

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

NOVEMBER 17, 1992

The first meeting of the University Senate for 1992-93 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Tuesday, November 17, 1992, at 2:30 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 144 voting faculty/academic professional members, 47 voting student members, 2 ex officio members, and 3 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided

I. ORIENTATION

Professor Mario Bognanno, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee, welcomed new and continuing Senate members. He emphasized the important role faculty, academic professionals, and students play in the decision-making process at the University of Minnesota through the governance system. Professor Bognanno reviewed the organizational structure of the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly and their relationship with the committees. Each of the twenty Senate and Assembly committee chairs was then introduced and Senators were encouraged to work with the appropriate committees with issues of interest to them or their colleagues. A handout identifying committee agendas was distributed.

**II. INTRODUCTION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND
DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL**

President Hasselmo welcomed and introduced Dr. Anne Petersen, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. The Vice President for Research, he said, is a new position that has been combined with the Dean of the Graduate School to emphasize the fact that research is intimately connected with graduate and professional education. The Vice President's agenda contains several elements, including the quality of graduate education at the University, research strength for the institution as a whole, interdisciplinary efforts, and issues of facilities and equipment necessary to support scholarly activities. Senate members welcomed Vice President Petersen with a warm round of applause.

**III. MEETING SCHEDULE
Information**

Other 1992-93 meetings of the University Senate are scheduled as follows:

Thursday, February 18, 1993
Thursday, April 1, 1993
Thursday, May 20, 1993

ACCEPTED

**CONSENT AGENDA 1
Action**

Agenda Items IV. through VII. are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature and are offered as a "consent agenda" to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a Senator. A majority of members present and voting is required for approval.

IV. MINUTES FOR APRIL 16, 1992, AND MAY 14, 1992

V. SENATE OFFICERS

The Chair of the University Senate recommends the following officers for 1992-93:

Parliamentarian -- Fred Morrison
Abstractor and Clerk -- Martha Kvanbeck

VI. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Committees of the Senate, 1992-93

COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS--Faculty/PA: Thomas Burk (chair), Ernest Davenport, Gertrude Foreman, Thomas Hoffman, James Olson (UMM), Harold Opgrand (UMC), George Wilcox, Tzvee Zahavy **Students:** Karen Geronime, Daryl Leibel **Ex Officio:** Don Riley.

DISABILITIES ISSUES--Faculty/PA: Terence Collins (chair), Dennis Ahlburg, Linda Belote (UMD), Nancy Eustis, Susan Gangl, Glenice Johnson (UMC), Stephen Kanee, Marie Knowlton, Joe Reichle, Glenn Scudder, James Slagle, Thomas Straw (UMM) **Civil Service:** Elizabeth Grundner, Ruanne Pearson **Students:** Ralph Leonard, 1 to be named **Ex Officio:** Sue Forsythe, Sue Kroeger.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY--Faculty/PA: James Tracy (chair), Victor Bloomfield, Thomas Clayton, James Cotter (UMM), Sue Donaldson, Megan Gunnar, Kenneth Heller, Robert Johnson, Clark Starr, Susan Wick **Students:** Michael Handberg, Andrea Mack, Lucy Martine, Tim Swierczek **Ex Officio:** Darwin Hendel.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN--Faculty/PA: Ann Burkhart (chair), Silvia Azar, Priscilla Grew, Wesley Hackett, Karla Klinger, Martin Roth, Kathryn Sedo, Mariah Snyder, Sharon Stewart **Ex Officio:** Patricia Mullen, Janet Spector.

FINANCE AND PLANNING--Faculty/PA: Irwin Rubenstein (chair), William Gerberich, Virginia Gray, Thomas Hoffmann, Craig Kissock (UMM), Fred Morrison, Doris Rubenstein, 1 to be named **Civil Service:** Michael Hoey, Jeff von Munkwitz-Smith **Students:** Karen Geronime, Julie Idelkope, Jason Schmidt, Susie Torgerson **Ex Officio:** Carl Adams, David Berg, Roger Paschke, Richard Pfitzenreuter, Paul Sackett, Thomas Scott, Mary Sue Simmons.

LIBRARY--Faculty/PA: Kay Cooper (chair), John Cogan, Robert Gorlin, Michael Hancher, Harold Hinds, Roberto Leon, Albert Markhart, John McConnell, David McLaughlin, Robert McMaster, Sheila McNally, 1 to be named **Students:** Krissy Hagestuen, Benjamin Studenski, Paul Thompson **Ex Officio:** LeAnn Dean, Joan Howland, Margaret Johnson, Harold Opgrand, Donald Riley, Thomas Shaughnessy.

PHYSICAL PLANT AND SPACE ALLOCATION SUBCOMMITTEE--Faculty/PA: Mary Sue Simmons (chair), Mark Davison, Martin Gwinup, David Kittelson, Fay Thompson, Mary Walser, 1 to be named **Civil Service:** Ginger DeRoiser **Students:** Aric Nissen, Nathan Rich. **Ex Officio:** Dennis Cabral, Robert Erickson, Elizabeth Grundner, Susan Markham, Villis Vikmanis.

RESEARCH--Faculty/PA: Paul Sackett (chair), Sara Evans, Daniel Feeney, Robert Jones, Essie Kariv-Miller, Eric Klinger (UMM), Jonathan Wirtschafter, Albert Yonas **Civil Service:** John Basgen **Students:** V.S. Mangipudi, Khahn Nguyen. **Ex Officio:** Signe Betsinger, N.L. Gault, Sue Markham, Anne Petersen, Tony Potami.

SOCIAL CONCERNS--Faculty/PA: Frank Wood (chair), Norman Bowie, George French, Mary Lou Gilstad, Warren Gore, David Hollister, Jacquelyn Zita **Civil Service:** Sandra Gatzke, 1 to be named **Alumni:** Lynn Boldt, Julie Johnson, Laura Langer **Students:** Robert Jacobson, Victoria Korias, Stacey Mangni, Jennifer McKeever, Rhonda Pierce, Andrea Popiel, 1 to be named **Ex Officio:** Jane Canney, Anne Truax, Katherine Cram.

STUDENT AFFAIRS--Faculty/PA: Thomas Soulen (chair), George Brauer, Sheila Corcoran-Perry, Joel Nelson, Earl Nolting, 1 to be named **Civil Service:** Mary Koskan **Alumni:** Stacy Einck **Students:** Phuong Phan, Denise Tolbert, Christine VeLure, Tony Wagner, Michael Whitt, 4 to be named **Ex Officio:** Marvalene Hughes.

INFORMATION:

ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS--Faculty/PA: Ellen Berscheid (chair), Jack Imholte, Alice Larson, David Storvick, Paul Quie, George Wright **Alumni:** Steve Kreitz, Cathy Milota, Betsy Neff, Barbara O'Leary, Paul Taylor **Students:** Sally Anderson, Kendall Heitzman, 1 to be named **Ex Officio:** Cheryl Jones, Gerald Fischer, Marcia Fluer, E. F. Infante.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES--Faculty/PA: Geoffrey Maruyama (chair), Wilbert Ahern (UMM), Charles Campbell, Ed Cushing, Robert Johnson (UMC), Jean Quam, Michael Steffes, Carolyn Williams **Students:** David Kelly, James C. McHie, Cindy Pham, Sandy Pham, 3 to be named.

CONSULTATIVE--Faculty Mario Bognanno (chair), John Adams, Amos Deinard, Judith Garrard, Paul Holm (UMC), Karen Seashore Louis, Toni McNaron, James Van Alstine (UMM), Shirley Zimmerman **Students:** Denise Tolbert (chair), David Dahlgren, Jamie Hodgson, Sonja Hoheisel, David Lee, Tom Lopez, Malaika McKee, Anne Sales, Dan Sinclair **Ex Officio:** Irwin Rubenstein, James Tracy.

GEOFFREY MARUYAMA
Chair

**VII. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE**

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Rules for Committees of the University Senate, as follows (double-underlined language is new):

2. Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees

Ex officio members shall be appointed from each of the offices listed below.

.....

- Computing and Information Systems--Office of Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs;
Office of Senior Vice President, Finance and Operations.

COMMENT:

Responsibility for computing, and for the upcoming information technology planning process, is divided between Academic Affairs (Acting Associate Provost Donald Riley) and Finance and Operations (Acting Assistant Vice President Michael O'Connor). The Computing Committee, in order to be kept apprised of events and actively involved in the planning process, wishes to have the individuals in both Academic Affairs and Finance and Operations serve as ex officio members.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

THOMAS E. BURK, Chair
Senate Committee on Computing and Information Systems

DISCUSSION:

Consent Agenda 1 was approved with no discussion.

APPROVED

CONSENT AGENDA 2
Action

Agenda Items VIII. and IX. are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature and are offered as a "consent agenda" to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Either item will be taken up separately at the request of a Senator. A majority of the total membership is required for approval.

VIII. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Physical Plant and Space Allocation Subcommittee

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 9 of the Bylaws of the University Senate, to change the name of the Subcommittee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation and to increase its representation on the Committee on Finance and Planning.

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES

.....

9. FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Finance and Planning Committee serves as the consultative body to the president and vice presidents on all major issues of budget and planning, including the capital request.

It shall have a permanent Subcommittee of ~~on physical plant and space allocation~~ Facilities Management composed of 6 faculty/academic professional members (at least one of whom shall be an academic professional), 2 students, one civil service staff member, and ex officio representation from the Office of the Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs; Office of the Senior Vice President, Finance and Physical Planning Operations (2 representatives) ~~(the Associate Vice President for Physical Planning and the Director of Physical Plant Operations)~~; Office of the Vice President, Student ~~Development~~ Affairs (Scheduling Office); and Office of the Vice President, Health Sciences. At least two of the members of the Subcommittee on Facilities Management, one of whom shall be the chair, shall serve as voting members of the Committee on Finance and Planning.

Membership

The Finance and Planning Committee shall be composed of 8 faculty/academic professional members, 4 students, 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. . . . The chairs (or their designees) of the Faculty Affairs and Research Committees ~~and the chair of the Physical Plant and Space Allocation Subcommittee~~ shall be ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee. (The representatives from the Subcommittee on Facilities Management may be included in the preceding numbers in this paragraph, or may be appointed to the committee in addition to those individuals.)

COMMENT:

The Finance and Planning Committee last year voted unanimously to recommend continuation of the existence of the Physical Plant and Space Allocation Subcommittee, to rename it the Facilities Management Subcommittee (to reflect the changes in name and function that have occurred in facilities management), and to increase the overlap in representation between it and the Subcommittee from one to two members (one of whom must be the chair of the Subcommittee). The Finance and Planning Committee voted unanimously on October 13, 1992, to approve this Bylaw amendment; the Senate Consultative Committee approved it unanimously on October 28. The Senate Committee on Committees endorses the recommendation.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

GEOFFREY MARUYAMA, Chair
Senate Committee on Committees

IRWIN RUBENSTEIN, Chair
Senate Finance and Planning Committee

IX. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Transfer of Waseca Student Seat on the Senate Consultative Committee

MOTION:

To amend the Senate bylaws, Article III, Section 4, Consultative Committees, as follows (additions are underlined, deletions are ~~struck out~~):

Senate Consultative Committee

Membership

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 faculty representatives shall serve as the Faculty Consultative Committee; the 8 elected student representatives and the chair and vice chair of the Student Senate shall serve as the Student Consultative Committee; ~~the 8 elected student representatives and the vice chair of the Student Senate shall comprise the 9 voting student members of the Senate Consultative Committee.~~]

....

Student Consultative Committee

Membership

The Student Consultative Committee shall be composed of ~~undergraduate student members from the Twin Cities campus, one student each elected from the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Waseca campuses, students from the Graduate and Professional Student Association, and the chair of the Student Senate.~~

- One student from the Crookston campus
- One student from the Duluth campus
- One student from the Morris campus
- Five students from the Twin Cities campus
- The chair and vice chair of the Student Senate

The numbers of undergraduate and graduate/professional students on the Student Consultative Committee from the Twin Cities campus shall be in proportion to the numbers of students represented by their respective assemblies,

rounded to the nearest whole number. The Assembly Steering Committee of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly shall determine the time and measures to be used in ascertaining the number of positions allocated to the two groups.
...

- At the time of their election, students shall be members of the University Senate (except for Crookston and Waseca).

Student vacancies shall be filled. . . .

The chair ~~or the vice chair~~ of the Student Senate shall serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Senate Consultative Committee if not otherwise elected in his or her own right. The vice chair of the Student Senate shall serve as a voting member of the Senate Consultative Committee.

COMMENT:

With the closing of the Waseca campus, the student seat on the Senate Consultative Committee can be transferred to another campus. This amendment provides that the vice-chair of the Student Senate shall be the ninth voting student member of SCC. (The chair of the Student Senate is already an ex-officio non-voting member of SCC.)

MARIO BOGNANNO
Chair

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, Consent Agenda 2 was approved 158 to 0.

APPROVED

X. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Representation on the Senate Consultative Committee
Action

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 4 of the Bylaws of the University Senate, to reflect a change in representation of Duluth on the Faculty and Senate Consultative Committees, as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~):

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES

.....

4. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

.....

Faculty Consultative Committee

Membership

The faculty of the Twin Cities campus and those faculty members on the Duluth campus eligible to vote in elections for the Senate shall elect 7 8 members, and the faculties of the Crookston, ~~Duluth~~, and Morris campuses shall each elect one faculty member . . .

- All members of the Faculty Consultative Committee . . .

- Each campus faculty . . .

- For the purposes of this section only, the faculty on the Duluth campus who are eligible to vote in Senate elections shall be considered a part of the Twin Cities campus: They shall be eligible (1) to vote in elections for the Faculty Consultative Committee and (2) for nomination and election to the Faculty Consultative Committee in accord with the provisions established by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. [Note: When a faculty member from the Duluth campus is elected under this provision, that individual shall not be a member of the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly Steering Committee or the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee.]

- Terms of office . . .

In case of a faculty vacancy . . .

The chairs of the Educational Policy and Finance and Planning Committees shall be ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee.

There shall also be one ex officio, non-voting member of the committee who shall represent the faculty on the Duluth campus eligible to vote in Senate elections. This representative shall be elected in accord with procedures established by the eligible Duluth faculty.

MOTION:

To amend Article 3, Section 2 of the Rules of the University Senate, to reflect a change in representation of Duluth on the Faculty and Senate Consultative Committees, as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

ARTICLE III. RULES FOR COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

. . . .

2. Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees

. . . .

- Consultative--Chairs of the Finance and Planning and Educational Policy Committees; elected representative from the Duluth faculty eligible to vote in Senate elections

COMMENT:

These amendments change the designation of the seat previously identified specifically for Duluth on the Faculty Consultative Committee/Senate Consultative Committee (FCC/SCC). There are supposed to be 10 elected faculty on FCC/SCC; ever since the Duluth faculty voted in favor of collective bargaining they have been unrepresented on FCC/SCC--and the voting membership of FCC/SCC has been 9 rather than 10 elected members. These amendments provide that there will be 8 seats on the FCC/SCC allocated to the combined eligible faculties of the Twin Cities and Duluth campuses, plus one seat allocated to each of the Morris and Crookston campuses. Any eligible member of the Duluth faculty could be nominated and elected by the procedures which now exist for electing the Twin Cities faculty representatives to the FCC/SCC; they also will be eligible to serve on the nominating committee that selects candidates for FCC/SCC.

There are faculty at Duluth who are not included in the bargaining group, in particular, the faculty of the Medical School. It is the view of the Senate Consultative Committee and those unrepresented UMD faculty that there should be an ex officio, non-voting representative from Duluth on the committee, irrespective of whether or not someone from Duluth is actually elected to the committee. This individual will provide continuity in representation of non-represented faculty from Duluth and provide a means for regular exchange of information and views.

The leadership of UMD's represented faculty also endorse the proposed changes reflected herein.

MARIO BOGNANNO
Chair

DISCUSSION:

Professor Bognanno, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee, presented the motions to amend the bylaws and rules of the Senate to merge the non-represented UMD faculty with the Twin Cities faculty for purposes of Senate Consultative Committee/Faculty Consultative Committee elections. He said the Consultative Committee worked closely with the faculty leaders at UMD to ensure fair and equitable representation and that the proposal has received unanimous endorsement from all affected constituencies.

After clarifying that the proposal does not change the faculty:student ratio on the Senate Consultative Committee, the motion to amend the bylaws was approved 157 to 0 and the motion to amend the rules was approved by a simple majority vote.

APPROVED

XI. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE Vision and Strategy for Computing and Information Technology Information and Discussion

October 26, 1992

Professor Mario Bognanno, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
Industrial Relations Center
537 Management & Economics

Dear Mike:

After considerable deliberation, the Senate Committee on Computing and Information Systems (SCCIS) wishes to bring the AUC "Vision and Strategies" statement back to the Senate Consultative Committee for placement on the docket of the Senate. While you have perhaps read the minutes from our recent meeting, I would nonetheless like to identify the issues that we dealt with as we considered your request that the vision statement be redrafted to include supercomputing.

