

Minutes\*

**Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees**  
**Thursday, April 6, 1995**  
**2:00 - 4:00**  
**Room 626 Campus Club**

Present: John Adams (chair), Carl Adams, Joel Bergstrom, Thomas Burk, Sheila Corcoran-Perry, James Gremmels, Kenneth Heller, Roberta Humphreys, Robert Jones, Geoffrey Maruyama, Michael Steffes, Rabun Taylor, Barbara Thompson

Regrets: Lester Drewes, Virginia Gray, Harvey Peterson

Absent: Corey Kopacek, Brandon Lujan, Donald Ness, Rachel Rabaey, Chad Reichwald, Tim Stanislawski

Others: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate)

[In these minutes: approval of the April 20 Senate and Assembly dockets]

Professor Carl Adams convened the meeting at 2:00, because Professor John Adams was detained at the Regents' meeting, and asked Committee members to review the Assembly docket.

Mr. Taylor explained the motions to change the structure of student leadership, items that will appear on both the Assembly and University Senate dockets. Faculty Committee members discussed with the student Committee members the rationale for the changes; the Committee then voted unanimously to approve them and place them on the docket.

Discussion then turned to the University Senate docket; the Committee discussed the resolution from the Committee on Educational Policy having to do with semesters. The resolution does not favor or oppose semesters, Professor Heller reported; it simply calls for the University to plan carefully and provide adequate resources for making such a change, IF a change is to be made. SCEP consciously chose NOT to discuss the merits of a change, noting that the issue has been rehashed many times and there is little new to talk about. Committee members discussed the problems with an early start and the State Fair, the need to accept a decision to change if one is made, the unfortunate precedent set if the legislature directs the University to change its calendar, and the implication of the resolution that the Senate will not stand in the way if a decision to change is made. The Committee approved the item.

Professor John Adams joined the meeting and reported on the vote taken at the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents on the President's nomination of Professor Shively to be Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering. The Committee, he noted with dismay, had voted 3-3 on the nomination. Committee members discussed the vote briefly with Professor Adams.

---

\*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Committee members then turned to the draft revisions in the sexual harassment policy. Professor John Adams assumed the chair and explained the reaction of FCC to the proposed policy revisions and noted the summary of that discussion that will be included in the Senate docket. FCC, noted one Committee member, had reviewed the proposal and concluded it did not like it; because this is a controversial issue, however, it concluded the item should be placed on the docket for discussion. Another Committee member expressed surprise that the University had no policy forbidding relationships with undergraduate students, at least, because many schools do. What is needed is a HARASSMENT policy, not just a sexual harassment policy; there should be a prohibition on ANY activity which impedes the academic enterprise. It should be made clear, said one of the Committee members, that the comments appended to the policy are those of the FCC; the students had not dissented from the proposal. Their views will be reported at the Senate meeting. With slight amendments to the comment, the item was approved.

Professor Adams then distributed a new revision of the proposed Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy. This version, a complete replacement for the earlier version the Committee had seen, was prepared at his request by Regents' Professor Rutherford Aris. Committee members enthusiastically supported the revision; after brief discussion and with two minor editorial changes, approved it for discussion at the Senate meeting.

The Committee unanimously approved the University Senate docket. Professor Adams then adjourned the Senate Consultative Committee meeting and convened the Faculty Consultative Committee to take up the docket of the Faculty Senate.

The Committee first took up a resolution concerning research forwarded from the Research Committee and the Committee on Faculty Affairs. After considerable discussion of the variance among units in workload requirements, and the amount of research faculty members are expected to do, the Committee made several significant revisions to the resolution and relabelled it an addendum to the faculty workload policy. If adopted and approved by the administration, it would become part of the workload policy of every unit.

Professor Adams then explained he had asked Professor Carl Adams to draft a resolution concerning the report of the Compensation Working Group; the Committee approved it.

It was agreed that there will be an additional Faculty Senate meeting on Thursday, June 8, in order to deal with the several significant issues that are on the agenda in the near future. The Committee concluded it would be wiser to allow more time for discussion than to attempt to rush things through. Professor Adams reviewed with the Committee the items that could appear on the dockets on April 20, May 18, and June 8.

The Committee concluded it did NOT wish to place tenure code revisions on the April docket because there is too much faculty uncertainty about the issues, but that the matter should be resolved and acted on by the June 8 meeting. There is less concern, it appeared, about placing responsibility for promotion and tenure in the hands of the provosts than there is about the locus of authority for dealing with such issues as unit dissolution and termination for cause. Committee members debated whether the appointment of three provosts implied that the Twin Cities campus was in essence being split into three campuses; one Committee member said that the President and Board of Regents are differentiating

between policy and oversight, on the one hand, and day-to-day operations on the other. At no time have the President or Board said they will relinquish policy and oversight responsibilities.

The Committee then approved the Faculty Senate docket.

Professor Adams then asked his colleagues to review a draft resolution concerning the possibility being mentioned that the University might consider construction of a new football stadium. The sense of the resolution was strongly supported by the Committee, although not acted on; Professor Adams was asked to transmit the Committee's sentiments to the President indicating simply that the Committee had discussed it and was strongly opposed to the idea of a new stadium on the Twin Cities campus.

Professor Adams then adjourned the meeting at 4:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota