of the Academic Affairs office as the "black hole of Morrill Hall" would be removed. His remarks concluded, the Senate applauded.

Grievance Procedures. Fred Morrison, professor of law, introduced a memorandum of understanding regarding the University grievance policy approved last spring by the Senate and sent to the Consultative Committee and the administration for implementation. It was a broadly based policy, he said, that would consolidate student, faculty, and certain other kinds of grievances. The purpose was to create simplicity, to try to balance the interests of central, University-wide, Senate, and administration concerns, and the interests of local resolution of grievances when possible—an effort to pull together all aspects of a grievance and have it resolved in a single place, at a single time, and an effort to have a final adminis-

trative decision with accountability for that decision. The memorandum, he said, was consistent with that policy. He noted that it provided that in two years' time a new committee would be appointed to review it and recommend any needed changes. He noted also that it provided a clarification that central administrative authority and accountability did not have to reside in the president personally, but with the senior vice president and provost. He called attention to the Judicial Committee report on the Faculty Senate agenda, which consisted of an explanation of decisions in cases where the decision of the president was less favorable to the complainant than that of the Judicial Committee's panel, citing that report as an example of the kind of accountability that is called for.

Tim Wolf, student, asked whether the policy included students. Mr. Morrison said they would serve on committees, and it would cover student grievances, except discipline cases, which come under the student conduct code. They should, however, be included in the review committee, and that addition was made to the draft.

Information Officer. Vernon Weckwerth, professor, School of Public Health, had asked the president when a chief information officer was to be appointed, citing a long-standing need at the University. The president explained that Vice President Kuhl, in the organization of his office, would be incorporating those responsibilities. Vice President Kuhl said there would be a search for a new vice president who would be responsible for this and the libraries, and that should take place shortly. Professor Weckwerth asked that the full question, which had not been distributed to senators, be read to make it clear what was meant by a chief information officer and to point up the fact that the University is almost at a point of information gridlock. The president said that information about the job description would soon be available. The reasons for postponing implementation, he said, was simply the number of other recruitments that were under way.

Mandatory Retirement Committee. Professor Ibele reported that the committee under Stephen Callen, professor of law, had almost finished its preliminary recommendations and its report would soon be printed in the *Daily* followed by a series of open forums before the final recommendations are made.

Extending Probationary Period Committee. Professor Ibele reported that the committee under William Gerberich, professor of chemical engineering and materials science, also was at work.

Student representation on committees. Professor Ibele reported that the Student Senate Consultative Committee had developed a policy concerning student representation on various committees and guaranteeing their representation, as well as a central point of accessibility for student representatives. He noted the recent resignation of three SSCC members and commended them for their faithful service.

Tuition Policy. Steve Boland, student, reported that, in reference to the proposed uniform undergraduate tuition rate, the Minnesota Student Association (MSA) was studying the issue, that the CLA Intermediary Board opposed it, and that student opinion in general was by no means clear. MSA would be reporting back to the Senate.

Task Force on Liberal Education. Constance Sullivan, associate professor of Spanish and Portuguese, called attention to the informational report of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), in which it was reported that the committee was deferring to the recently appointed Task Force on Liberal Education on matters to be addressed by that body. She said it was an area that clearly was a responsibility of SCEP, and she deplored the decision. She also took issue with the committee's stated right to review policy related to how curriculum changes made at the department level are to be handled. She said that policy had to do with the academic freedom of the faculty to establish course syllabi and curriculum for undergraduate lower and upper division majors and minors. She reported other areas of outrage, such as the increase in tuition for CLA undergraduates and the refusal of administrators to respect CLA faculty wishes not to split. She said its faculty was beginning to feel like an orphan child that might be put anywhere, whose faculty had no right to decide its curriculum, course structure, and theoretical approaches, the latter being key to the humanities debate. She said all committees, task forces, and administrators should beware—it was bigger than it looked!