As you know, following our initial discussions of the vision statement, SCCIS adopted the following resolution:

The Senate Committee on Computing and Information Systems (SCCIS) strongly endorses the August 12, 1992, 'Vision and Strategy for Computing and Information Technology' statement prepared by the Advisory Users Committee. SCCIS believes it to be an admirable declaration of the aspirations the University should have as well as the directions in which the University should immediately begin to move. SCCIS firmly believes that a plan to implement the statement should be developed as soon as practicable: it is time to get at the business of moving the University forward in computing and information technology.

When we brought that resolution to the Senate Consultative Committee, you asked that we consider the role that supercomputing should play in the vision, inasmuch as the statement appeared not to speak to supercomputing in any explicit way.

In developing that resolution, and especially as we have reflected on it and met again with the authors of the vision statement, we conclude we can legitimately interpret the AUC vision statement as being directed at all forms of computing and information technology at the University of Minnesota. In particular, we believe that supercomputing should not be treated differently than any other kind of computing and must be appropriately available to support the University's teaching, research, and outreach missions. The AUC vision statement speaks at length to how computing and information technology must be integrated into these missions; accordingly, computing resources should be ranked in priority and allocated based on their furtherance of these missions. The vision anticipates a governance structure being established to provide the framework under which funding and level of service priorities will be considered; supercomputing clearly should be included in such deliberations. It follows that the information technology planning process evolving from the vision statement must determine whether the current means through which supercomputing is obtained and utilized by the University is effective and efficient in fulfilling academic needs.

In our discussions with several members of (the now-disbanded) AUC, we learned that AUC discussed supercomputing at considerable length and wrote the vision statement intending that it include supercomputing--even though the language of the statement may not make it clear. They pointed out to us that the vision statement does not mention any specific kinds of computing but that it does have language and phrases which makes it clearly applicable to all computing at the University. Although we determined that we had the prerogative to interpret the statement in whatever way we felt appropriate for the faculty and students of the University, and had the authority to make our endorsement of the statement contingent on our interpretation, SCCIS was glad to learn its views coincided with those of AUC members.

Beyond supercomputing issues and the obvious concern about when the information technology planning process will start and who will pay for it, the Committee remains concerned that appropriate emphasis be placed on education of students, staff, and faculty on the availability and use of the capabilities of computing. One way to begin that education is to have the vision statement prominently displayed in the docket of the Senate.

You should know also that we have communicated these strongly-held views to Acting Associate Provost Don Riley and to Acting Assistant Vice President Mike O'Connor. I am certain they understand our position. I also believe that they concur with our view of the vision statement and intend to incorporate supercomputing in the information technology planning process that is now just beginning.

Finally, the AUC vision statement recommends the establishment of a strong advisory structure as part of the planning process; we have requested that SCCIS play a major role in that advisory structure. Both Dr. Riley and Mr. O'Connor, as well as Mr. Fitzpatrick, who will serve as project manager for the planning process, have endorsed the request. We also note that two of the three members of the planning project "Oversight Subcommittee" are ex officio members of our Committee, so we expect to remain fully and continuously informed about the progress of the planning process.

I should point out that the Committee believes that discussion of supercomputing, and in particular the relationship between the University and the Minnesota Supercomputer Center, Inc., should not be lost in the larger discussions about public-private partnerships that the President has begun. We are concerned that the progress we can make in incorporating supercomputing in the scheme of computing set out by the vision statement not be delayed.

I am available at the pleasure of SCC on October 28 to discuss this matter. If you wish me to attend the meeting, please let me know.

Thank you.

Cordially,

Thomas E. Burk, Chair
Senate Committee on Computing
and Information Systems

Vision and Strategy for Computing and Information Technology

University of Minnesota

August 12, 1992

Submitted by the Advisory Users Committee

George Wilcox, Chair - Health Sciences & Senate Committee on
Computing and Information Services

Katherine Cram - Business Services

Robert Ferguson - Graduate Student

Roger Forrester - Human Resources

Lael Gatewood - Medical School and College MIS Coordinators

Susan Grotevant - Student Affairs

Thomas Shaughnessy - Libraries

Billie Wahlstrom - Agriculture

Jim Colten, CIS Staff Representative

Diana Ristenpart, AIS Staff Representative

Tim Fitzpatrick, ex officio - Administrative Information Services

Mike O'Connor, ex officio - Acting Assistant Vice President for AIS

Don Riley, ex officio - Acting Provost for Computing and Information
Services

Introduction

This report provides the Advisory Users Committee's (AUC) vision of computing and information technologies for the University of Minnesota. We consider this vision part of the development of a computing and information services strategy. Both the University and the field of computing are constantly changing, and changes in both arenas will influence the directions which a computing and information strategy might suggest. If the University of Minnesota desires to remain a premier research institution, it must have a well-defined computing strategy and clearly-articulated information policy.

The issues involved in computing for any university are long-term and diverse, and do not lend themselves to one-shot remedies. The situation is further complicated by the rapid rate of change in computing and information services fields. No sum of money today could purchase the amount and type of computing power and resources that will be needed in the 21st century, and there is no way of knowing exactly what will be developed. Yet, with some foresight, we hope to position the University of Minnesota to capitalize on new technologies as they are developed. The preliminary strategy outlined here provides for continuous refinement in order for it to remain current and at the same time far-sighted.

This document is not the first set of recommendations regarding computing and information strategies and planning done at University of Minnesota. Among the more recent reports are the Adams committee, 1982; Foster report, 1984; Focus on Computing, 1987; the Pyclik/Gatewood report, 1988; the Hobbie reports of 1988 and 1989; the Gillespie, Faulkner and Associates report, 1989; Luker report, 1991. For many reasons, these recommendations were not fully addressed by the University of Minnesota. Consequently, this report presents a number of recommendations that are similar to those made in other reports. This document, however, also proposes a planning process and some implementation ideas for carrying out those recommendations. Even so, the recommendations made here will also go unheeded without

1. Administrative support, commitment, and participation that are essential to the success of a information technologies strategy and planning process,
2. Direct involvement of academic and administrative units in the planning process,
3. Acceptance of the major costs of computing (administrative and student access, as well as base support for research, education and outreach) as part of the normal University of Minnesota operating costs, and
4. University willingness to compete for qualified individuals in the job market to serve the growing need for professional service staff and encourage retention of technical expertise.

Assuming the support outlined above, the Advisory Users Committee makes the following recommendations to the University of Minnesota community.

Vision and Strategies

Given University of Minnesota's mission as a land grant institution, information technology must be central to the university. Strong information technology is essential to fulfilling the land grant mission because it supports University units in carrying out their research, teaching, and administrative functions; and it is central to the University's outreach efforts to the metropolitan area, to greater Minnesota and to the international community. As members of a major research and teaching university, students, faculty and staff need access to information resources at the level of technology appropriate for their disciplines. This includes access to workstations and local, national, and international electronic communication networks. Additionally, as a major research institution the University of Minnesota is involved in advancing computing and information services in various technical disciplines.

Decentralized computing with full campus connectivity is a necessary base for both options stated above. The strategy described in this report is designed to establish an environment of well-connected, decentralized information technology systems. This environment will meet our current needs by creating a common information space in which university personnel can carry out their work, and it will set the stage for the development of a shared information resource in the future.

Philosophy Statements

The five statements below represent a philosophy for University of Minnesota information technologies.

1. **The Role of Computing at University of Minnesota:** The University should provide a strong base of information technology support for educational, research, service, outreach and administrative needs.
2. **The Availability of and Access to Information Technologies:** University information technologies should be available to all students and faculty within reasonable limits, and to all staff as determined by their job functions. Convenient access to information technologies should be available for instruction, research, and administration.
3. **The Relation of Information Technologies to Communication Technologies:** Decisions made about computing and information services should take into account concurrent developments in all other communication and related technologies.
4. **Roles of Administrative and Academic Units and the University:** Decisions regarding computing and information services should be made at the lowest practical level. However, oversight and control must be exerted to prevent unnecessary duplication and costs. Therefore, the University of Minnesota should provide appropriate guidelines and technical standards to be used in the decision making.
5. **Funding of Information Technologies:** Computing infrastructure requires adequate and predictable funding. Investments in computing and information resources should be justified in terms of educational worth, research support, process improvement and/or administrative effectiveness. They should provide at least as great a benefit to the University of Minnesota as other options for achieving the goals of the University in order to be considered for funding.
6. **Staffing for Computing and Information Technologies:** Information technology staff play a critical role in the development, maintenance and delivery of services critical to this vision. Maintenance of an environment conducive to effective service and appropriate investments in human resources are essential to the realization of the vision.

The Vision of Information Technologies at the University of Minnesota

We envision an electronic environment, a common space, that invites members of the University community to make use of distributed information technology in realizing our land-grant mission. In addition we wish to involve members of the community at large in this collaboration. This environment will be tolerant of diverse computing

platforms, provide access to global information resources, and will value innovation . To support this vision, the AUC offers the following objectives to be reached within the next five years.

Objectives

1. Faculty, students, and staff will have universal access to a distributed information commons.
 - a. Information not limited by contract, agreement or statute will flow electronically to those who need it within the Twin Cities campus and across unit boundaries where appropriate.
 - b. A campus-wide network will be expanded to provide the following:
 - 1) Effective and efficient connections between decentralized computing facilities at the University of Minnesota will provide access to a variety of hardware, software, and database applications for research, instruction, and administrative needs.
 - 2) Easy access to local and worldwide electronic networks.
 - 3) A single, easy electronic mail system.
2. The University will support a continuum of access options which embrace multiple platforms and operating systems within a broad framework of standards.
 - a. The University community will have access to a distributed information utility from a variety of electronic work environments and from a variety of locations including home, dorm room, lab, office, classroom.
 - b. Access to the distributed information utility will be via a transparent and uniform interface.
 - c. Appropriate standards will be adopted and applied.
3. Information technologies will be integrated into administration, planning, research, teaching, outreach.
 - a. Computing will be integrated into all appropriate curricula, both specific and general education, to ensure a level of literacy and numeracy appropriate for a research university.
 - b. A full range and variety of equipment, software, and services appropriate for the institutional requirements of a major research university will be maintained and will be readily accessible to all students.
 - c. Basic information technologies necessary to support research appropriate for a major research university will be available to all faculty members.
 - d. Administrative computing will be cost-effective, reliable, and will strengthen University of Minnesota's competitive position among peer universities. The basic operation procedures will be modified to improve the standard and quality of computation, communication, and data transfer resulting in long-term savings to the University of Minnesota.
 - e. All computing and information technologies will be coordinated with, and done in the context of, activities on campus involving other communication and related technologies.
4. There will be a single, readily identifiable source for help, support, and service with networks, computers and databases.
 - a. A single source will coordinate and provide guidance to academic and administrative units concerning information, common application software, uniform guidelines, networking, and standards.
 - b. A core team will coordinate delivery and assess the effectiveness of computing and telecommunication resources which, by their nature, transcend unit boundaries.
5. There will be a rational funding model that encourages individual and institutional investment and standardization.
 - a. Funding for information technologies should be a high institutional priority.
 - b. Computer support services will be streamlined to increase cost effectiveness and clientele appropriateness for its operation procedures.
 - c. Computing resources will be allocated on the basis of needs that advance the University of Minnesota's mission and in accordance with the governance structure described below.

- d. A computing environment will be established that is open, flexible, and supportive to ideas and initiatives for acquiring and using computing and information resources.
 - e. Funding assistance from outside sources should be sought and encouraged with seed funds.
 - f. Various incentives will be used to obtain compliance with the standards adopted.
6. There will be a rational model for creating a productive environment for computing and information technology staff.
- a. Decisions about staffing will be based on analysis of needs.
 - b. Staff development opportunities and organizational management policies should ensure the expertise needed to support required services and technologies.

Gains from Implementing Vision

Achieving the vision for information technologies will result in a number of gains for the University of Minnesota. The AUC believes that failure to follow up on these objectives will result in a net loss in resources for the entire University community. Below are the primary returns to the University of Minnesota from implementing the proposed strategy:

- 1. Provide the same level of access to information resources for all students, staff, and faculty.
 - a. Reduce geographic and informatic caste distinctions at the University of Minnesota by making resources available to the coordinate campuses and the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses.
 - b. Provide information resources as part of the University's outreach programs including CEE and MES.
- 2. Faster access to available research and existing instructional technology will increase faculty productivity.
 - a. Faculty will have world-wide access to collaborative research groups.
 - b. Bibliographic searching will be freely available.
 - c. Access to high performance simulations, imaging, and multimedia presentation will be accessible.
 - d. Databases can be added to, shared, and viewed easily.
- 3. One hundred percent office connectivity and standardization will reduce paper flow, maximize use of and access to university resources, and reduce express mail delivery expenses.
 - a. Electronic submission of grants (e.g. NSF) will be facilitated.
 - b. Reducing the need for duplication of some acquisitions will improve library collections.
 - c. Electronic forms (paperless buying, paying, communicating, and electronic signature verification system) will reduce errors and document turn-around time.
- 4. Universal access to a distributed information utility will improve administrative decision-making by facilitating tracking of student, staff, and faculty demographics.
 - a. Course scheduling, grades, financial aid and billing will be accessible appropriately to students, staff, and administration.
 - b. Duplication of databases can be eliminated.
- 5. The creation of an integrated electronic environment will provide for more cost-effective decisions about resources.
 - a. Uniform standards will allow for a more systematic approach to the selection and development of major systems that will result in effective purchasing and maintenance of equipment and software and will facilitate college and departmental system integration.
 - b. Available resources and databases will be uniformly accessible via transparent interfaces.
 - c. An integrated environment will require minimum training for users and will be self-service.

- d. Decisions about telecommunications, printing and duplicating, media resources, and the library will be coordinated.
6. A productive staff environment will result in cost-effective delivery of quality service.
 - a. Rational staffing decisions will reduce perceived job insecurity.
 - b. Minimizing staff turnover can promote retention of experienced staff.
 - c. Well managed transitions between old and new technologies can optimize use of staff resources.

Next Steps

The AUC was charged with creating a vision of information technology and offering some preliminary strategies for achieving that vision at the University of Minnesota. We present the outline of the steps necessary to implement the vision below:

1. Secure executive approval of the vision statement and share the vision with other units.
2. Agree upon a mandate for a team commissioned to develop a plan for implementing the vision.
 - a. Develop a technology and organizational strategy.
 - 1) Identify targets for strategic investments in information technologies that reestablish the university as a technological leader.
 - a) Adopt uniform technical standards and publish them.
 - b) Determine migration paths to newer, more compatible systems whenever practical (or encapsulate incompatible systems when not).
 - c) Connect and equip every office, class and study room for network access.
 - d) Provide network access to connect homes where appropriate.
 - e) Identify sources for matching grants to encourage university, college and department investment in technology development and maintenance.
 - f) Identify a funding model to encourage student investment in appropriate access modes (e.g., databases via networks) and tools (e.g., laptop computers).
 - b. Define the organizational structure most appropriate to deliver technology to the entire university community and foster innovation. Duties should include the following:
 - 1) Implement and continuously update the strategic plan guiding information technology.
 - 2) Provide support to units requiring help in developing their computing plans.
 - 3) Plan and coordinate computing and telecommunications activities within the University.
 - 4) Direct development of a plan for assuring that there are adequate computer teaching facilities across the university.
 - 5) Establish faculty reward system encouraging implementation of technology in teaching.
 - 6) Identify sources for development and maintenance funds.
 - 7) Identify promising technology directions that could be useful to the university community.
 - 8) Evaluate continuously new alternatives and the quality and effectiveness of existing information technology.
 - 9) Acquire, design, develop, and implement components of technology infrastructure
 - 10) Maintain the technology infrastructure.
 - 11) Choose an organizational model that will achieve a high degree of coordination across the University community and that can be held accountable.
 - c. Define the governance structure that fosters cooperation toward university community goals and represents various stakeholder constituencies. Responsibilities should include the following:
 - 1) Assure that the strategic plan guiding information technology is continuously updated and supports the strategic direction of the University.
 - 2) Review and approve information technology initiatives within the University.
 - 3) Assure that the University of Minnesota's resources committed to computing and networking are appropriately prioritized.

- 4) Address policy issues related to computing under the framework of the University's computing philosophy and strategy.
 - 5) Establish a strong advisory structure allowing feedback from faculty, students and staff concerning services, needs and plans, and encouraging participation by people not familiar with computing and information technology.
 - 6) Advocate for faculty, students and staff on computing proposals to the University.
- d. Explore lasting partnerships with industry.
- 1) Encourage the University of Minnesota to explore viable means of generating external computing funds.
 - 2) Pursue appropriate partnerships with outside enterprises to leverage our financial and intellectual assets.
 - 3) Pursue technological innovation by enlisting several corporate partners to develop jointly a cost-effective universal access model for campus information technology.
 - 4) Attract an excellent visionary to lead this project.
- e. Establish rational financing mechanisms that provide incentives for actions and behaviors supporting the mission of the university, driving implementation of our technology vision, and inviting external interest and funding:
- 1) Explore and encourage units of the University of Minnesota to explore innovative means of generating external funds.
 - 2) Budget computing facilities on the same basis as other key infrastructure needs.
 - 3) Establish funding policies that encourage decentralized acquisition decisions from a university-wide perspective.
 - 4) Invest according to a previously articulated plan vs. who can pay.
 - 5) Provide sufficient funding for basic access to all users.
 - 6) Align tuition and fees with direct instructional benefits.
 - 7) Acquire university-wide site licenses for selected software and databases.

3. Commence computer and information technology planning process for the whole university from top down.

 Paper version includes a copy of the commons picture.

MARIO BOGNANNO, Chair
 Senate Consultative Committee

THOMAS BURK, Chair
 Computing and Information Systems Committee

DISCUSSION:

Professor Thomas Hoffman, member, Computing and Information Systems Committee, introduced the Vision and Strategy for Computing and Information report prepared by the Advisory Users Committee. He said the Computing and Information Systems Committee has strongly endorsed the document and believes that a plan to implement the statement should be developed as soon as practicable.

One Senator commended the committee's report but inquired about the consequences for those individuals who do not own computers and who do not have an interest in participating in electronic mail and other technological advances. Professor Hoffmann said it is the committee's hope that faculty, staff, and students will choose to take advantage of the opportunities being offered by the University. He added that voice mail and paper copy would still be options for those who choose not to participate in e-mail.

Another Senator pointed out the ecological benefits of using e-mail and encouraged individuals to consider not only the cost savings and efficiency of electronic mail but the positive effects on the environment as well.

President Hasselmo thanked the committee for its fine work.

ACCEPTED

XII. UNIVERSITY POLICY AGENDA, 1992-93

The Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee has called upon the President to submit his annual policy agenda to the University Senate. In the same form of response presented in 1991, this report summarizes a more detailed document, "1992-1993 Presidential Goals, Objectives, and Projects," which was presented to the Board of Regents in June, 1992, as part of the Regents' annual process for evaluating the President's performance and providing the basis for the next year's evaluation. As in previous years, the same goals, objectives, and projects are used for the President's annual evaluation of Cabinet officers, who are encouraged, in turn, to use them for performance evaluations of administrative officers reporting to them. This process has also proven to be an effective way to coordinate plans for the coming year.

The 1992-1993 document has been shared with the Board of Regents, the Senate Consultative Committee, and the Deans, Directors, and Department Heads. Copies of the complete document are available through the President's Office, 626-1616.

For the purposes of this report, only the nine goal statements and selected objectives/projects are presented.

GOAL 1: REAFFIRM AND COMMUNICATE THE MISSION AND ASPIRATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Conduct strategic planning process for the period beyond 1993.

- o Establish strategic planning process and begin development of specific plans, including:

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| vision statement | health sciences plan |
| strategic issues statement | tuition plan |
| enrollment management plan | financial plan |
| technology plan | human resources plan |
| campus/collegiate plans | internationalization plan |
| Rochester | rural econ. development plan |
| Twin Cities | campus master plans |
| Crookston | |

Continue to develop and disseminate information on the University's impact on the state's economy and on its social, cultural, and physical environment, and strive to create a sense of ownership among the citizens of the state and alumni and supporters elsewhere.

Conduct public campaign to enhance base support among alumni and Minnesota citizens. Continue to promote common goals of the University and other higher education systems and organizations on a state and national level.

- o Maintain involvement in HEAC, HECB, and related groups.
- o Solicit Big Ten and national endorsement of athletic gender equity and ROTC initiatives.
- o Participate in AAU, NASULGC, and other national bodies.
- o Explore further cooperation with other states (Midwest Consortium).

GOAL 2: ENSURE CONTINUED RESPONSIVENESS AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN MANAGERIAL DECISION-MAKING ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Refine the annual segments of, and implement the plan for, Restructuring and Reallocation; prepare 1992-93 budget and seek the approval of the Board of Regents.

Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the University's accountability to the Board, the broader University community, the Legislature, the state, the federal government, and the public through personal interaction with key leaders, audits, and surveys.

Continue the strengthening of financial and personnel management through administrative training programs, specifically Total Quality Management, and performance measurement.

Provide and promote media access to information about the University and its activities consistent with the law.

- Assess and ensure compliance with Data Practices Act and Regents policies regarding
 - internal consulting
 - public/private partnerships
 - professional services contracts
 - conflicts of interest.

Conduct reviews of selected academic and non-academic programs.

Ensure that all campuses participate as full members of the University and receive fair and equal treatment.

GOAL 3: PURSUE RESOURCES FOR THE UNIVERSITY FROM STATE, FEDERAL, AND PRIVATE SOURCES.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Develop an overall fiscal strategy for the University.

Prepare the biennial request to the state.

Prepare capital request to the state, dealing both with new and remodeled facilities and deferred maintenance.

Work with Regents, students, faculty, staff, alumni, and other constituencies to present the University's biennial and capital requests to the Governor and the Legislature.

Work with the President, the Executive Committee, and the Board of the University of Minnesota Foundation to gain private and corporate support for the University's priority programs and facility needs, with special emphasis on financial aid.

Work with the Minnesota Congressional Delegation, the national higher education community, and appropriate University administrators and faculty members to help maintain and enhance federal support for student financial aid and for teaching, research, and outreach programs of national importance.

GOAL 4: ENHANCE THE WELL-BEING AND EFFECTIVENESS OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND STAFF.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Establish an effective salary distribution and evaluation system for faculty and P/A staff, and seek resources through State appropriations and internal reallocation to maintain competitive salaries and reward performance.

- Revise, as needed, and begin implementation of the salary and evaluation systems for faculty and staff.

Complete the review of the administration of the University's human resources and implement appropriate changes.

Maintain mechanisms for ensuring equity for women and minorities in compensation, promotion, and tenure, including annual analysis and review of appropriate data.

Ensure, through review, analysis, and evaluation procedures, that all campuses and colleges pursue the goals for the recruitment and retention of women and minorities established for the unit, and that satisfactory progress is made.

Continue to implement managerial/staff development training programs.

Evaluate the effectiveness of selected employment principles, policies, and benefits.

- Develop a statement of faculty workload principles in consultation with the SCC.

- Revise the University grievance system.

- Continue to monitor and evaluate developments in regard to retirement and health care programs for faculty and staff.

GOAL 5: ENHANCE THE UNIVERSITY'S TEACHING PROGRAMS AND STUDENT ENVIRONMENT.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Implement the University's recruitment and admissions plan to ensure that students who should be served by the University receive appropriate information and advice, and that the admissions process is effective.

Ensure through review, analysis, and evaluation that the various campuses and colleges pursue the goals for recruitment and retention of minority undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, established as part of the "Strengthening Excellence Through Diversity."

Continue the implementation of the "Initiative for Excellence in Undergraduate Education" with special emphasis on the Liberal Education plan and on modifications in "how we teach."

- Further monitor the implementation of the Liberal Education plan.

- Continue enhancement of study space and classrooms.

- Continue improvement of support for persons with disabilities.

- Develop a plan for gender equity in intercollegiate athletics.

Review and propose appropriate modifications in "how we teach."

- Implement newly-adopted teaching evaluation system.

Monitor the effects of cost and current tuition/financial aid policies on student access to the University; seek to ensure access by limiting tuition increases to what is absolutely necessary to provide quality education and acceptable in terms of available financial aid.

Continue to seek to increased financial aid from state, federal, private, and corporate sources.

Continue to enhance graduate and professional programs, including fulfillment of Restructuring and Reallocation commitments.

GOAL 6: ENHANCE THE UNIVERSITY'S RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY AND ARTISTIC ACTIVITIES.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Continue to encourage and support faculty, staff, and administrators throughout the University in their efforts to create environments that support intellectual vitality, entrepreneurship, and productivity.

◦Expand research opportunities for undergraduates.

Introduce more systematic planning for, and presentation of, the University's overall research and scholarly and artistic activities under the leadership of the redefined position of Vice President for Research/Dean of the Graduate School, in cooperation with the academic vice presidents, the chancellors, deans, department heads and chairs, and appropriate faculty; achievements, general priorities, and interdisciplinary efforts will receive attention and the importance of these activities to the state will be highlighted.

Provide appropriate support structures for research, scholarship, and artistic activity; provide matching and set-up funding for projects that fall within the University's academic priorities.

Encourage and support participation by the University faculty in state, national, and international organizations that can benefit from their expertise and enhance their competence.

Develop and enforce policies that will guarantee academic freedom and the open dissemination of the results of research, scholarship, and artistic activity.

Further refine and enforce policies that will ensure the maintenance of high scholarly and ethical standards, including, as a minimum, compliance with federal and state regulations.

◦Complete adoption of and implement the new policy for academic research misconduct.

GOAL 7: ENHANCE THE UNIVERSITY'S RESEARCH AND PUBLIC SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Plan for, coordinate, and present, through the newly established "Outreach Council," the activities of the units that extend the benefits of research, scholarship, artistic activity, and teaching to areas and groups and individual throughout the state.

Continue the development of "Project Outreach" to smaller businesses as well as other forms of technology transfer.

Help foster a spirit of entrepreneurship and service in the University that will ensure a constant reassessment of the usefulness and effectiveness of research and outreach programs.

Maintain and enhance the University's international activities in order to assist other countries in their development and to foster global understanding.

GOAL 8: ENSURE A SENSE OF COMMUNITY THAT RECOGNIZES APPRECIATES, AND FOSTERS THE UNITY WITH DIVERSITY THAT IS ESSENTIAL TO THE FULFILLMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S MISSION.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Foster an atmosphere within the University that supports its basic purpose of critical inquiry; ensure academic freedom for the members of the disciplines and professions and freedom of speech for all.

Continue to build a community that adheres to the six Carnegie Foundation principles:

--an educationally purposeful community, a place where faculty and students share academic goals and work together to strengthen teaching and learning on the campus.

--an open community, a place where freedom of expression is uncompromisingly protected and where civility is powerfully affirmed.

--a just community, a place where the sacredness of the person is honored and where diversity is aggressively pursued.

--a disciplined community, a place where individuals accept their obligations to the group and where well-defined governance procedures guide behavior for the common good.

--a caring community, a place where the well-being of each member is sensitively supported and where service to others is encouraged.

--a celebrative community, one in which the heritage of the institution is remembered and where rituals affirming both tradition and change are widely shared."

Expand, with the help of Academic Affairs and the faculty-student leadership, opportunities to raise the University community's awareness of, and ability to combat bigotry based on race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

- Continue diversity forum program and other efforts to combat bigotry and hatred.
- Continue, jointly with the Big Ten, NASULGC, and other educational organizations, the efforts to change DoD policy that discriminates against gays and lesbians.

GOAL 9: ENHANCE THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY New IN SUPPORT OF ITS MISSION.

Selected Objectives/Projects

Continue the improvement of physical planning and management, including general campus plans, specific construction priorities, management of remodeling, and deferred and routine maintenance.

Continue efforts to make the University an environmentally responsible and effective institution through energy efficiency and proper maintenance of grounds and facilities.

Continue to improve selected support services and activities.

- Begin to implement rationalization of registration systems under TQM.
- Develop strategic plan for libraries in cooperation with HECB and other higher education systems (legislative mandate).
- Develop strategic plan for the University art museum.
- Review and revise, as needed, the administration of University computing services.

- Clarify the role of the Supercomputer Center as a provider of services to the University.

XIII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Hasselmo reviewed nine issues central to his agenda:

1) The University of Minnesota is taking the need to change seriously. Both Commitment to Focus and the recent Restructuring and Reallocation Plan entail substantial change and clarification of what the University of Minnesota is about, the President said.

2) The University participated significantly in solving the State's financial problems during the last biennium when it underwent a \$43 million reduction to its base budget. Political leaders and the citizens of Minnesota need to understand the extent of the University's contribution.

3) The University is accountable. The President commended the work of Associate Vice President Sue Markham and her staff in restructuring and effecting change in the Facilities Management Department. Accountability also has to do with the academic enterprise, the President said, citing the adoption of preparation requirements a few years ago. Seventy-five percent of students entering the University fall quarter had fulfilled all preparation requirements as opposed to 17% in 1985.

With regard to the ALG issue, the President said he and his staff are reviewing the program's management structure and possible legal violations. The President emphasized that this has been a highly productive operation that has been questioned because of certain operating practices. Action has been taken in the management of that operation and the University is pursuing full compliance with FDA regulations and other rules and regulations that apply to the University. The FDA has given provisional permission to begin distributing ALG again.

4) The University is highly productive. The average faculty member spends 57 hours each week working for the University in teaching, research, service, and outreach. Productivity is measured in many ways, President Hasselmo said, for example, University faculty graduated almost 11,000 students during the past year, brought into the University \$273 million in sponsored research, and organized numerous outreach programs, one of which has been identified by President-elect Clinton as a model for the nation.

5) The University has been and will continue to be a good partner to the State as it passes its financial crisis. The biennial request will include investment initiatives critical to the State of Minnesota, including issues on children, youth, and the family; water research; and distance learning.

6) The University is of fundamental importance to the long-term future of the State. Involvements at the University are the seed-corn of the future, President Hasselmo said, extending from undergraduate education to innovations from the faculty in research, scholarship, and artistic activity.

7) The University must be true to its basic purpose. It must define what it means to be a research and land-grant University in the 1990's and the 21st century, serving undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, doing research scholarship, artistic scholarship, and outreach.

8) The University must win acceptance by the citizens of Minnesota for what it is. People often expect the University to be something that it is not, the President said. Communication is vital and he encouraged all University faculty, staff, and students to help carry that message across Minnesota.

9) Lastly, the President encouraged institutional loyalty and asked University faculty, staff, students, and administrators to work together on their differences so the University can stand united when dealing with political leaders and the citizens of Minnesota.

XIV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Question:

We are beginning to hear talk of a significant reduction over the next twenty years in the number of research universities. Given the competition for increasingly scarce resources that is likely to intensify during this period combined with increasing pressure to deliver only results that have applicability in the short term, we can anticipate that early casualties of this situation will be: (a) basic scientific research; (b) humanistic scholarship; and (c) artistic and other imaginative endeavor. What is being done now to protect these parts of the University's mission and what will be done in the future to ensure that they survive and prosper?

Response:

President Hasselmo responded that defining the University is the best way of protecting the central responsibilities of the institution. The recent restructuring and reallocation activities specifically addressed some of those issues having to do with the fundamental importance of research, scholarship, and artistic activity as the driving intellectual forces behind the institution. The University seeks State funding on the basis that it is a research University where research, scholarship, and artistic activities are at the heart of what the institution is all about. It is important to create public understanding of what that particular agenda is, the President said.

XV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Report by the Chair

Professor Mario Bognanno, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), recognized and expressed appreciation to the faculty and student members of the Senate Consultative Committee. In the face of dwindling resources, he said, the University finds itself in a time that demands more teaching, research, and service. It also finds itself in a time that demands greater accountability. Consequently, the Senate Consultative Committee has found itself in a position of reminding the public what a land-grant university is all about. Too few, he said, understand what goes into instruction and even fewer understand the present and future payoffs to society that result from research. In response to the need to communicate with the citizens of Minnesota, a subcommittee of the Faculty Consultative Committee has been appointed to work with central administrators to explore untapped ways of telling the University story.

The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has also devoted many hours to responding to questions involving issues such as ALG, the Mineral Resources Research Center, and the Super Computer Center. The Consultative Committee strongly supports the President's agenda that ranks accountability first. The FCC, Professor Bognanno said, has been searching out initiatives 1) to minimize communication problems between the faculty and central administration, 2) to involve the faculty more directly in decisions that drive central administration's search for excellence in classrooms, laboratories, clinics, offices, libraries, etc. by rewarding those who do the best work, 3) to involve the faculty in evaluating the job being done by the University's first line and middle managers, and 4) to see a greater role for faculty self-determination in setting forth the professional standards guiding their behavior as teachers, researchers, and agents for outreach.

Moreover, the Senate Consultative Committee is working on developing a protocol to hasten the response of central administration to Senate action. A proposal to "Stop the Tenure Clock" for non-tenured new parents will be deliberated at the December 10, Faculty Senate meeting, as well as amendments to the Academic Misconduct Policy. Other issues under consideration by the Senate Consultative Committee include a Smoke-Free Policy, a proposal to expand academic professional representation in the Senate, student CEE representation, and the University's Grievance Policy and Procedures.