Professor Ibele said that the charge to the task force was broad and that Professor Sullivan was right in that it did not specifically deal with the issue as stated in the SCEP agenda, but its instructions run beyond that. It would consider in the broadest sense what every baccalaureate holder who graduates from the University should have by way of a liberal education content to the degree and the question of what particular disciplines would participate and how those disciplines were organized. He pointed out that the whole subject had not been reviewed since 1965 and much had happened since then. Also, there was no longer a faculty body constituted to see that those general policies continued to be fulfilled. It was obvious that reexamination was necessary, a new policy and new conditions should be set, with a duly constituted all-University faculty committee in place to exercise oversight on a continuing basis. The president added that it was clear that curricular control and management must rest in the hands of properly constituted faculty committees. As to the issue of the organization of CLA, he said it came out of planning that had proceeded for a number of years and was brought forward in the planning framework two years ago, at which time it was tabled. His administration, he said, had inherited the issue and, when Dean Lukermann left his position, the president thought it was important for his own enlightenment to look at the issue again. He, the dean, and the executive committee of the college had discussed the matter, and he had just written the dean about the outcome of the discussions. The letter had not yet been received so he could not reveal its contents, but he thought it probably would not be surprising to most people.

Centralized budgeting. A UMD senator noted, in the Consultative Committee annual report for last year, a reference to a centralized budgeting proposal and asked for further information. It is a continuing subject for the Senate Finance Committee, Professor Ibele said, and information is being gathered relating to what particular form it should take.

Following a silent tribute to deceased faculty members and students, the Senate was adjourned.

The Faculty Senate was convened immediately, minutes approved, two items accepted, and adjourned.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 1989-90 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the Faculty Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 44 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. STUDENT LOBBY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REPORT BY LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR (5 minutes)

See abstract

IV. SENATE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS

Discussion (15 minutes)

CONSTITUTION

Article III, Section 6. University Senate and Student Senate Officers

b. The officers of the Student Senate shall be a chair, a vice chair, a clerk, and a treasurer.

The chair and vice chair shall be elected by the Student Senate....from the members of the Student Senate. The chair and the vice chair shall not be from the same campus. In the event that no one is nominated for the vice chair position from a separate campus, the position will be open to all qualified members of the Student Senate. Term of office shall be July 1 to June 30, and the person holding office is eligible for re-election. The duties of the chair are....Student Advisory Council. The duties of the vice chair are (1) to assume the duties of the chair in the event of an absence or incapacity of the chair, and (2) to assume responsibilities delegated by the chair.

BYLAWS

Article III, Section 2. Committee on Committees

Membership

Of the student members, 4 5 shall be elected from the Twin Cities campus (at least one of whom shall be a graduate or professional student), and 3 one each from the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Waseca campuses...

Article III, Section 4. Consultative Committees

Membership of the Senate Consultative Committee

The Senate Consultative Committee shall be composed of 10 elected members of the faculty, 9 elected students, and the vice chair of the University Senate. The chair and the vice chair of the Student Senate shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members....

Article III, Section 4. Consultative Committees

Membership of the Student Consultative Committee

The Student Consultative Committee shall be composed of 5 student members elected from the Twin Cities campus (at least one of whom shall be a graduate or professional student),...

Chairs: The Student Consultative Committee shall have a chair and a vice chair who shall be from separate campuses. The vice chair shall assume the duties of the chair in the event of an absence or incapacity of the chair and shall assume responsibilities delegated by the chair.

See abstract

V. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The Student Senate was called to order by Rod Jorgenson, chair, at 4:30 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by phone. Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Chair Report. Mr. Jorgenson announced that the chair and vice chair posts would be up for election at the last spring meeting, and he urged those interested to talk to him. He reported visits to all campuses during the year, which had been one of his major goals.

As to the Student Lobby Advisory Committee (SLAC), two issues had been taken up: one, the state scholarship grant and the financial aid issue, and the other, child care. The committee also came up with a capital request agenda which included the libraries on the Twin Cities campus, the student center at Morris, the campus centers at Duluth and Waseca, the biological sciences addition in St. Paul, the agricultural operations management center at Crookston, Ferguson Hall, and recreational sports facilities. It added to \$66 million. In addition, the committee had worked on a pamphlet to give to legislators. Student

Lobby Day was set for February 21 at the Capitol, and he presented the day's schedule, which included a rally.