XVI. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Annual Report, 1991-92

Committee on Committees primary task each year is to prepare faculty, academic professional, and student

nominations to committees. In order to gather as many nominations as possible, faculty committee members sent letters to deans and department heads, committee chairs, Senate members, and the Academic Staff Advisory Committee soliciting nominations. The committee also placed announcements in BRIEF and FOOTNOTE. In addition to the nominations generated by these sources, the committee used as a reference the Faculty Interest Survey conducted in April 1991. Student committee members gathered nominations by posting announcements, advertising, and participating in informational fairs. Several meetings were then held to prepare the nominations for 1992-93 committees. Consideration was given to adequate representation by race, gender, academic rank, campus, and collegiate unit.

The committee also accomplished the following tasks:

1. Nominated for approval by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly a committee to prepare a slate of candidates for the Assembly Steering Committee election.
2. Reviewed ex officio representation on Senate and Assembly committees.
3. Appointed faculty and student members to a number of non-Senate committees.
4. Submitted to the University Senate a recommendation to change the name of the Services for the Handicapped Committee to the Disabilities Issues Committee to conform to the language in the disabilities policy and procedures and to more appropriately describe the committee's charge. [Motion was approved by the University Senate at its February 20, 1992, meeting.]
5. Reviewed a request by the Physical Plant & Space Allocation Subcommittee to re-name the committee and revise its duties and responsibilities to reflect the reorganization of the Facilities Management Department [formerly the Physical Plant Department] and establishment of the Space Advisory Committee. A proposal will be brought to the University Senate Fall quarter 1992.
6. Submitted to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly a motion to establish the Council on Liberal Education. [Motion was approved by the Assembly on October 31, 1991.]
7. Presented motions to the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly clarifying faculty/academic professional eligibility for service on Senate and Assembly committees. [Motions were approved by both the Senate and Assembly on April 16, 1992.]

This year Committee on Committees appointed 63 faculty and academic professionals to serve on various Senate and Assembly committees and, as presented each year, the chart below indicates the proportions of NEW faculty and academic professional appointments by rank and gender, with comparable all-University figures.

| Rank | Distribution by Rank | | Distribution by Gender | |
|------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | Percent of New Committee Members of this rank | Percent of Faculty/Aca Prof Members of this rank | Percent of New Committee Members who are women | Percent of Faculty/Aca Prof Members who are women |
| Professor | 55% | 37% | 28% | 10% |
| Associate Professor | 29 | 27 | 50 | 26 |
| Assistant Professor | 8 | 25 | 20 | 34 |
| Instructor | 0 | 5 | 0 | 46 |
| Academic Professional* | 8 | 6 | 60 | 52 |
| Total | 100% | 100% | | |

*Figures reflect only those academic professionals who are eligible to serve on the Senate and Assembly and its committees.

GEOFFREY MARUYAMA
Chair

ACCEPTED

XVII. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Annual Report, 1991-92

The Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) met regularly throughout the 1991-92 academic year and discussed a wide variety of issues.

Three policy statements were presented to the Senate and adopted by that body. These concerned the evaluation of teaching, the right of students to make up examinations missed for legitimate reasons, and the scheduling of University events during study days and final examination periods. The calendar for the 1994-95 academic year recommended by SCEP was also adopted by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

The committee produced a revised description of the Bush Sabbatical Program and forwarded it to the Office of Academic Affairs, which administers this program. The committee's recommendation would delete "Bush" from the title, since that foundation no longer funds the program, and would broaden the purpose of the grants so that they would not be restricted to projects specifically involving undergraduate teaching.

The selection committee for the Morse-Alumni Teaching Awards was appointed by SCEP, which ratified the list of recipients and took part in the awards ceremonies.

Members of SCEP participated in several discussions of the University budget. As required by the Senate Bylaws, they heard requests from the athletic department for exemptions allowing certain games to be played on study day or during examinations. They spent considerable time discussing the relationship between credits and class hours and made recommendations regarding the interpretation of present Senate policy on this matter. The recurring issues of the semester system and plus-minus grading were raised again during the year, but no new action was taken, primarily because the committee believed that the various points of view were well known and it was not likely that the Senate would welcome further debate on them. The chair of SCEP served as an ex officio member of the Senate Consultative Committee and the Provost's Council.

STANFORD LEHMBERG
Chair

ACCEPTED

XVIII. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN COMMITTEE

Annual Report, 1991-92

The Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee (EEOWC) met nine times during 1991-92. The Committee was concerned with several issues: a) parental leave for academic employees; b) monitoring salary equity; c) use of the procedures for exemption from searches for filing administrative posts; and d) the impact of retrenchment and reallocation on employment of women.

The Committee addressed the issue of parental leave and the tenure clock, which was referred to EEOWC from the Faculty Consultative Committee in 1991. After consulting with appropriate administrative offices, including the University Attorney's office, the EEOWC recommended that any probationary employee who becomes a new parent be allowed to stop the tenure clock for one year to recognize that the demands of becoming a new parent make it difficult to fulfill the extraordinary demands of probationary academic employment. This option could not be used more than twice, in keeping with current tenure regulations. This recommendation was sent to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Professional Academic/Administrative Advisory Committee for consultation at the conclusion of 1992 year.

The Committee reviewed materials related to salary equity, including a report by the Rajender Salary Settlement Committee. The Committee also invited Professor Charlotte Streibel and Mr. Dave Berg to a meeting to discuss the various issues involved in determining salary equity. The Committee made recommendations to the administration about the models and variables which should be used to monitor salary equity post-Rajender, and to request specific reports about steps taken to address the most dramatic inequities found in previous analyses. The Committee will be prepared in fall 1992 to analyze the salary data after the first round of raises given post-Rajender.

Members of the EEOWC were consulted, along with a number of other key University committees, about the appointment of the Senior Vice President and Provost to his current position without a search. The Committee wrote to the President expressing unanimous opposition to such a practice and suggesting that the current guidelines for "target of opportunity" hires (used to grant exemptions from searches) were written for and more appropriate for hiring for faculty positions. The Committee offered to be involved in revising guidelines for acting appointments to administrative positions and met with Professor Laurie Hayes (currently on the committee granting exemptions) and Ms. Pat Mullen, Director of the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action, to provide suggestions for these guidelines.

The EEOWC also spent a fair amount of the year seeking information about the impact of retrenchment and reallocation on employment of women and other protected groups. The Committee met with Ms. Pat Koval-Jarboe, Reallocation Coordinator in Academic Affairs, and with the coordinators for the Career Transition Center, Jean Pooch and Kate Schaefer, about the demographics of those who have been laid off, services provided to employees who lose their positions, and about the difficulties of determining who fits in this category. The Committee also met with Senior Vice President and Provost Ettore Infante about these concerns and about the impact of retrenchment and reallocation on diversity.

Special thanks are extended to *ex officio* assistance from Carol Carrier and her staff, and to Pat Mullen. In addition, Vickie Courtney provided able and effective staff support for the Committee throughout the year. Ann Burkhardt, Law School, has been appointed as Chair of the Committee for 1992-93.

BECKY SWANSON KROLL
Chair

ACCEPTED

XIX. LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Annual Report, 1991-92

The Senate Library Committee met seven times during the academic year. In the fall, Library planning and budgeting priorities were discussed with University Librarian, Tom Shaughnessy. Committee members expressed concern about the impact of further staff reductions on the level of services provided. The cutbacks are particularly troublesome because library staffing is already well below the staffing levels of libraries at comparable research institutions. It was also noted that the library system of the Twin Cities Campus lends more materials to other libraries than any other library in the country, including the Library of Congress. The committee also considered the impact of electronic information sharing and publication on the library budget and operations.

At the January and February meetings the committee heard several reports on important library activities. Ellen Nagle, Director of the Bio-Medical Library reported on its operation and future needs. Librarians from each of the Coordinate Campuses introduced their budget plans. The committee also heard a report on the Integrated Information Center, a grant funded collaborative effort of the University Libraries, the Carlson School of Management and the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs. The Center was explained to the committee by Joe Branin Associate University Librarian, and Professor George D'Elia from the Carlson School. The Center is supported with major funding of a three year grant from the U.S. Department of Education. It will use new technology and individualized integrated support to provide faculty and staff with needed research and administrative information resources. The committee was pleased to have Regent Ann Wynia as an observer and participant at the January meeting.

The LUMINA system was discussed on two occasions during the winter and spring. Joining in these discussions was Charlene Mason, Assistant University Librarian with responsibility for Automated Systems. The software package for LUMINA is currently being updated. The committee discussed priorities for improvement among the various possibilities under consideration. Experience with the trial period for "First Search" data base and the possible addition of other data bases to the Library system were also discussed.

In April, the committee met with Vice President Jim Infante. The purpose of the meeting was to confer about the impact of information technology on research libraries. The committee was impressed with Dr. Infante's

commitment to the continuing improvement of the library system and his support for new directions in information dissemination.

When the new circulation loan policy went into effect at the beginning of the 1991-92 school year, the committee agreed to evaluate its impact during the year. Through a notice in Brief and an advertisement in the Minnesota Daily valuable user reaction was gathered. The committee considered all comments at a special meeting in May. Several measures were recommended to address concerns.

In view of the usefulness of the University Library system to the entire State of Minnesota, and its remarkable volume of interlibrary loans, the library administration has developed plans for a "Friends of the Library" support group to assist the library in meeting future needs. The Library Committee expressed firm support for the development of the "Friends" group and encouraged the Administration to continue with its plans.

The Library Committee was aided immeasurably during the year by the cooperation of University Librarian, Tom Shaughnessy, and his staff. We also appreciated the helpful participation of the librarians from each of the coordinate campuses.

DOUGLAS PRATT
Chair

ACCEPTED

XX. UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE Annual Report, 1990-92

The University Grievance Committee provides the following report for the first two years of operation, from September 16, 1990 through September 15, 1992.

Membership. The following individuals served on the University Grievance Committee during this period of time:

| | | |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|
| Professor Fred Morrison | 1990-91 | 1991-92 |
| Professor Paul Murphy | 1990-91 | |
| Professor Anne Pick | 1990-91 | 1991-92 |
| Professor Michael Steffes | 1990-91 | |
| Professor Ted Uehling | 1990-91 | 1991-92 |
| Professor Edwin Layton | | 1991-92 |
| Professor Hernan Vidal | | 1991-92 |
| Ms. Joyce Wascoe | 1990-91 | 1991-92 |
| Ms. Bonita Bartholomew | 1990-91 | 1991-92 |
| Mr. Dana Defosse | 1990-91 | |
| Mr. Stanley McConnell | 1990-91 | |
| Mr. Bimal Malhotra | | 1991-92 |

Professor Charlotte Striebel served as University Grievance Officer from the beginning of this period through February, 1992, when she withdrew from the position. Under the terms of the Grievance Policy, Professor Fred Morrison, then Chair of the Grievance Committee, assumed the role of Acting Grievance Officer. Professor Steven Penrod was appointed to serve as Deputy Grievance Officer. Professor Anne Pick assumed service as Acting Chair of the Committee at that point.

Workload of the Grievance Process. During this two-year period, 54 grievances have been filed with the Grievance Committee. (These are in addition to other appeals which have been filed directly with the Senate Judicial Committee, the Civil Service Committee, or the Academic and Professional Staff Advisory Committee.)

Of these 54 cases, 14 were filed by students, 5 by civil service employees, 23 by faculty members, and 12 by other members of the University community, primarily members of the academic and professional staff.

Of the 54 petitions, 41 have now been resolved. Nine were referred to other University hearing bodies which had appropriate jurisdiction (3 to the Civil Service Committee, 1 to the Judicial Committee, 4 to the Academic and Professional Staff Advisory Committee, and 1 to the Student Conduct Committee). Fourteen of the cases were withdrawn or settled. Ten cases were dismissed by the Grievance Officer (or by the Standing Subcommittee on Procedure) as being outside of the scope of issues which could be heard under the Grievance Policy. Seven cases were heard and decided by hearing panels. In some cases these matters were then reviewed on appeal by the University Grievance Committee.

Of the 13 cases currently pending, panels have prepared opinions or draft opinions in 5 of them. Two of these are currently on appeal to the University Grievance Committee; the other 3 are awaiting responses from the parties. Five other cases are awaiting the designation of a panel for hearing; several of these are still in the discovery or negotiation process. Three cases reflect new filings within the late summer months.

The Business of the Committee. The business of the Committee has ranged from matters which certainly appear serious to the participants involved, but are relatively minor in the general framework of the University, to those which raise substantial policy issues at the University level or questions regarding major issues of fairness. Our most positive contribution has been when we have been able to secure a resolution of controversy without the necessity for adversary presentations. The mere existence of the grievance process has sometimes contributed to a considered review of a controversy by all of the parties, leading to an amicable settlement. Another contribution has been the routing and consolidation of cases before a single tribunal, so there is no longer controversy about which body will hear a matter.

We have on several occasions found it necessary to reject cases which were outside of our jurisdiction. The grievance process does not review grades, for example. It also has only limited jurisdiction to review discretionary decisions of administrators. Several cases have also been dismissed because the parties chose not to pursue them actively after the initial filing.

The cases presented to us have reflected a wide variety of issues, many involving questions of academic judgment. Three cases involved claims that faculty members were not afforded due process in investigations under the Interim Policy on Research Misconduct (now replaced), one involves the propriety of a dean's decision to refuse to allow a faculty member to continue to teach a certain course; another involves a controversy between a principal investigator and another faculty member regarding access to research data. Several salary and benefit disputes have also been reviewed.

The Committee has observed no problem with the implementation of panel recommendations by University administrators.

The Future of the Committee. A task force reported last spring, proposing major changes in the way in which grievances are handled at the University. We anticipate that these changes will be debated in the course of the year. Thus, the present system will probably remain in effect for most or all of the current academic year.

The Grievance Committee recognizes that a number of substantial improvements could be made to the processing of grievances at the University. In doing so, we would like to emphasize a number of points which we believe must be taken into consideration:

- There should be systems in place for handling all kinds of grievances, including both employment grievances and student grievances.
- The system should be impartial and should be perceived to be such. It should emphasize the academic environment of the University.
- The system should emphasize and encourage settlement, rather than adversary, but must provide for due process in the last analysis.

ANN D. PICK
Chair

FRED L. MORRISON
Acting University Grievance Officer

ACCEPTED

XXI. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

XXII. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Denise Tolbert, Chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee, introduced Mr. Martin Conroy, the newly-appointed 1992-93 Student Legislative Director.

President Hasselmo called the Senate's attention to a letter he had written to the Star Tribune November 14, 1992, on accountability. The letter was distributed to Senate members for information.

XXIII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY

WILLIAM C. JOHNSON 1928-1992

William C. Johnson, Adjunct Professor of Chemical Engineering died August 15, 1992. Professor Johnson taught courses in Chemical Engineering, while still maintaining full-time employment at 3M Company. He was a popular and effective teacher, and his industrial experience was especially relevant to the courses he taught. His part-time teaching was an important part of his life, and was desired and encouraged by his students, by himself, by his employer 3M, and by the Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science.

Professor Johnson was employed at 3M since 1958, where he was known as "Mr. Chemical Engineering." He was Chairman of the Continuing Education of the Chemical Engineering Association of the AIChE, and was a member of the American Chemical Society. He was a member of many musical groups, and Past Master of the Garnet Masonic Lodge in White Bear Lake, MN. He was known as one of the top U.S. experts in the area of distillation.

Professor Johnson is survived by his wife, Lois May Johnson. He will be deeply missed.

JANE LEICHSENRING 1894-1992

Jane Leichsenring died at her home in Florida on August 27, 1992 at the age of 98. Dr. Leichsenring received her B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Illinois and began teaching at the University of Minnesota in 1924. She was a member of the Home Economics Department faculty from 1924 until her retirement in 1960. While on the faculty, she received the Borden Award for fundamental research in nutrition and experimental foods.

Dr. Leichsenring was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Omicron Nu, Iota Sigma Pi, and Sigma Delta Epsilon. In addition, she held memberships in the American Institute of Nutrition, American Chemical

Society, American Diabetic Association, American Home Economics Association, and American Association of University Professors.

As a member of the Presidents' Club at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Leichsenring made a generous bequest to be used "in helping graduate and undergraduate worthy students who are interested in the scientific aspects of home economics."

She is survived by her sister, Myrna Leichsenring, and a nephew, George Leichsenring.

MICHAEL J. LOUPE 1943-1992

Faculty, staff and students at the School of Dentistry mourn their friend and mentor, Michael J. Loupe, Ph.D., who died July 10, 1992, following surgery for esophageal cancer. At the time of his death, Dr. Loupe was serving as Director of Educational Research, Planning and Development and as a faculty member in the Department of Preventive Sciences.