Mr. Jorgenson announced the resignation of the vice chair, Matt Kirkwood, and opened the floor for discussion on the replacement procedure. It was suggested that the election be held immediately, although there was not unanimity, some preferring to notify others who might be interested in running. Steve Boland moved that the election be held in conjunction with the March 1 MSA Forum meeting with coordinate campus groups connected by phone. Objections came from the coordinate campuses because they are not a part of the MSA Forum, though they might be willing to do it by correspondence, which would prolong the process; besides, UMD would be in the middle of finals. Karen Alexander suggested that the present would be a prudent time for the election because the person must be a senator in good standing—a person who was present would be showing a commitment. The question of a quorum was raised, but was not requested, and Mr. Jorgenson said there appeared to be an average number present. At this point, Mr. Boland withdrew his motion, and Ms. Alexander moved that the election be held forthwith. Darby Long (UMD), Martin Conroy (UMM), and Ron Merckling (Twin Cities) were nominated. Asked about the duties, Mr. Jorgenson said it would mean working with him on the Student Lobby Advisory Committee, SSCC, and with the University Senate. The three candidates then gave a one-minute summary of their qualifications, and Darby Long was elected.

Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC). Eric Huang reported on the status of search committees, in which students had participated in the interview process. Also, he said the SCC is drafting a policy to ensure appropriate representation on search committees all the way to department level. He urged those interested in participating on an interviewing panel for candidates for the vice president for student affairs position to contact him. The SSCC had named three students to serve on the president's committee on intercollegiate athletics; two of his committee members were working on the issue of representation of graduate and professional students in the Senate, and that work is proceeding at MSA. As to first-day registration for student senators, that proposal was not practical due to the number of governance groups on campuses, so alternative ways of getting fourth-day registration were being considered. Finally, he said the faculty is going to be informed as to the resources available for accommodating students with learning disabilities. He then asked that students contact him if they were interested in filling out the SSCC vacancy.

Constitution and Bylaws. Mr. Jorgenson reported that he, Mr. Conroy, and Ms. Alexander were working to strengthen the Student Senate by giving its committees some direction. Mr. Conroy then distributed copies of proposed constitution and bylaws amendments, which he said would be brought to the next Senate meeting. They provided for graduate or professional student representation on the Consultative Committee and the Committee on Committees, defined the role of the vice chair and specified that the chair and vice chair must be from different campuses, called for one representative each from Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Waseca campuses on the Committee on Committees, and added the chair and vice chair to the SCC as ex officio nonvoting members.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

Comments on the proposal for a change in the composition of the Senate from elected representatives to membership that would include all professors and associate professors with elected representatives only from the assistant professor and instructor group.

COMMENTS BY FACULTY FAVORING THE PROPOSAL

"This change would provide better continuity and enthusiastic support because faculty members interested enough to attend could participate year after year. With the present system most of the senior faculty are left out entirely while many disinterested faculty members are elected to the Senate and give little attention to the proceedings at Senate meetings. By contrast the Administrative Committee does have continuity and may tend to dominate the activities in the Senate because they are best informed of its activities."

"I strongly favor the proposal. Some of our faculty who would have much to give to the deliberations of the Senate have been too busy in scholarly activities to solicit the popularity that is necessary for election. I do not believe that the University should be operated without some advice from the really scholarly but relatively retiring members of the faculty."

"It's about time. Even rotation would be better than the present system, whereby a man can spend a lifetime on the faculty without being elected to the Senate. As it is the same clique gets elected every year and the rest of us don't know what is going on."

"As an alternate proposal, the AAUP recommendation which would essentially increase proportion of elected members of the Senate would be acceptable to me."

"The most serious failure to the present system is the lack of a formal nominating system. Nominees are sometimes named by Department Heads."

"The present arrangement is unsatisfactory and undemocratic. I should like the opportunity for all members of the professorial staff to have the right to vote directly on all matters when they may wish to exercise this right. In many cases I feel that my elected "representative" votes the opposite from the way I would like to vote. Also, the present Senate is improperly weighted in its membership on the side of administrative personnel, as opposed to the backbone of a University--its professors."