Born in 1943, Michael Loupe received his doctorate in educational psychology from Michigan State University in 1969 and joined the Division of Health Ecology in 1970. Recruited to coordinate the division's course offerings, Dr. Loupe's keen understanding of the educational process and his dedication to effective teaching were quickly recognized by the faculty and administration. He rapidly emerged as a leader for the School's Educational Policy Committee and was responsible for many innovations and improvements in the curriculum. His impact on teaching and student evaluation procedures at the School is unsurpassed and contributed greatly to the School's reputation as an outstanding institution.

Michael Loupe's research contributions encompassed a number of problem areas, including diagnostic thinking, clinical problem-solving, teaching and program evaluation, the expansion of primary care responsibilities in dentistry, the role of attitudes in health behavior, and the issues of delivering dental care to the elderly. He generated nearly two million dollars in research funding for the School, supervised many graduate students, and published widely. His work was highly regarded, both nationally and internationally.

Early in 1992, he received an award from the American Association of Dental Schools for the best paper on a new educational program in dentistry. The program upon which his paper was based was a 1991 nationwide summer institute designed to train young dental faculty in teaching and research skills.

The summer institute was in many ways typical of Dr. Loupe's entire career. As a teacher, Dr. Loupe taught not only dental students, but faculty and graduate students as well. Much of his work focused on helping others to improve their teaching. For this reason, among many others, his influence on dental education will continue for many years to come. He will long be remembered for his gentle humor, his careful attention to individual student needs, his respect for individual difference and, above all, his humility and kindness.

J. IAN RICHARDS 1936-1992

J. Ian Richards, professor of mathematics, died suddenly on June 21, 1992, at the age of 55. He was on the faculty for 30 years.

Ian lived in St. Paul for most of his life. In 1957 he graduated from the University of Minnesota. He remembered fondly his undergraduate days and his teachers, including the late mathematicians M. Donsker and S. Orey. An intense and brilliant student, he was winner of the Putnam exam, the nationwide undergraduate mathematics competition. As a consequence he was awarded a fellowship to Harvard, where he received his Ph.D. in 1960 under the Fields medalist Lars Ahlfors with a thesis in surface topology. He spent the next two years at MIT as an instructor before joining the Minnesota faculty in 1962.

Ian's research ranged over a large mathematical territory. He made substantial contributions to topology, complex analysis, number theory, probability, mathematical logic, functional analysis. Ian was most fond of his major result in number theory obtained jointly with his student Doug Hensley. It established the incompatibility of two well known and much studied conjectures about prime numbers, creating a stir among number theorists and earning Ian an invitation to address the 1973 summer meeting of the American Mathematical Society.

For much of the last 14 years, Ian collaborated with his colleague Marian Pour-El in recursive analysis. They made fundamental contributions to computability in analysis and the relation of this theory to physics. A research monograph coauthored by them appeared in 1989. Their results also have important implications for the philosophy of science and had even reached popular attention by their treatment in Roger Penrose's book, "The Emperor's New Mind."

One of Ian's final contributions was an introductory text on the Theory of Distributions, written with his former student, H. Youn. A reviewer praised the book highly: "Seldom does one read a book as carefully crafted as this one...This book will become a classic."

Ian enjoyed working with graduate students; he developed close professional relationships with them and wanted them to do well. He had nine doctoral students in the diverse areas of his research.

Ian's ability as a powerful problem solver was recognized in his service first as a member and then chair of the Putnam exam committee as well as chair, for many years, of the committee for the U.S.A. High School Mathematical Olympiad. At the University, he coached the Minnesota Putnam team with colleague Warren Loud.

Ian was a superb lecturer and expositor. In addition to giving a number of invited lectures at the leading institutions throughout the world, he often spoke at local colleges - Macalester, Carleton, St. Olaf, etc., where he had many friends. Ian's excellence in expository writing earned him the Allendoerfer Award of the Mathematical Association of America.

For a number of years, Ian was a competitive white-water canoeist. He also enjoyed taking long canoeing trips in the boundary waters area and taught canoeing to the members of the University canoe club as well as to colleagues. In a different area, Ian was very interested in the political issues of the day and liked to discuss them.

Though he never married, Ian was devoted to his brother Steven's family. He is also survived by his father, A. Glenn Richards, Professor Emeritus of the University of Minnesota and a distinguished entomologist, and another brother Glenn.

Ian Richards was a generous loyal friend and colleague. Those of us who are fortunate to have known him will miss his special human qualities and mathematical gifts. Ian gave the world much more than he received.

ROBERT FRANCIS SPENCER 1917-1992

Robert F. Spencer, professor emeritus of anthropology, died of cancer in Minneapolis on June 9, 1992.

Professor Spencer, who spent his youth in San Francisco, CA, received his Masters degree at the University of New Mexico, where Professor Leslie Spier was his teacher. He received his Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of California at Berkeley in 1946. He studied with Dr. Alfred Kroeber and Dr. Robert Lowie, both famous anthropologists. He taught at Reed College for one year, at the University of Oregon for another, and then, in 1948, joined the Department of Anthropology at the University of Minnesota where he remained for thirty-nine years. He brought with him a view of anthropology as a holistic discipline, as well as wide-ranging interest in such aspects of the field as cultural ecology, ethnography, linguistics, kinship, religions, folklore, nationalism, urbanization, and ethnopoetics. He was fluent in four languages, with a reading knowledge of more than ten others.

Dr. Spencer's field work was equally broad in scope. Beginning with a doctoral dissertation on Japanese Buddhism in America, his research took him from World War II Japanese-American relocation centers

in Arizona to Europe and Asia. He visited New Zealand and Australia, lived in Inuit villages and a Burmese monastery, spent sabbaticals in Austria and Pakistan. In 1965, he received a Guggenheim award for the study of poetry and culture in the latter country.

Out of this research came books on religion and cultural change in Asia, an ethnographic atlas, studies of Native Americans and of factory women in South Korea, and a definitive monograph on the North Alaskan Eskimo which was brought out in its original form, then in an updated edition, by the Smithsonian Institution. He published well over one hundred articles in scholarly journals, and contributed chapters to several edited volumes.

The attainments of this internationally known scholar had their counterpart in the classroom. An advisee once wrote of him, "Robert Spencer is a remarkable teacher; for undergraduates, a stimulating and vital lecturer; for graduate students a very demanding mentor, often Socratic in approach, intolerant of poor scholarship, yet also patient, attentive, and generous with his time." His doctoral students kept in touch with him by letters and personal visits. Three years after his retirement, seventeen former students and colleagues published a volume of essays in his honor.

Dr. Spencer served as chair of the Anthropology Department three times. He also chaired the program in Middle East Studies during a transitional period, and he was a member of the Department of East Asian Studies.

He is survived by his wife, Marietta E. Spencer, noted social worker and specialist in post adoption services; son Paul of Saint Paul, and daughter Claudia Samuelson of Minneapolis.

ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

ERWIN C. WELKE
1900-92

STUDENTS

KIMBERLY A. PAULSEN

XXIV. ADJOURNMENT

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

Martha Kvanbeck
Abstractor

NOVEMBER 17, 1992

The first meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1992-93, was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Tuesday, November 17, 1992, at 3:50 p.m. (immediately following the University Senate meeting). Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 144 voting faculty members. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MEETING SCHEDULE

Information

Other 1992-93 meetings of the Faculty Senate are scheduled for:

Thursday, December 10, 1992

Thursday, February 18, 1993

Thursday, April 1, 1993

Thursday, May 20, 1993

ACCEPTED

CONSENT AGENDA

Action

Agenda items II. and III. are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature and are offered as a "consent agenda" to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Either item will be taken up separately at the request of a Senator. A majority of members present and voting is required for approval.

II. MINUTES FOR APRIL 16, 1992, MAY 14, 1992, AND MAY 21, 1992

III. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Committees of the Faculty Senate, 1992-93

FACULTY AFFAIRS--Faculty: Carl Adams (chair), Daniel Canafax, Mary Dempsey, Ann Erickson, Ann Fallon, Roger Feldman, Richard Goldstein, Audrey Grosch, Ruth Kanfer, Morris Kleiner, Richard McGehee, Michael Sadowsky, Bernard Selzler (UMC), W. Donald Spring (UMM), Michael Wade, Judith T. Younger **Academic Professional:** Steve Laursen **Students:** Robert F. Martin, 1 to be named **Ex Officio:** Carol Carrier, Dianne Mulvihill, Roger Paschke, George Seltzer.

JUDICIAL--Faculty: David Ward (chair), Jean Bauer, Hyman Berman, David Born, Richard Brunning, Jonathan Chaplin, Amos Deinard, Patricia Ferrieri, Shirley Garner, Susan Gerberich, Hillel Gershenson, Jack Imholte (UMM), Shirley Johnston, Tarald Kvalseth, Barbara Loken, Cleon Melsa (UMC), Larry Miller, Steve Nickles, Carla Phillips, George Ruth, Joel Samaha, Harold Schwartz, Marilyn Sime, David Smith, Roderick Squires, Patricia Tomlinson, Frank Wilderson.

GEOFFREY MARUYAMA
Chair

APPROVED

IV. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Report of the Faculty Workload Task Force
Action

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate adopt the following Report of the Faculty Workload Task Force:

Report of the Faculty Workload Task Force

Carl Adams
Mercedes Ballou
Victor Bloomfield
Sara Evans
Bill Gerberich
Anne Hopkins, ex officio
Karen Seashore Louis
Dan Svedarsky

October 30, 1992

Introduction

For several important reasons, the University community has been prompted to define and clarify the expectations of faculty effort at the University of Minnesota. One reason is that the pressure to make the best use of the faculty's time is increasing. Demands for teaching, research, and service/outreach output are generally growing while available resources fail to keep pace with inflation. Another reason is that, in this time of economic difficulty and constricted budgets, the general public is demanding more accountability from tax-supported institutions. Most importantly, our mutual responsibilities as a community of scholars who support the tripartite mission of the University require us to develop the means to guide our efforts. This responsibility has its roots in the "moderate communitarianism" philosophy (Etzioni, 1990). This philosophy is juxtaposed with a more individualistic philosophy, emphasizing individual faculty rights (Rawls, 1971), that some see as underlying other University policies such as the Tenure Code and the Policy on Academic Freedom. A balance between rights and responsibilities is needed. Faculty rightly believe that society has entrusted them with a major responsibility to create, organize, disseminate and apply knowledge for the common good. As a professional community, the faculty must reward society's trust by ensuring the development and application of appropriate effort principles. Failure to do so simply invites the imposition of inappropriate bureaucratic mechanisms. In response to these concerns, the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), in consultation with the University administration, appointed the University Workload Task Force on July 15, 1992, with the general charge of developing proposed faculty effort principles by mid-September.

As the report below details, the Task Force has chosen to address effort clarification by specifying a process of individual effort determination. This process is guided by a set of principles that applies to all University faculty. Additional sets of principles with increased specificity apply to various divisions of the University. The proposed process emphasizes decentralization in recognition of the diverse character of the University.

As a starting point in this project, the Task Force reviewed studies and relevant legislation from University researchers and administrators in other states where faculty effort issues have recently been considered. Additionally, the Task Force met with University colleagues familiar with the issues of effort determination and reporting. Based on these inputs, two distinct and important components of oversight related to faculty effort were identified. One deals with establishing good administrative practices and procedures to ensure the development of policies to guide faculty effort. The other ensures the availability of hard data on faculty activities and accomplishments. Both approaches are needed.

Defining faculty effort expectations and keeping better records of effort and accomplishments will have several salutary effects. They will:

- Help clarify variations in missions among units of the University and facilitate the development of a consensus regarding those missions within the University community.
- Link individual activities more clearly to the priorities of the University community.
- Facilitate the self regulation of the faculty.
- Improve the University's ability to relate faculty effort to components of its tripartite mission.

The Task Force recommends that the University community adopt the administrative practices and procedures outlined in this report. This includes the statement of principles and the effort determination process. The list of faculty effort elements is seen as an evolving document that is the joint responsibility of the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. We also recommend very prompt University attention to developing a faculty activities and accomplishments database.

We have argued that the topic of faculty effort is very important and it is clear that the brief time available to the Task Force makes a definitive treatment of this important and complex subject impossible. We strongly urge members of the University community to adopt an incremental approach to this important topic. From this perspective, adoption of the principles, process, and database recommendations presented below is just the first step in the development and reporting of faculty effort. Given the experiences of other universities, the Task Force encourages all members of the University community to engage in the process of building on these initial steps as a way of ensuring the evolution of an effective system for dealing with faculty effort.

Principles

The following principles are to be used to develop a clear understanding between each faculty member and the appropriate University department/college/unit regarding expected effort. The process envisioned is outlined in the next section. A key concept is the development at one or more levels of a cascading set of principles. Each set of principles is consistent with those at the more general level but is more specific to the local situation. None of the developed principles is intended to conflict with existing University policies and procedures such as the Tenure Code and the policy on academic freedom.

- As units vary in their contributions to the University's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service/outreach, so will the proportion of effort contributed by individuals to each component of the overall mission vary. Each individual is expected to develop his/her intellectual efforts in accordance with his/her individual competencies and the needs of the unit in fulfilling its mission.
- All faculty members are expected to conduct some work that supports each of the three major mission components. As faculty follow normal career life cycles, substantial shifts may occur in the proportion of effort devoted to each of the major components. For example, some departments reduce the service/outreach and administrative obligations of their non-tenured faculty so that they can devote additional time to research in order to reach the threshold for tenure.
- In addition to undertaking activities that support the University's tripartite mission, faculty are also expected to take part in administrative and governance activities that are needed.
- Teaching at research universities necessarily includes training in research, clinical, and artistic methods. Regular classroom instruction is not effective in meeting some of these needs especially in professional and post baccalaureate programs. Much of this training must be accomplished through informal one-on-one mentoring.

- For pay and promotion purposes, faculty will continue to be evaluated on the significance and magnitude of their accomplishments rather than on how hard they work.
- Faculty efforts must, in the aggregate, meet the workload of their unit and must be responsive to the mission of their unit. Expectations for unit workload must be commensurate with available resources. With appropriate consultation, academic officers (e.g. deans or department chairs) must set relevant effort guidelines and communicate them to the faculty as a group and individually.
- Accessibility to students, colleagues, administrators, and the public requires that appropriate time must be spent at the faculty member's University office. It must be recognized, however, that many faculty activities are appropriately carried out at sites away from the faculty's University offices (e.g. libraries and archives on campus and elsewhere, research laboratories, home offices, industry sites and professional meeting locations).
- Both the individual faculty member and the University have a responsibility to maintain the individual faculty member's currency in his/her field of knowledge which is related to his/her unit's mission.
- The faculty member and his/her appropriate administrator must share a clear understanding of the effort expected of the faculty member and that understanding must be reviewed periodically. This understanding should be developed in a timely fashion so that faculty can adequately plan their activities.
- As professionals, faculty are responsible for establishing a daily work schedule that allows them to meet their teaching, research, service/outreach, administration and governance obligations. Persons of talent and energy will have difficulty accomplishing all that is expected of them within the limits of a 40 hour week. Numerous national and local studies confirm that a typical faculty member works approximately 55 hours per week.

Effort Determination Process

In the university environment, there is a fine line between the institution's need to define how the institution will carry out its tripartite mission and the faculty member's obligation to determine what specific efforts best serve the institution's objectives. As with most major research universities, the University of Minnesota has a tradition of collegiality and consultation in the determination of its mission, goals, and objectives. While freedom of action is a significant corollary of academic responsibility, individuals at all levels are not assumed to be free to follow only their own interests. Similarly, departments and colleges must recognize the validity of extra-departmental or extra collegiate workload. In a very real sense, effort determination is a "team" decision.

At a minimum, all faculty members should have a clear understanding of the effort that the institution expects them to provide. This expectation should at least address how much effort should be allocated to each component of the University's tripartite mission (teaching, research, service/outreach) and how much to administration and governance activities. The nature of work can vary according to the varying missions of units within the University and according to the stage of development of individual faculty members. Thus, the University cannot prescribe a uniform expectation of effort for all faculty members. The University can, however, ensure the timely determination of individual effort expectations by defining an appropriate process of faculty and administrative involvement. While it is clear that each faculty member is entitled to significant professional latitude in determining how his/her efforts are carried out, it is also clear that the University has an obligation to establish reasonable expectations regarding both the effort and accomplishments of each faculty member.

The process to follow in developing effort expectations is outlined below:

1. Upon passage of the Faculty Effort Principles and the Effort Determination Process by the Faculty Senate and their approval by the Administration, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will direct the deans of the colleges and the vice-chancellors for Academic Affairs of the Morris and Crookston campuses, to develop, consistent with these institutional faculty effort principles, elaborations of these principles for their units which will provide more specific guidance in the determination of individual faculty effort expectations.
[Footnote: It is hoped that the Duluth campus administration and faculty will consider these principles as part of their collective bargaining process. It is assumed that the medical faculty at Duluth will participate in the Health Sciences process.]
2. Consistent with the Principles above, each college or campus will use its regular faculty consultative process to develop college or campus effort principles. Since effort expectations may vary by department or division within colleges or campuses, the college or campus may choose to have both a unit-wide set of principles and a more specific set for individual departments or divisions.
3. Upon the development of college, campus and subunit faculty effort principles, the dean or vice chancellor shall forward such principles to the appropriate vice president for approval. When approved at the vice president level, the principles shall be forwarded to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. All principles will become effective when they are approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.
4. All revisions of college, campus, or related subunit faculty effort principles will follow this process.
5. When all of the relevant effort principles are approved, the appropriate administrator will meet with each individual faculty member to develop a clear understanding of the expected faculty effort. Normally effort expectations will be set sufficiently in advance of their applicability that faculty can adequately plan their activities. Appropriate documentation of these understandings is desirable.