"Provided some reasonable figure can be set for what constitutes a quorum."

"It would provide an opportunity for all faculty members to take part and provide the opportunity for all departments to be represented."

"I have noticed a definite diminution of interest in University policies on the part of that portion of the faculty who are not good enough, or don't talk enough, to receive any particular recognition but are too good to fire. Perhaps I am in that group but I used to attend most of the Senate meetings and now I don't even bother to vote for proposed representatives. I feel that the proposal as outlined would have a unifying effect on the University and Lord knows we need it."

"I feel that each permanent member of the staff should be interested and should have a voice in the Senate."

"Instead of including all professors and associate professors, we could include all staff members with tenure."

"Departments within a college may not be represented by at least one from the ranks under the present system. At least heads of departments should have the right to speak and to vote (without asking special permission) on vital issues."

"The representative merely represents himself. There is no consultation with the rest of the staff. Consequently, he cannot convey the wishes of the people he represents. Also with responsibility comes greater interest in problems and issues."

"Department chairmen and others in administrative positions should be members in order to improve communication with faculty units and facilitate action when desirable."

"The proposal is superior to the existing plan in that it restores to professors and associate professors their membership. The proposal also is sound in giving representation to the assistant professors and instructors, as now. It would rectify an original mistake, as I think, in giving up membership some years ago. I had voted No, then."

"I feel the change is very much in order. The present arrangement actually disfranchises many who when appointed were informed that associate and full professors make up the Senate. The numbers of full and associate professors is not so great that they need to yield their direct right to vote. The more one surrenders to another one's own right to vote, the greater is the weakening of our democratic process. Congratulations to the Committee on Business and Rules."

"While I do not welcome more demands on my time, I feel I should have more responsibility to Senate affairs. There is too much of a tendency to leave all matters to representatives under the present system."

"Provides opportunity for those really interested to participate in decision making. Because of present election procedures some sizeable units may at times have no elected representatives to the Senate."

"I feel strongly that the present arrangement is not satisfactory."

"It seems ridiculous to have any balloting (or limitation on membership except for tenure requirement) since quorums seem difficult to obtain."

"Under the present system of elected representation it is difficult to have representation of all Divisions within a College. Also many of the actions taken are based on the opinion of the representative rather than the group he represents due to the problem of communication. I believe in broader representation."

"I think the elected Senate has failed to represent adequately staff opinion on many important issues."

"As one serving his third elected term to the faculty Senate, I am convinced that the election of tenured people to the Senate violates the spirit of the "peer relation"."

"I feel that more senior faculty would interest themselves in the Senate if this proposal is adopted."

"It goes without saying that a small department such as this would have a disproportionate share of the vote unless the number of elected representatives from each department were adjusted to compensate the imbalance."

"If faculty members of the senior ranks are not those best fitted to control university affairs, there must be something wrong with our system of promotions."

"I am not in favor of the present annual popularity contest."

"Inability to get a quorum for action under present arrangement seems to indicate that any other arrangement is worth a try."

"How else can my voice be heard if I am not elected?"

"If the proportion of members from the assistant professor and instructor ranks is increased. It seems to me that there is a danger of the Senate structure becoming too gerontocratic."

"With modifications. The representation of the junior faculty must be increased, so that they will not lose their due proportion in the Senate."

COMMENTS BY FACULTY PREFERRING THE PRESENT ARRANGEMENT

"My only reason for this vote is that the change would result in an unwieldy group."

"If the reason for this proposed change is to balance the ex-officio representation then a better solution would be to propose a change in ex-officio representation."

"I strongly oppose the proposal as undemocratic and as doing a disservice to the many dedicated and loyal people in the lower ranks, especially in the assistant professorships. Moreover, I think that what happened at a meeting last year when business could not go on without a quorum would become the rule rather than the exception if membership were automatic in the top ranks."