It is expected that the first cycle of this process will be completed within twelve months of its approval by the administration.

Terminology

As administrators and faculty develop an understanding of effort expectations, they will need a common set of terminology to identify specific elements of faculty effort. To promote standardization of the terminology, the Task Force is providing an initial list of the elements of effort (see attached). The major categories in the list are the three traditional mission areas - teaching, research, and service/outreach. In addition, we have identified a fourth category to include administration and governance activities. This categorization is consistent with the Tenure Code separation of professional service and other service activities. There are numerous subcategories within each category. The Task Force is aware that the Outreach Council is proposing to eliminate the use of the term service in describing mission related activities. The judgement of the Task Force as reflected in the proposed list of elements is that activities in support of professional groups belong in a mission category and should not be viewed as simply support service. If the recommendations of the Outreach Council are adopted by the University, the existing wording in the Tenure Code and other documents will need to be changed.

This extensive list of elements of faculty effort is an indication of the complex and comprehensive set of duties that faculty members typically perform. Obviously, not all of the faculty engage in all of these specific activities. We expect that units will make use of this list in developing their effort principles, making explicit which aspects are most applicable and most important to the mission of the unit. The initial list should not be seen as a fixed document, but rather one that is intended to evolve over time. Presuming that our initial effort will receive considerable refinement as this report is implemented, we recommend that together with the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs institute a systematic process for reviewing and updating this list on a regular basis.

Database of Activities and Accomplishments

Most of this document is directed to the statement of institutional faculty effort principles and the process for elaborating and utilizing these principles within units. It is also important to include here a recommendation for reporting the activities and accomplishments of the faculty.

Faculty effort principles and development processes will provide a necessary basis for accountability, but they may not be sufficient by themselves. The record of actual faculty effort and accomplishments is a form of accountability that is commonly expected.

While the institution must be careful not to impose onerous reporting requirements on itself and its faculty, it must have a means of summarizing faculty effort and accomplishments. Currently nearly all faculty members prepare an annual statement of activities and the University's Course Inventory provides information on some aspects of teaching. However, the current institutional information seems substantially deficient in providing an overview of the full range of effort and, most importantly, of the broad array of faculty accomplishments.

In response to this need, the Task Force recommends the following action:

The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will, in consultation with the FCC, appoint a task force to recommend the most appropriate means of collecting and reporting data on faculty activities and accomplishments. Consideration should be given to data that reflect unit activities and accomplishments to the extent that they are more than a simple aggregation of the data for individuals. The recommendations of the Task Force will be available for action by June, 1993. With this recommendation, the Faculty Workload Task Force is specifically not suggesting a very detailed data collection activity in which form triumphs over substance. In particular, we would expect a data collection effort that is designed around the list of effort elements but does not address detail below the level of the first major subdivisions under each of the four major categories (Teaching; Research, Scholarly and Creative Work; Service/Outreach; and Administration and Governance).

ATTACHMENT ELEMENTS OF FACULTY EFFORT

I. Elements of Teaching (Undergraduate, Graduate and Professional)

- Large Basic Lecture Courses
 - Lecturing
 - Preparing and updating syllabi
 - Preparing current lectures
 - Arranging guest lectures by other faculty and professionals in the field or subject area
 - Preparing text materials
 - Reviewing and selecting textbooks
 - Preparing visual aids and demonstrations
 - Reading to keep up with recent developments
 - Preparing problem sets, homework assignments and exams
 - Publishing lecture notes
 - Meeting with students during office hours and at other times
 - Training and supervising teaching assistants and graders
 - Maintaining course records
 - Coordinating with other faculty in multi-section courses
 - Managing discussion sessions
 - Grading exams
 - Responding to student questions and comments

- Regular Lecture and Lecture Discussion Courses
 - Lecturing
 - Preparing and updating syllabi
 - Preparing current lectures
 - Arranging guest lectures by other faculty and professionals in the field or subject area
 - Reviewing and selecting textbooks and other readings
 - Preparing visual aids and demonstrations
 - Framing activities designed to facilitate focussed discussions
 - Reading to keep up with recent developments
 - Preparing text materials
 - Publishing lecture notes
 - Preparing problem sets, homework assignments, and exams
 - Grading problem sets, homework assignments, and exams
 - Meeting with students during office hours and at other times
 - Maintaining course records
 - Responding to student questions and comments

- Laboratory and Field Courses
 - Devising and testing field exercises, laboratory experiments, and models
 - Devising computer exercises
 - Teaching the laboratory or field exercise (lecturing and leading)
 - Arranging professional contacts to meet with students in field settings
 - Organizing equipment for practice
 - Planning and supervising field trips
 - Preparing reagents, specimens, etc.
 - Supervising teaching assistants
 - Devising lab quizzes and exams
 - Grading exercises, quizzes and written and practical exams
 - Developing and presenting lectures on laboratory material
 - Guiding students and answering questions in lab and at other times
 - Maintaining course records

- Seminars and Advanced Courses
 - Lecturing when appropriate, or evaluating student presentations
 - Reading extensive specialized literature
 - Reading lengthy student papers
 - Choosing, inviting, and hosting guest lecturers
 - Meeting extensively out of class with students
 - Assigning grades and maintaining course records
 - Advising and directing student tutorials
 - Selecting readings and other class materials

- Clinical Professional Courses
 - Clinic and bedside teaching
 - Individual or small group discussions and evaluations
 - Patient related seminars and clinical materials review
 - Developing and presenting lectures on clinical materials
 - Lecturing
 - Preparing and updating syllabi
 - Devising clinical quizzes and exams
 - Grading quizzes and exams
 - Evaluating papers and care plans
 - Maintaining course records
 - Responding to student questions and comments
 - Guiding students and answering questions in clinic/hospital and at other times
 - Teaching surgical and patient examining techniques
 - Maintaining course records
 - Planning and chart review for student clinical experiences

- **Instructional Preparation and Follow-up**
 - Learning about general institutional resources e.g. computer facilities
 - Consulting internally on scientific methods
 - Handling post-course problems and complaints
 - Working with publishers to provide advice on needed texts and appropriate authors
 - Maintaining artistic and intellectual standing in the discipline

- **Studio Classes**
 - Deliver instruction that enables students to make art, apply art, and facilitate arts activities

- **Instructional Improvement**
 - Revising and designing curriculum
 - Exploring new teaching approaches
 - Obtaining and implementing student course evaluations
 - Evaluating the teaching of peers
 - Developing and participating in internships and international programs
 - Preparing and teaching honors courses
 - Attending relevant professional meetings
 - Previewing audiovisual and computerized programs for classroom use
 - Updating study guides and other educational materials

- **New Course Development**
 - Reading texts, monographs, and research journals
 - Consulting with other faculty at UM and elsewhere
 - Preparing grants for course and curricular development
 - Preparing new lecture notes, visual aids, etc.
 - Writing textbooks, study aids, etc.

- **Undergraduate Creative Work and Research Supervision**
 - Meeting with prospective students to explain research possibilities
 - Planning suitable research projects
 - Training in necessary lab and data analysis techniques
 - Frequently discussing results, giving guidance on next steps to take, troubleshooting
 - Editing research papers
 - Helping prepare research presentations
 - Obtaining grant support

- **Student Advising (Graduate and Undergraduate)**
 - Giving advice on course selection
 - Providing career guidance
 - Providing personal counseling and referral
 - Writing letters of recommendation
 - Supervising preprofessional student organizations
 - Serving on thesis guidance and oral exam committees
 - Devising, administering, and grading graduate written prelim exams
 - Providing approvals for use of university services
 - Advising ad hoc student groups
 - Providing guidance and direction in the field

- **Working With Other Faculty on Curricular Decisions and Development**
 - Coordinating multi-section courses
 - Preparing syllabi, textbooks, and exams
 - Revising existing courses
 - Coordinating sequences of courses
 - Devising new courses
 - Developing new curricula, majors, minors, etc.

- Creative Work and Research Activities That Should Be Counted Under Teaching
 - Guiding and mentoring Master's and PhD candidates
 - Supervising and training postdoctoral students
 - Attending research group conferences, journal clubs, and meetings related to training young scholars
 - Obtaining and administering training and instructional development grants
 - Reviewing theses and participating in review or examining committees for post baccalaureate programs
 - Colloquium coordination and presentation

II. Elements of Research, Scholarly, and Creative Work

- Hands-on Faculty Creative Work and Research
 - Pursuing scholarly investigation in the laboratory, the library or in the field
 - Participation in research as a faculty member/scientist in the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station or similar unit
 - Creating works of art, writing music, designing, architecture, performing works of art, etc.
 - Undertaking scholarly investigations with colleagues at other institutions (e.g. during quarter leave, or via telecommunications)
 - Applying art and facilitating arts and activities
 - Writing and publishing* research papers
 - Reviewing articles and monographs of peers
 - Writing research publications* with post-doctoral associates or colleagues
 - Preparing scholarly presentations for local, national and international meetings
 - Editing collections of essays
 - Carrying out clinical research (laboratory, epidemiological, etc.)
 - Clinical collaboration with basic researchers

* Publication within the arts means placing work before professional communities and the public.
- Graduate and Professional Student Creative Work and Research
 - Assisting research students outside of the instructional setting
 - Supervising creative works outside of the instructional setting
 - Writing research publications in conjunction with graduate assistants
 - Assisting students in travel, and attendance at research meetings
 - Preparing students for their research presentations
 - Attending graduate research presentations
 - Preparing and presenting research at local, national and international meetings
 - Writing laboratory specifications, and documentation (e.g. lab safety)
 - Supervising medical and other health sciences resident research contributions
- Undergraduate Creative Work and Research
 - Assisting in preparing material for undergraduate research projects
 - Counseling graduate students in assisting undergraduate research
 - Assisting undergraduates in summer undergraduate research projects
 - Attending undergraduate research presentations
 - Maintaining relationships with organizations supporting undergraduate research projects
 - Conducting tutorials and directed studies activities
 - Consulting internally on scientific methods
- Supporting a Creative Work and Research Base
 - Writing unsolicited proposals to federal, state and local government funding agencies
 - Writing unsolicited proposals to private foundations
 - Writing solicited proposals through the federal registry

Writing solicited proposals to private industry
Obtaining research funding support
Managing budgets, contracts and grant requests
Selecting and supervising technical support staff
Writing specifications for capital equipment purchases
Writing specifications for building and laboratory renovation
Attending committee meetings for managing laboratory facilities (e.g. the High and resolution electron microscopy center and human subject and animal experimentation review)
Preparing interim and final project reports
Arranging and conducting project site reviews
Attending meetings to discuss preparation of proposals to funding agencies
Attending meetings to coordinate inter-institutional research projects
Reading appropriate journals and other publications

III. Elements of Service/Outreach

- Professional

- Reviewing grants and manuscripts of peers
- Serving on advisory boards of government and foundation - granting agencies
- Serving on national examining boards (e.g. The American Board of Medical Examiners)
- Providing editorial functions for professional journals or collections of essays
- Serving as officers and counselors for professional societies
- Evaluating non-University of Minnesota faculty accomplishments for promotion and tenure
- Maintaining liaison relationships with local, state and national professional societies
- Reviewing external books/papers/proposals as requested by others
- Organizing and presenting workshops, symposia, and sessions at meetings
- Visiting other major research institutes and universities at the request of funding agencies or other universities
- Meeting with government, industrial and private foundation leaders to generate funding proposal interest
- Hosting faculty visitors
- Mentoring junior colleagues
- Serving on accrediting bodies

- Clinical Service

- Diagnosing and treating patients
- Holding diagnostic conferences
- Preparing and reviewing patient records
- Providing public education about health-related issues
- Facilitating patient care/management seminars

- Extension and Outreach

- Needs assessment
- Program evaluation
- Research synthesis and developing interpretations
- Writing periodic consumer interest articles for the popular press
- Developing research based "fact sheets," bulletins, audio-visual and other educational materials on new technology and other ideas useful to consumer groups
- Serving on advisory committees to various community and commodity groups
- Coordinating county and providing input to state 4-H youth programs
- Conducting periodic mass media educational programs
- Establishing demonstration plots illustrating new crop varieties and experimental treatments

Developing and carrying out informational conferences, workshops, field tours, and field day demonstrations
Responding to individual requests for information on horticulture, forestry, agronomy, soils, pest control, etc.
Relaying consumer issues and problems to University specialists and responding with recommendations
Carrying out applied research directed at specific short term needs and problems
Providing expertise to public agencies
Developing field trials and demonstrations
Consulting on scientific methods

- Community Service and Education

Working with other parts of the higher education system
Consulting without compensation with units of local, national and international government
Collaborating and consulting with local industry
Facilitating the transfer of technology to industry
Serving without compensation as expert witnesses
Providing outreach programs to community professionals and consumers of their services or products
Assisting local school systems
Providing expertise to the media, community groups and the general public
Answering phone and other contacts of the general public
Delivering non credit courses
Providing lectures, seminars, and workshops for the public
Preparing publications and other materials to communicate information to the public

- Quasi-State Agency Functions

Coordinating or conducting activities with government constituents

IV. Elements of Administration and Governance

Preparing course schedules
Providing leadership for specific departments, colleges, or the University
Allocating space and facilities allocation
Supervising shared research facilities
Recruiting faculty and staff
Making hiring, promotion and tenure decisions
Taking part in faculty governance
Developing educational policy
Providing advice to administration
Handling grievances
Assisting with undergraduate student recruitment and orientation (including minority and international students)
Assisting with graduate student recruitment and orientation (including minority and international students)
Developing library acquisition policy
Developing research policy
Supporting fund-raising and other development activities
Serving on committees
Ordering laboratory supplies for teaching and research
Administering clinical programs
Directing technology transfer activities with government and industry
Managing shared research facilities
Recruiting and evaluating students for admission
Facilitating communication between faculty and central administration

MARIO BOGNANNO
Chair

DISCUSSION:

Professor Mario Bognanno, Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), presented the Faculty Workload Task Force report. He briefly outlined the development of the document and thanked Task Force members for their prompt and hard work. Professor Bognanno then introduced Professor Carl Adams, chair of the Task Force. The report, Professor Adams said, outlines principles to be used to develop a clear understanding between each faculty member and the appropriate University department/ college/unit regarding expected effort, and a process to follow in developing effort expectations. Additionally, the report recommends: 1) that the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs institute a systematic process for reviewing and updating the Elements of Faculty Effort attached to the document and 2) that the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Faculty Consultative Committee, appoint a task force to recommend the most appropriate means of collecting and reporting data on faculty activities and accomplishments. Professor Adams said comment and review of the report has ranged from strong endorsement to strong opposition. He assured Senators that the initiative for the document came from the faculty through the Faculty Consultative Committee and is not being thrust upon the faculty by any individuals or groups of individuals. The FCC and others believe there needs to be recognition of the professional responsibilities of the faculty. The report, he said, stresses communication between faculty and administrators and flexibility in response to diversity. He encouraged Senators to think of the report as an evolving document, subject to modification and change.

In response to a number of questions relating to interpretation, Professor Adams said the document anticipates a fair amount of diversity and that the Task Force subscribed to the principle that the University does not have specialists, per se, that work in only one or two of the mission areas, but that every individual has some responsibility for each of the three major missions of the University.

Senator Swan recommended adding "responding to student questions and comments" under the Large Basic Lecture Courses section of the Elements of Faculty Effort. Professor Adams accepted the recommendation as a friendly amendment.

Another Senator inquired about 1) the relationship between collecting data and dealing with abuses and 2) the relationship between the workload document and other University documents that govern faculty. Professor Adams said the document does not include sanctions in an official sense, but instead emphasizes communication. If abuses are determined, there are methods already in the system for encouraging individuals to work up to a level of reasonable expectation. In answer to the second question, Professor Adams said the document is not intended to supercede or conflict with other University documents; however, if it does, he presumes in the spirit of evolution, the conflict would be corrected.

One individual expressed concern about measuring inputs rather than outputs and the potential for administrators to devote an inordinate amount of time to activities, policies, and behaviors that are decoupled from outputs. Of even greater concern, he said, is the possibility that the document will be approved and then ignored, further compromising the integrity of the institution. He strongly encouraged the Senate and administration to promote faculty output, to measure teaching effectiveness, and to attack the problem of malfeasance among faculty and administrators.