"It seems to me that Senate membership is already too predominately drawn from the senior faculty ranks, so that to enlarge by ten times the number of professors and associate professors in the Senate would effectually deprive persons with junior appointments from having any voice in Senate decisions. The proposal is certainly undemocratic. Moreover, substantial enlargement of Senate membership to include all professors and associate professors would almost certainly mean that a quorum for changes in constitution or by-laws could very seldom be obtained, for even the presently elected professors and associate professors frequently fail to attend meetings where action is to be taken (as experience in 1960-61 proved.)"

"I would wish to see the present arrangement modified with respect to the "loading" of the Senate with administrators."

"In essence, we tried this type of representation before and it did not work. Also the change as suggested, poses a definite bias against the assistant professor and instructor ranks. If we must change, then try something better than the present arrangement, rather than this new "old" proposal."

"The present arrangement is more democratic than the suggested change."

"This is clearly a reactionary proposal, and the Senate must know that."

"I believe there are too many administrators in the Senate."

"An unreasonable proposal. The underlying assumptions are contrary to traditional university philosophy and practice. I question the motives of the proponent."

"In the face of increasing staff, the proposal reverses the clock and once again suggests we revert to a senate which is less representative and more unwieldy."

"The Senate, under the proposal, would seemingly be an unwieldy body-- non-representative of the faculty."

"As large as the University is, we should be able to discharge Senate business more expeditiously as a "republic" rather than as a "pure democracy" with the lower ranks largely disenfranchised."

"The present arrangement is the only equitable arrangement for the Duluth Branch and Morris."

"Wouldn't the group be too large to do business? I am not on but don't aspire to the job, at least for the present."

"Proposal--too cumbersome a group by virtue of numbers.
Elected Group--elected by virtue of fair representation, capability for the job, etc.."

"It seems to me that giving membership to the associate and professor level would mean that no travel expenses would be given to the Duluth representatives and that because of that we might have fewer people representing us. My vote then is pretty much oriented to the interest of this campus."

"Since all promotions and salary raises and many matters of policy are executed by persons of higher rank, I feel that having the Senate composed primarily of staff members at the rank of associate professor and higher would tend to infuse the Senate with a type of attitude that might be prejudiced to staff members of the lower ranks. I think this would definitely be detrimental to the best interests of the University."

"size--too big a group!"

"Undemocratic!"

"I believe senate members should be elected for longer periods, say 3 year terms, one-third of senate being elected annually."

"The proposed change is nothing more than a return to the earlier arrangement that led the Senate to be held in poor repute. While the present system may have deficiencies, it is to my thinking far superior to the proposed change."

"Rather than widen Senate membership, I would encourage a more direct responsibility of our "representatives" to report on, and discuss, matters of Senate importance with their constituencies."

"But preferable to either plan, I think, is election by departments, with the chairman a senator ex-officio, other representation proportional to size."

"I feel representation which included all professors and associate professors would not function efficiently because of its large size. I feel a smaller, but representative body, would be more efficient."

"Elected representatives are obligated to attend and thus insure a representative senate. The proposal would encourage minority groups to campaign for attendance and thus outvote a majority group who are not organized on the basis of a singular issue--i.e. Liberal elements in SLA could outvote non-organized science faculty."

"Of the alternatives listed the present arrangement is preferable. Changes in the present arrangement should be made, however, to improve the Senate's function."

"Too large. Membership would become meaningless."

"A senate containing all professors and associates would be completely unworkable and useless. If anything, the Senate size should be reduced. Having been a member of the Senate at least four times, I think it's perhaps the most USELESS organization on campus. It makes all sorts of plans on what it would do if anything important ever came up, but nothing ever does that can't be handled quite adequately by either the President, the Regents, or the Legislature."

"This ballot does not allow a vote against the proposal. This should have been done to allow expression of favoring some sort of change."

"The organization is bulky enough as is."

"Small faculties might lose adequate representation. Number of Senate members too large to be workable in the proposed change."

"I am new here. My questions regarding this proposal are:

- (1) Would this not reduce the effective representation of non-tenure faculty members?
- (2) Cannot special meetings be called for the entire faculty under the present arrangement?"

"The proposal disenfranchises the junior faculty, in effect, and is grossly unfair."

"It appears to me that if the Senate is to be an effective organ at all the present arrangement is more advantageous. An elected representative will have a greater sense of responsibility for continuous and regular attendance. The block representation will encourage sporadic attendance and loss of continuity. The second problem in changing from the present system will be an increase in the size of the organ making it less effective as a committee of action and accomplishment."

"I frankly believe that the proposal would destroy all possibility of effective faculty participation in University policy-making. The present arrangement at least provides a reasonable possibility of such participation."

"The proposed plan seems unwieldy to me. I believe an elected Senate member will devote more thought to University problems for he will feel responsible to the group which elected him."

"I wish before this poll had been taken there had been a chance for floor discussion (there was none) and for amendment. I do not think it is fair to take a vote without any previous discussion, even though the vote is not binding on the Senate. I shall move to amend the proposed amendment to include assistant professors with tenure, since I believe anyone holding tenure has an equal right to sit in the Senate with anyone else. (I am aware the committee is following the instructions of the Senate in taking this poll)."

"I would like to hear this discussed."

"Present plan gives someone definite responsibility. With proposed plan the population of successive meetings is too unstable to develop consistent policy. I can visualize faculty periodically being badgered into devoting a disproportionate amount of time going to Senate meetings to avoid or undo the actions of an unrepresentative minority."

"If the proposal is adopted, will the Senate meet in Northrup?"

"I believe that interest in the University Senate functions is limited and is, in a high degree, concentrated among the faculty who compete for position on the

Senate. The interest, I speak of, is participant interest. Because of the competition and the responsibility entrusted to them, I believe that a high degree of participation by Senate members results.

I feel that, if the present representative government is replaced by "town hall democracy", the incentives which presently exist will be impaired. There is a difference in representing a group as against appearing in the role of self vested interest. If this logic holds up, presumably more democracy would be accompanied by less representative government arising from impaired motivation. Also, I feel that the promoters of the amendment have not dealt with low attendance participation groups where narrow issues can lead to packing the meeting."

"While I prefer the present system either plan is acceptable. The formal plan is less important than devising some plan to stimulate more faculty to use a scholarly method of considering the questions that face us. Some of the comments made during the athletic relations discussions were, in my opinion, less than accurate and not fully relevant."

"I should think the Senate is large enough now. I would be reluctant to favor a proposal which would make this body unwieldy to the point of ineffectiveness. I have always been pleased with the Senate and its works and see no advantage in a change of the sort proposed."

I feel that elected representatives feel greater responsibility to attend Senate meetings and to become informed about issues confronting the Senate. The press of responsibility at the professor and associate professor levels would, I fear, prevent every member being informed and actively involved thus leaving the conduct of business in the Senate to the "professional radical" and "campus politicians". At present every staff member may attend Senate meetings and address the group. This right is as important in a group such as the Senate as the right to vote and it is already in effect."

"I believe that elected members will be more apt to take an interest in Senate affairs and will be more prompt in attendance. This means that they will also be better acquainted with the business at hand and will be more apt to cast an intelligent vote on proposed legislation."

"There may be a tendency toward more desultory participation by those members who are not representative of a larger group. A larger member body of the Senate could become more unwieldy as a forum and as a handler of legislative matters. The present composition hardly favors the assistant professor-instructor group."

"I see no great advantage of either representation or efficiency under the proposal, but I do see an increase in demands on faculty time for work that is neither scholarship nor teaching."

"Make the term of office of elected senators three years; provide limitation of number of members appointed to Senate by the President so as to make the principle of representation operative as otherwise the present faculty representation plan will be under continued attack. Encourage greater attendance and participation by non-members."

"I feel that elected members are more likely to attend and speak up at meetings. We already attend too many meetings and committees. A large Senate may make business more difficult to transact."

"If definite responsibility is assigned--through an elective Senate--there is likely to be higher percentage participation and greater sense of responsibility, I think

our experience has demonstrated this."

"I would like to hear discussion."

"A representative Senate gives a much stronger voice to the faculty than an ad hoc Senate. An elected Senator is more likely to attend (giving better representation). An ad hoc Senate invites undesirable politicking and meeting packing. Anyone may attend the meetings now and speak. The final vote, however, is a reasonable cross-section of the total faculties."