Speaking in support of the document, the University's Faculty Legislative Liaison said faculty are being called upon to demonstrate that they take their responsibilities seriously. Many legislators, she said, are under the impression that faculty operate without rules, guidelines, sanctions, etc., and while faculty know that is not the case, it is difficult to explain that to legislators without some kind of workload document. She reminded Senators that there is a national movement in which state legislatures are mandating teaching loads and she encouraged the faculty to take the lead in this endeavor by supporting their own document rather than have one imposed upon them.

A Senator from Morris also urged approval, emphasizing the need for accountability, for defining faculty productivity, and for increasing public awareness. The document, he said, "has perhaps as much potential as Garrison Keillor does for having some positive responses from the citizens of Minnesota and their legislators."

One curious principle, an individual noted, was that faculty will continue to be evaluated on the significance and magnitude of their accomplishments for pay and promotion purposes, yet the document speaks only to effort and not accomplishment. "Why then expend the effort to worry about effort," he queried?

Final comments encouraged support of the document suggesting that while imperfect, it is important that faculty take the initiative in developing its own workload principles. The faculty needs to respond to its constituents the citizens of Minnesota as to how they spend their time.

A motion to postpone action on the report until the December 10, Faculty Senate meeting was not approved and a motion to adopt the report was approved.

APPROVED

**V. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Bush Sabbatical Supplement Program
Information**

**Bush Sabbatical Supplement Program
1992-93**

Purpose

The Bush Sabbatical Supplement Program provides supplementary income for faculty who seek to enhance their ability in scholarship, creative work, teaching, or service to the community. The program provides support to those faculty for whom an award will result in significant benefits for the University and the individual, and for whom the benefits would be otherwise difficult to obtain. Having regard for the specific mission of each unit, Bush Sabbatical Supplement awards may focus on research, writing, creative activities, or on improving instruction (particularly at the undergraduate level) or outreach programs.

Begun in 1981-82 with a grant from the Bush Foundation Faculty Development Program, the Sabbatical Supplement Program is now supported entirely by University funding. With approximately \$ 300,000 to distribute among 20 faculty members each year, it is a highly competitive program designed to encourage scholarly or creative work that will make a definite and visible contribution to the University of Minnesota.

Eligibility

Faculty members who are tenured at the time of application, who are eligible for a faculty Sabbatical Furlough, and who have not previously held a Bush Sabbatical Supplement award may apply for sabbatical support for three continuous academic quarters under the Bush Sabbatical Supplement Program.

Awards

The Program provides a salary supplement of \$15,000 or 30% of the B-base salary (whichever is greater) for the year in which the sabbatical is taken. The combination of University Sabbatical Furlough salary (50 percent), Bush Supplement award, and any other salary support may not exceed full-time salary (100 percent). The supplement is provided during the academic year only and excludes summer support.

The Bush Sabbatical Supplement Program no longer makes awards for travel.

Application Procedure

Faculty wishing to apply for a Bush Sabbatical Supplement should obtain current application forms from the Office of Human Resources, 217 Morrill Hall, (phone 626-7730). A copy of the form has also been sent to each dean's office. This form should be used as is, without the addition of lengthy explanatory material or copies of grant proposals. Each application must also include either a condensed two- or three-page curriculum vitae or a brief narrative of the applicant's academic history and accomplishments. Since the information requested of applicants has changed over the history of the program, applications submitted on old forms cannot be considered.

Faculty wishing to apply for Bush Supplement awards must first secure a recommendation from their department or division head (or, in the event that this person is also an applicant, from the previous chair or other appropriate departmental officer) on the form provided, and should then submit the original and eleven copies of their application materials, along with the Departmental Recommendation, to their deans for review within their collegiate units.

Since deadlines may vary from one unit to another, interested faculty are urged to contact the office of their dean for specific instructions. Colleges and campuses are asked to review applications from their faculty and to forward the original and eleven copies together with recommendations to reach the Office of the Human Resources, 217 Morrill Hall, Minneapolis Campus, **no later than 4:00 p.m., January 8, 1993**. Applicants will be notified about results of this year's competition by early to mid March.

Consultation and Assistance

Faculty who would like further information concerning the preparation of their proposals may call the Office of Human Resources, 626-7730, for a select group of past-Bush Supplement recipients who have volunteered to offer some consulting assistance.

Review Process and Criteria

In order to ensure that projects funded by the Bush Sabbatical Supplement Program will affect the University's programs in a significant and positive way, the applicant's department head and college dean are given an opportunity to review and recommend on proposals before they are submitted for central review. In doing so, each administrator should also keep in mind ways in which his or her unit will support the efforts of returning Bush Supplement recipients to undertake instructional or curricular improvements that result from their sabbatical activities. Since this assessment may be difficult in some larger colleges, the selection committee has agreed to requests to make the Collegiate Recommendation optional.

All proposals will then be forwarded to the Office of Human Resources for review by the Bush Sabbatical Supplement Program Selection Committee, an all-University faculty panel representing different colleges, campuses, and academic disciplines. The recommendations of this committee will be submitted for approval to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. A list of committee members will be available on request from the Office of Human Resources.

While individual applications will differ in regard to the types of activities proposed for the sabbatical, all will be judged on the following criteria:

1. The quality of the proposed project in light of the mission of the University, as indicated in the first paragraph on page 2.
2. Evidence that an award will make a direct and significant contribution to the applicant's professional development as well as to the University, and that without it these efforts would be difficult or even impossible.
3. The strength of the research, scholarly, or creative component of the proposal, including evidence that the project is well-focused and neither at so preliminary a stage that it could not be largely completed during the sabbatical leave, nor at so advanced a stage as to constitute the completion of work that is for all intents and purposes already finished.
4. Where such resources exist, evidence that the applicant is seeking funding from outside agencies that might support the project, freeing Sabbatical Supplement Program funds for another faculty member.
5. The applicant's record for productive use of past leaves, educational development grants, and research grants from University and non-University sources.
6. The coherence of the applicant's plans with the mission of the department and college of which he or she is a member.

Reporting requirement

Recipients of all sabbatical leaves must file a report on their activities to their dean. Recipients of this award shall include in their report a reflection on how they expect the sabbatical leave will enhance their teaching or outreach activities.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY STATEMENT

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

MARIO BOGNANNO
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee

JAMES TRACY
Chair, Educational Policy Committee

VI. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS Annual Report, 1991-92

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) met fifteen times during the 1991-92 academic year to discuss issues of interest to the faculty of the University of Minnesota. Included on the committee were faculty members Avner Ben-Ner (chair), Carl Adams, Mary Dempsey, Ann Fallon, Daniel Feeney, Roger Feldman, Richard Goldstein, Audrey Grosch, Ruth Kanfer, Morris Kleiner, Donald Rasmusson, Bernard Selzler, W. Donald Spring, Michael Wade, Gayle Graham Yates, Judith Younger; academic professional member Steve Laursen; and ex officio members Carol Carrier, Dianne Mulvihill, Roger Paschke, and George Seltzer. In order to facilitate its business, the committee established the following subcommittees:

- Faculty Retirement Plan
- Faculty/Academic Staff Advocacy & Grievance Advisory Program
- Faculty Benefits Other than Retirement and Health Plans
- Health Plans Evaluation
- Tenure

Additionally, SCFA was represented on the following committees:

- Academic Staff Advisory Committee
- Performance Appraisal and Salary Increases Working Group
- Health Plans Task Force
- Senate Finance and Planning Committee

The committee began its year by establishing a tentative agenda and set of goals. The following is a summary of SCFA's accomplishments this year.

Ombuds Committee Report

SCFA was asked to review the report of the Ombuds Committee which was appointed to review and evaluate various dispute resolution models and to make recommendations for an organizational structure to serve all campuses and constituencies. For a number of reasons, SCFA did not endorse the report and forwarded its conclusions to the Senate Consultative Committee and the University Senate, which concurred with its recommendation.

Phased Retirement and Terminal Leave Policy

In the Fall of 1990, SCFA reviewed and endorsed proposed changes to the Phased Retirement and Terminal Leave Policy. The changes included upgrading the existing policy to comply with new federal legislation requiring that all benefit programs disregard age when determining eligibility and levels of benefits; bringing the policy into compliance with Section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code; and revising the medical benefits section to allow a person working less than 50 percent time to continue receiving medical coverage [the subsidy would not continue below the 50 percent level, however]. Additionally, SCFA has recommended to central administration that individuals be allowed to draw on their retirement funds, which the current plan precludes.

Receivership of Departments

The Senate Consultative Committee had asked SCFA to consider recommending procedures for placing departments in receivership without violating the rights of faculty in tenure and educational policy matters. After considerable discussion by the Tenure Subcommittee and SCFA a policy was developed and forwarded to the Faculty Consultative Committee. The policy was subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate on February 20, 1992.

Faculty Compensation Policy

SCFA spent a considerable amount of time over the course of many months reviewing and responding to the Performance Appraisal and Salary Increases Working Group's recommendations for a Faculty Compensation Policy. SCFA realized it was not possible to develop a policy that would please everyone, but it did endorse the policy that was subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate on May 21, 1992. It included 1) establishing in each academic unit clear criteria for annual salary increases; 2) development of procedures for making salary decisions by the faculty and administrator of each unit; 3) establishment of a salary committee (or committee-of-the-whole) to determine annual salary increases; 4) fixed promotion increases for promotion to associate and full professor; and 5) establishment of a standing administrative and faculty compensation committee to examine and make additional recommendations on salary issues.

University Health Plans

SCFA also devoted considerable time to reviewing and responding to the Health Plans Task Force proposal to separate from the State of Minnesota's health plan and design a University health plan. SCFA agreed in principle with the idea of a University managed plan that could allow for greater options in addressing employee needs; however it opposed the proposal because it lacked confidence in the University's ability, at this time, to develop its own plan. In addition, there was too much uncertainty, especially for retirees and coordinate campus employees, to support the proposal. The Health Plans Task Force proposal was not adopted by the administration and SCFA subsequently approved a resolution to establish a standing subcommittee to focus on health care for University employees, including retirees. The subcommittee will begin its work in the Fall of 1992.

Faculty Retirement Plan

The Faculty Retirement Plan Subcommittee presented periodic reports updating SCFA on the investment performance of the various options for both the Faculty Retirement Plan and the Optional Retirement Plan. Additionally, it recommended and SCFA endorsed, a proposal to add three new options to the Faculty Retirement Plan.

Disability Insurance Benefit for Faculty

SCFA examined the current Disability Policy for faculty and concluded that no changes should be recommended at this time, especially in view of the University's financial difficulties. The committee was concerned about two issues, however: 1) whether the 60% monthly salary disability benefit is fair for faculty with small salaries and 2) whether the disability benefit should be the same for all faculty versus the current policy which provides larger benefits to longer-term faculty.

Sabbatical Programs

SCFA discussed with Provost Infante the University's sabbatical programs and the changes recommended by SCFA during the 1990-91 academic year. The Provost supported SCFA's recommendations and will bring implementation proposals for SCFA's review by early Fall 1992.

Academic Staff Vacation Policy

A proposal to allow academic staff to defer vacation days under special circumstances into the subsequent year was approved by SCFA and forwarded to central administration for incorporation into the policy.

Merger of the Academic Personnel and Civil Service Personnel Departments

SCFA participated in discussions with and provided recommendations to Provost Infante, Associate Vice President Carol Carrier, and others on the proposal to merge the Academic Personnel and Civil Service Personnel Departments. SCFA strongly recommended that if the two departments are merged, they report to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Faculty/Academic Staff Advocacy and Grievance Advisory Program

In 1989 the Faculty/Academic Staff Advocacy and Grievance Advisory Program was established, under SCFA's direction, to provide information and assistance to all academic employees regarding internal University grievance procedures. Upon examination of the program and the performance of its director, SCFA recommended the program be continued, as well as its director, at least until the work of the University Grievance Review Committee is complete.

Parental Leave and "Stopping the Tenure Clock"

The Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee (EEOWC) brought for SCFA's review a proposal recommending the Parental Leave Policy be amended to allow any new parent who is a probationary academic employee to request that the academic year in which a birth or adoption takes place be discounted as a probationary year toward tenure or continuous appointment. SCFA suggested several changes including a requirement that the request for additional time be contemporaneous with the birth or adoption and that an individual not be allowed to "stop the clock" once the tenure review process has begun. EEOWC will bring a final draft of the proposal to SCFA early Fall Quarter 1992.

As the report indicates, members of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and its subcommittees worked very hard this year and I wish to express my appreciation for their contributions.

AVNER BEN-NER
Chair

ACCEPTED

VII. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Martha Kvanbeck
Abstractor

November 17, 1992

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 1992-93 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Tuesday, November 17, 1992, at 1:00 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 47 voting student members. Mr. Thomas Lopez presided.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Action

The agenda was approved with no discussion.

APPROVED

II. APPROVAL OF APRIL 16, 1992, MAY 14, 1992, and OCTOBER 8, 1992 MINUTES

Action

APPROVED

III. REPORTS

A. Student Senate Chair--Mr. Thomas Lopez, chair, Student Senate, said the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) is considering a number of important issues that will be brought forward to the Student Senate in the coming months. He and other Senate members will also be working closely with the Student Lobby Advisory Committee (SLAC) and others regarding the biennial request.

B. Student Senate Vice Chair--Mr. Love Goel, vice-chair, Student Senate, said he is looking forward to working with the Student Senate in an effort to accomplish its goals for 1992-93. He encouraged open and broad communication among all campuses, citing the Student Senate's responsibility to be a representative body. He said the new Student Legislative Director will be meeting with legislative leaders, faculty, administrators, and others during the next month to discuss University issues and legislative strategies.

C. Student Senate Consultative Committee Chair--Ms. Denise Tolbert, chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), reviewed agenda items currently under study by the SSCC. They include a proposed smoking policy for the Twin Cities campus, expanded Senate representation by academic professionals, and long-range planning efforts.

D. Student Senate Consultative Committee Vice Chair--Ms. Sonja Hoheisel, vice-chair, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) reported that a working group had been established by SSCC to evaluate the need for a separate student constitution. The working group concluded that the University Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules should be amended to clarify the role of the Student Senate rather than the Student Senate developing a separate constitution.

IV. STUDENT SENATE BUDGET

Action

Mr. Lopez briefly outlined the Student Senate budget request for 1992-93 and recommended its approval by the Student Senate. A motion to accept the budget as presented was approved.

APPROVED

V. BIENNIAL BUDGET RESOLUTION

Action

Senator David Dahlgren presented the following Biennial Budget Resolution for consideration. The

resolution, he said, addresses tuition, programmatic cuts, and financial aid, and was developed as a means of communicating student concerns to central administrators and the Board of Regents. The resolution, Senator Sales added, has received endorsement by the Minnesota Student Association, the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, the student representatives to the Board of Regents, and the Student Senate Consultative Committee.

RESOLUTION ON BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST

Whereas the general downturn in the state's economy has adversely affected higher education in general and students at the University of Minnesota and their families in particular, and;

Whereas the rate of inflation during the last biennium was approximately 3.5% per year, and is estimated to be approximately 3.5% per year during the next biennium, and;

Whereas average tuition at the University of Minnesota has increased alarmingly at rates of 9% and 14% per year respectively for each year of the last biennium, and;

Whereas tuition rates for individual colleges and campuses recommended by the administration and enacted by the Board of Regents for the 1992-93 school year produced a disparity of increases ranging from 0-24%, creating an extremely disproportionate burden for students in many collegiate units, particularly students already engaged in a course of study and unable to avail themselves of more affordable alternatives, and;

Whereas programmatic cuts were recommended and enacted with little or no input on the part of students enrolled in those programs, and;

Whereas financial aid has not matched increases in tuition, resulting in diminishing access to higher education by students unable to afford it;

Therefore, be it resolved that the University of Minnesota hold tuition increases during the next biennium to less than 3.5% per year, or roughly the rate of inflation predicted during the biennium, and;

Be it further resolved that the President of the University of Minnesota appoint standing committees on each campus which include students, and that the charge of these committees will be to formulate any and all recommendations to the Board of Regents and the Legislature concerning tuition policy and programmatic changes, and;

Be it further resolved that the President of the University of Minnesota present these recommendations to the University's Board of Regents and the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

On a voice vote, the Student Senate approved the resolution.

APPROVED

VI. SENATORIAL PARTICIPATION ON SENATE COMMITTEES

Discussion

Ms. Denise Tolbert asked Student Senate members to consider whether service on a Senate/Assembly committee should be mandatory for student senators and whether there should be a mechanism in place for removing members who violate the committee attendance policy. Attendance has been a problem on a number of committees and in those instances the student voice is not being heard.

One individual expressed concern about the increased burden it would place on students and about adopting a policy that would apply to students and not faculty.

Another senator said mandating committee service could result in students being forced to serve on committees they have no interest in. Ms. Tolbert said student senators would be given priority placement over non-senators, hopefully allowing them to serve on committees of interest to them.

If service becomes compulsory, coordinate campus senators said it would be helpful if some meetings could be held on the outstate campuses.

Senators expressed support for developing a mechanism for removing committee members who violate the Senate/Assembly attendance policy.

VII. DIVERSITY FORUM

Discussion

Mr. Lopez introduced Ms. Malaika McKee, member, Student Senate Consultative Committee. In 1990, Ms. McKee said, President Hasselmo asked Dr. Josie Johnson to assist the University in reviewing issues of intolerance in religious, racial, cultural, and lifestyle differences that persist at the University of Minnesota and to recommend ways of eliminating such intolerances. Under the direction of Dr. Johnson, she said, a qualitative self-reflective study was conducted including students, staff, faculty, administrators, and some members of the Board of Regents. Results indicated that making diversity and pluralism a reality at the University of Minnesota would require 1) making the University more inclusive of minorities with regard to diversifying its student profile, 2) having a greater number of minorities in the composition of its faculty and staff, and 3) establishing a curriculum representative of the pluralistic nature of American society.

Ms. McKee said a state-wide teleconference forum on diversity was held fall quarter and a more student-focused forum is scheduled for April. She encouraged the Student Senate to become actively involved in the April forum and other diversity activities that will be scheduled throughout the year. Interested students may contact Ms. McKee at the Africana Student Cultural Center or Dr. Nuri Hassumani at the Humphrey Institute.

Ms. McKee then introduced Dr. Nuri Hassumani, assistant to Dr. Josie Johnson. Dr. Hassumani reinforced Ms. McKee's comments and also encouraged student participation in the overall University efforts to eliminate intolerance at the U of M.

VIII. REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY SENATE AGENDA

Mr. Lopez reviewed a number of items on the University Senate agenda and invited discussion of those or other items on the agenda. The Senate and Assembly meetings, he reminded members, would begin immediately following the Student Senate meeting.

IX. INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR

Mr. Love Goel reported that Mr. Martin Conroy had been selected to serve as the Student Legislative Director for 1992-93. Mr. Conroy, a graduate student and former student body president of the Morris campus, has already begun meeting with appropriate individuals and groups in preparation for the 1993 legislative session.

X. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

XI. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Martha Kvanbeck
Abstractor

APPENDIX A

ELECTED MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES, 1992-93

(key to unit codes follows membership list)

ELECTED FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS

| | Unit | Term | | Unit | Term |
|------------------------|------|-------|----------------------|------|-------|
| Albertson, Vernon | 22 | 91-94 | Ferris, Thomas F. | 15 | 91-94 |
| Albrecht, Lisa | 8 | 90-93 | Fogelman, Edwin | 12 | 92-95 |
| Anderson, John | 4 | 92-95 | Foreman, Gertrude | 13 | 90-93 |
| Arvey, Richard | 14 | 91-93 | Galaskiewicz, Joseph | 12 | 92-95 |
| Ballou, Mercedes | 33 | 92-95 | Gardner, Gary | 2 | 92-95 |
| Banker, Rajiv | 14 | 91-94 | Gilanshah, Farah | 33 | 91-94 |
| Bauer, Jean | 10 | 92-95 | Gray, Virginia | 12 | 91-94 |
| Baxter, John | 22 | 91-94 | Gremmels, James | 33 | 91-94 |
| Beatty, John | 4 | 92-95 | Hamilton, David | 15 | 90-93 |
| Berger, Thomas | 22 | 92-93 | Hansen, Leslie | 2 | 91-94 |
| Berman, Hyman | 12 | 90-93 | Hatch, Jay T. | 8 | 92-95 |
| Bitterman, Peter | 15 | 91-94 | Hawley, Louise | 30 | 92-95 |
| Bland, Carole | 15 | 91-94 | Hicks, Dale | 2 | 90-93 |
| Bloom, Paul | 2 | 91-94 | Holder, Bobby | 25 | 90-93 |
| Bloomer, Joseph | 15 | 92-95 | Holtan, James | 6 | 92-94 |
| Bohn, Dorothy | 13 | 92-95 | Hoover, Emily | 2 | 91-94 |
| Bomash, Bill | 16 | 91-94 | Hostetter, Margaret | 15 | 92-95 |
| Boss, Pauline | 10 | 90-93 | House, James | 15 | 91-94 |
| Burk, Thomas | 17 | 90-93 | Hughes, Jack | 14 | 91-94 |
| Busta, Francis | 2 | 92-95 | Humphreys, Roberta | 22 | 90-93 |
| Canafax Daniel | 19 | 91-94 | Imhote, Jack | 33 | 90-93 |
| Caplan, Arthur | 15 | 92-95 | Jernberg, James | 20 | 92-95 |
| Cardozo, Richard | 14 | 90-93 | Johnson, Fred | 8 | 91-94 |
| Carter, Clarence | 13 | 91-94 | Jordan, Peter | 17 | 91-94 |
| Cerra, Frank | 15 | 91-94 | Kac, Michael | 12 | 91-94 |
| Chaplin, Jonathan | 2 | 92-94 | Kagan, Alan | 12 | 90-93 |
| Charvat, Iris | 4 | 90-93 | Kain, Richard | 22 | 91-94 |
| Cheng, H.H. | 2 | 90-93 | Kane, Robert | 21 | 92-95 |
| Clayton, Thomas | 12 | 91-94 | Kanee, Stephen | 12 | 91-94 |
| Chrisham, Patricia | 18 | 90-93 | Kaplan, Edward | 15 | 92-95 |
| Collins, W. Andrew | 7 | 92-93 | Karni, Karen | 15 | 92-95 |
| Connett, John | 21 | 92-95 | Kautz, Barbara | 13 | 92-95 |
| Corcoran-Perry, Sheila | 18 | 92-95 | Kegler, Stanley | 7 | 90-93 |
| Cummings, Larry | 14 | 92-95 | Keierleber, Dennis | 5 | 90-93 |
| Davidson, Kris | 22 | 92-95 | King, Jean | 7 | 92-95 |
| Day, Deborah | 15 | 92-95 | King, Richard | 15 | 91-93 |
| Delaney, John | 15 | 91-94 | Klee, Carol | 12 | 92-95 |
| Deno, Stanley | 7 | 92-94 | Lange, Dale | 7 | 92-95 |
| Dunn, David | 15 | 92-95 | Laursen, Steve | 16 | 92-95 |
| Dworkin, Martin | 15 | 92-95 | Lehmborg, Stanford | 12 | 91-94 |
| Eagon, Jack | 22 | 92-95 | Leppert, Richard | 12 | 92-95 |
| Eisenberg, Richard | 30 | 90-93 | Levy, Robert J. | 11 | 92-94 |
| Feeney, Daniel | 24 | 91-94 | Liu, Benjamin | 22 | 89-92 |
| Feigal, Robert | 6 | 90-93 | Lodge, Tim | 22 | 92-95 |
| Malmberg, John | 5 | 91-94 | Rose, Thomas | 12 | 92-95 |
| Mason, H.E. | 12 | 92-95 | Roth, Martin | 12 | 90-93 |
| Masten, Ann | 7 | 92-94 | Scheman, Naomi | 12 | 91-94 |
| McKeever, Patrick | 24 | 92-95 | Schulman, Yechiel | 22 | 92-95 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|-------|-------------------------|----|-------|
| McMurry, Peter | 22 | 92-95 | Seybold, Virginia | 15 | 92-95 |
| Melsa, Cleon | 25 | 92-95 | Shapiro, Alan | 22 | 90-93 |
| Meyers, Sue | 16 | 92-95 | Shapiro, Burton | 6 | 90-93 |
| Miller, Frank | 12 | 90-93 | Sheldon, Amy | 12 | 92-95 |
| Miller, Willard | 22 | 92-95 | Shier, Thomas | 19 | 90-93 |
| Moller, James | 15 | 91-94 | Siegal, Gerald | 12 | 90-93 |
| Montgomery, Jean | 12 | 90-93 | Simmons, Michael | 4 | 90-93 |
| Moon, Roger | 2 | 90-93 | Spring, W. Donald | 33 | 91-93 |
| Munholland, John K. | 12 | 91-94 | Stein, Marvin | 22 | 90-93 |
| Murphy, Paul | 12 | 91-94 | Steffes, Michael | 15 | 91-94 |
| Murthy, V.R. | 22 | 92-95 | Stuthman, Deon | 2 | 90-93 |
| Myers, Kenneth | 25 | 91-94 | Sutton, Vern | 12 | 90-93 |
| Nagaraja, K.V. | 24 | 91-93 | Swan, Craig | 12 | 92-95 |
| Nassauer, Joan | 3 | 91-94 | Thompson, Theodore | 15 | 90-93 |
| Newstrand, Lois | 9 | 90-93 | Towle, Howard | 15 | 90-93 |
| Noland, Wayland | 22 | 92-93 | Tracy, James | 12 | 92-95 |
| Oehlert, Gary | 12 | 91-94 | Turner, Caroline | 7 | 92-93 |
| Olson, David | 10 | 91-94 | Van Essendelft, William | 5 | 90-93 |
| Osborn, Joy | 6 | 92-94 | Wagner, Philip | 23 | 92-94 |
| Penrod, Steven | 11 | 91-93 | Wangenstein, O. Douglas | 15 | 90-93 |
| Peterson, Kathleen | 4 | 92-93 | Weckwerth, Vernon | 21 | 92-95 |
| Polla, Dennis | 22 | 92-95 | Welsch, Delane | 2 | 92-95 |
| Quie, Paul | 15 | 91-94 | White, James | 15 | 90-93 |
| Ragsdale, David | 2 | 92-95 | Wildung, David | 1 | 91-94 |
| Richter, Wayne | 22 | 91-94 | Williams, Carolyn | 21 | 90-93 |
| Robertson, Paul | 15 | 90-93 | Wirtschafter, Jonathan | 15 | 90-93 |
| Robinson, Elaine | 24 | 92-95 | | | |

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

| | Term | | Term |
|-------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|
| Adams, John | 92-93 | Liu, Benjamin | 92-93 |
| Bognanno, Mario (Chair) | 91-94 | Louis, Karen Seashore | 91-95 |
| Deinard, Amos | 90-93 | McNaron, Toni | 92-95 |
| Garrard, Judith | 91-95 | Van Alstine, James (UMM) | 87-93 |
| Holm Paul (UMC) | 90-93 | Zimmerman, Shirley | 90-94 |

ELECTED FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL ALTERNATES

| | Unit | | Unit |
|-------------------|------|------------------|------|
| Archibald, Sandra | 20 | Cotter, James | 33 |
| Banttari, Ernest | 2 | Daly, Carol | 5 |
| Ben-Ner, Avner | 14 | Davis, Eugenia | 10 |
| Benson, Katherine | 33 | Flynn, Diane | 16 |
| Borchardt, Edith | 33 | Fox, David | 22 |
| Bouchard, Thomas | 12 | Fricton, James | 6 |
| Fuchs, James | 4 | Miller, Wilmer | 22 |
| Gallant, Esther | 24 | Mueller, Van | 7 |
| Gardner, Leroy | 8 | Mullan, Louise | 10 |
| Gaston, Judy | 5 | Nathan, Marshall | 22 |
| Gooch, Van | 33 | Nolting, Earl | 5 |
| Grosch, Audrey | 13 | Paige, Michael | 7 |
| Healty, David | 8 | Park, Rosemarie | 7 |
| Hepworth, Malcolm | 22 | Parker, Gary | 22 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|----|--------------------|----|
| Honadle, Beth | 16 | Phillips, Jane | 4 |
| Hu, Wei-Shou | 22 | Polzin, David | 24 |
| Hupp, Susan | 7 | Roe, Terry | 2 |
| Johnson, Thomas | 33 | Rhodus, Nelson | 6 |
| Kahn, Peter | 8 | Scanlan, Thomas | 2 |
| Kane, Mary Jo | 7 | Schottel, Janet | 4 |
| Krosch, Penelope | 13 | Sellew, Philip | 12 |
| Labuza, Theodore | 2 | Snowden, Frank | 8 |
| Leo, Perry | 22 | Trent, Micky | 24 |
| Lewis, Darrell | 7 | Weeks, Steve | 3 |
| Lykken, David | 12 | Vainshtein, Arkady | 22 |
| Maitland, Ian | 14 | Weinberg, Richard | 7 |
| Marquit, Erwin | 22 | Wick, Susan | 4 |
| Marshak, Marvin | 22 | Williams, Charles | 16 |
| McCormick, Richard | 12 | Williams, Gloria | 10 |
| Messing, William | 22 | Zeyen, Richard | 2 |

Faculty/academic professional senators from the following units may ask any faculty/academic professional from within their unit who is eligible to vote for senators to serve as an alternate:

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Agricultural Experiment Station | Medical School |
| Crookston | Natural Resources |
| Dentistry | Nursing |
| Duluth School of Medicine | Pharmacy |
| Law | Public Health |
| Liberal Arts | |

ELECTED STUDENT MEMBERS - as of November 3, 1992

Students are elected for a one-year term

| | Unit | | Unit |
|--------------------|------|---------------------|------|
| Arenot, Anne | 5 | Harper, Erik | 33 |
| Bakeman, Christoff | 12 | Hokans, Mark | 29 |
| Banzhof, Pat | 26 | Jacobson, Robert | 12 |
| Bulander, Amy | 12 | Jensen, Derkek | 22 |
| Butler, Allister | 9 | Jokela, Deanna | 29 |
| Campbell, Andrew | 32 | Kawolski, Kim | 5 |
| Charles, Samuel | 9 | Kelly, David | 33 |
| Ernst, Kim | 10 | Kuehnel, Andy | 12 |
| Frankovich, Stacey | 5 | Leonard, Ralph | 12 |
| Glenn, Christopher | 5 | Love, Carolyn J. | 12 |
| Goel, Love | 32 | Mack, Andrea | 12 |
| Hagestuen, Krissy | 22 | Martin, Robert F. | 22 |
| Martine, Lucy P. | 12 | Schonardt, Stacy | 28 |
| McHie, James C. | 1 | Schultz, John | 8 |
| McLaughlin, David | 5 | Shier, Tess | 12 |
| Mensing, Elizabeth | 9 | Sivagnanaguru, S.C. | 5 |
| Merritt, Caroline | 9 | Stephenson, Baxter | 14 |
| Miller, Peter G. | 17 | Stewart, Nora | 5 |
| Nissen, Aric | 12 | Stoner, Tamara | 9 |
| Ochoada, Orlando | 5 | Studenski, Benjamin | 22 |
| Odell, Kim | 27 | Swierczek, Joseph | 5 |
| Ottman, Gerda | 19 | Thornley, David | 9 |
| Pavek, Keith | 12 | Tyler, Liza M. | 12 |
| Pham, Sandy | 12 | Whitt, Michael | 33 |

| | | | |
|----------------|----|-----------------|----|
| Phan, Phuong | 12 | Williams, Craig | 26 |
| Pierce, Rhonda | 22 | Yankton, Lisa | 30 |
| Popiel, Andrea | 8 | | |

STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Dahlgren, David | McKee, Malaika |
| Hodgson, Jamie (UMC) | Sales, Anne |
| Hoheisel, Sonja (UMM) | Sinclair, Dan (UMD) |
| Lee, David | Tolbert, Denise (Chair) |
| Lopez, Tom (UMM) | |

STUDENT ALTERNATES

| | Unit | | Unit |
|-------------------|------|-----------------|------|
| Norgaard, Rebecca | 5 | Sullivan, Linda | 5 |

Students in units other than Continuing Education and Extension may ask any other student in their unit who is eligible to vote for Senators to serve as an alternate.

UNIVERSITY SENATE CODES

| | Unit | | Unit |
|--|------|---|------|
| Agricultural Experiment Station | 1 | Liberal Arts | 12 |
| Agriculture | 2 | Libraries | 13 |
| Architecture & Landscape Architecture | 3 | Management | 14 |
| Biological Sciences | 4 | Medical School | 15 |
| Continuing Education and Extension | 5 | Minnesota Extension Service | 16 |
| Dentistry | 6 | Natural Resources | 17 |
| Education | 7 | Nursing | 18 |
| General College | 8 | Pharmacy | 19 |
| Graduate School | 9 | Public Affairs | 20 |
| Human Ecology | 10 | Public Health | 21 |
| Law | 11 | Technology | 22 |
| University College | 23 | UMD, Liberal Arts | 29 |
| Veterinary Medicine | 24 | UMD, Medicine | 30 |
| Crookston | 25 | UMD, Other (includes non-collective bargaining faculty/academic professionals from UMD) | 31 |
| UMD, Business and Economics | 26 | | |
| UMD, Education and Human Service Professions | 27 | UMD, Science and Engineering | 32 |
| UMD, Fine Arts | 28 | Morris | 33 |