"Enlarging the Senate would make it even more unwieldy than at present."

"The change would make the Senate even more of a self-selected group than at present. Those who are willing to put aside scholarship and research to devote time to politics would be most influential."

"Older members too conservative."

"From what I have gathered, there has been some criticism of the Senate--whether it really was needed or could be useful. It seems that to add all members of any large, mostly uninterested group, would only hamper any effectiveness it might otherwise enjoy. If the ratio of tenure to non-tenure members should be changed, why not simply disseminate the non-tenure positions and either have the same size or reduce the number of tenure and ex-officio members? Being a new appointee, I do not have the details of this proposal of last spring, and do not know what purpose it was meant to serve."

"Rather than change the present set-up, why not improve it. The present election system might be more effective if we would know a little more about whom we are voting for."

"An elected representative bears a responsibility. General membership often produces apathy."

"I prefer the system of elected representatives with a higher ratio between these and other senate members than at present."

"In favor of present election system but would prefer longer, staggered, tenure of elected members."

"There would be too many in the Senate if all associate professors and professors were in it.

Since the associate professors and full professors would not be elected there would be a tendency for no one to assume the responsibility of attending all meetings and take part in activities of the Senate."

"I believe I voted on this not long ago. It must come up annually."

"I fear that a body composed of all professors and associate professors would be too unwieldy. Also the sense of responsibility usually assumed by an elected representative would be absent in most of the Senate members. Their sense of mission would be destroyed."

"I feel that the committee has proposed the obvious and the easiest way around what has been termed a major problem. Some alterations of the present arrangement might be in order but the proposal suggests that Group 2 has really nothing to offer and that Group 1 is all-knowing."

"I believe the proposal would so enlarge the Senate membership as to make it unwieldy. The present system of all-faculty voting on issues of importance with the present size Senate acting on the major portion of the problems seems the most efficient to me."

COMMENTS BY FACULTY TO WHOM EITHER PLAN IS ACCEPTABLE

"Doubt it makes much difference except that the proposed plan may make the Senate even more unwieldy."

"I am so new to the faculty of this University that I am not aware of the values involved in this proposal. It appears to me, however, that this change would enormously increase the voting membership of the Senate, and I wonder if this would be reflected in creating an unwieldy organization. The present voting membership stands at 172 members. I personally should think that 172 intelligent men could operate the Senate as well as, if not better than, a much larger group. However, due to my unfamiliarity with the situation on this campus I shall gladly accept either plan. Thanks for the opportunity to have aired my views."

"I like the idea of avoiding elections, yet I feel it is important to keep the group small enough to work efficiently. Why not just professors?"

"The present arrangement would seem preferable and more efficient, but the Senate's decision for a poll raises doubts in my belief. This explains my vote."

"Have no strong feelings. If this proposal were passed, however, it seems to me a smaller group would still be needed to conduct much of the business of the Senate."

"Newly appointed I have no opportunity to review the Senate minutes of March or April."

COMMENTS BY FACULTY NOT IN FAVOR OF EITHER PLAN

"I am not well enough informed to vote on this. However, feel that the elected system is sound in principle."

"If there are issues that are of prime concern to professors and associate professors, such as retirement or other fringe benefits, etc., it would seem to me that these issues are of equal importance, or more important, to those of lower rank. In fact, it seems to me that issues of importance should be brought to the attention of all members and this could well be done by delegates, i.e. Senate members. The proposal simply substitutes a poor proposal for a weak system or for one that is not handled properly. Delegates don't seem to feel responsible to their constituents."

"I have not checked any of the above, because I feel emphatically that we have tried both plans and neither works well. I see no advantage in reverting to what we know has serious drawbacks. What is needed is a thorough investigation of improvements in both and then make a choice."

"Neither. I prefer the present arrangement but with the same proportional representation for the Administrative and Consultative Committees as for the rest of the faculty."

"Neither plan is appropriate. What we need is a forum, held by the Committee on Business and Rules, to clarify why the present plan doesn't work and how it
1. Could be modified, or how 2. the proposal could be spelled out to work."