UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

February 14, 1985

The second meeting of the University Senate for 1984-85 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, February 14, 1985, at 3:40 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 122 voting members of the faculty, 60 voting members of the student body, 3 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 12 nonmembers.

Chair Kenneth Keller presided.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 15

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. MOTION BY FACULTY SENATOR

STUDENT GOVERNANCE, UNIVERSITY SENATE

(30 minutes)

MOTION:

In order to achieve the following objectives:

1. To encourage students to focus their efforts on those parts of the University’s governance structure in which their contributions can be most fruitful—on committees at all levels of the system, in the campus assemblies, and in their own student government institutions.

2. To change the composition of the University Senate to eliminate the student representatives, except for the student body presidents of the five campuses; to abolish the Faculty Senate, whose functions will be taken over by the University Senate; and, through these reforms, to provide a governance structure (the University Senate) in which the voice of the faculty can be heard more clearly.

Therefore, be it resolved that the following amendments be made in the Constitution of the University Senate:

(refer to Item VIII, pages 8-10, University Senate minutes, November 15, 1984, for proposed amendments; they are unchanged)

COMMENT:

Until 1969, the main governance structures at the University were the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee. In 1969, two additional structures were grafted on—the University Senate and the Senate Consultative Committee—so that students would be represented. At that time, too, a special effort was made to give the students representation on the campus assemblies, on task forces, and on most committees at all levels of governance.
Student participation in governance may be justified on two grounds: (1) to provide them with experience in leadership, and (2) to enable them to make useful contributions in those areas in which they have had experience and have information that they alone can provide. In an effective system of governance, students should be encouraged to focus on activities that help them to develop leadership qualities and enable them to inject their viewpoints on those subjects in which they are especially qualified and hence can make the most significant contributions. This can best be done in those forums that deal with such matters as curriculum development, student fees, the calendar, and similar issues. The appropriate forums for such discussions are departmental and college committees, some Senate committees, campus assemblies and committees, task forces, and the institutions of student governance. For the students to perform well in areas where their “input” is badly needed requires a great many people who are expected to spend considerable time on this work. (Last year there were more than 180 student committee positions on Senate and Assembly committees alone.) The students have usually encountered difficulty in recruiting people to serve in positions where their contributions can be the most fruitful; they should be encouraged to concentrate their efforts in these forums, where their performance is greatly needed and deserves improvement. At a time when we are emphasizing improvement of quality at the University, we ought also to strive to improve the operation of our governance structures.

It should be noted that this motion does not deprive the students of participation in the campus assemblies, on task forces, or on various committees (except for the “Senate Consultative Committee”). Nor does it say anything about the students’ right of access to the Regents which they currently enjoy—rights that are denied to the faculty.

One of the purposes of this motion is to abolish the Senate Consultative Committee (the body composed of both faculty and students), leaving only the Faculty Consultative Committee. Under the existing arrangement, the faculty meet as the Faculty Consultative Committee, and then subsequently the faculty meet with the students as the Senate Consultative Committee. Administrators attend both meetings. Having to hold the two meetings consumes the time of both faculty and administrators. Most members of the Faculty Consultative Committee during the past two years would agree that the FCC meetings are much more valuable to the University than are the meetings of the Senate Consultative Committee. The work of the latter tends to be “added on” or duplicative. The disbanding of the Senate Consultative Committee does not deprive the students of their ability to consult with the President, for student leaders have their own regular meetings with him.

For a good number of years, faculty members have been concerned about the present governance structure. In their view, there is no forum in which the voice of the faculty as a whole can be expressed: the present Faculty Senate is circumscribed in its jurisdiction, and to amend the Constitution so as to increase its authority would encounter the same opposition that this motion is encountering. Despite the valiant efforts of some student leaders, they experience difficulty in filling their seat allotments, and the attendance record is rather poor. When the University Senate acts, the faculty is not entitled to say that it is the voice of the faculty because more than one-third of the seats are given to students. This motion, however, permits the student body presidents of the five campuses to be members of the Senate and to participate and to vote even on matters that hitherto have been delegated to the Faculty Senate. This is an effort to improve student governance by upgrading the position of student body president.

This motion, then, has two major objectives:
1. To provide the faculty with a legislative forum in which they can interact across colleges on agendas that they control, thus enabling them to express their views and to take action as a faculty. (In sharp contrast with the situation that prevails with respect to the faculty, the students have several student mechanisms through which their views can be expressed and are being expressed).
2. To encourage students to mobilize their limited student resources—they have many positions to fill and a relatively small number of students interested in participating—in filling posts in those governance structures in which the student input is vital and is not being rejected as effectively as it should be and could be.

PATRICIA SWARTZ
Senator
The motion above was entered into the docket for the November 15 meeting of the University Senate. After debate in that meeting, it was referred to the Senate Consultative Committee for consideration and presentation at the winter quarter meeting. Following Consultative Committee discussion of the motion and of related governance questions in its meetings of November 15, December 6, and January 17, including a discussion with Professor Swan, the SCC on January 17 voted 15-0 with one abstention to recommend that the Senate not adopt the motion.

JACK MERWIN, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

DOUGLAS MELBY, Chair
Student Consultative Committee

MOTION:

That the rules be suspended to allow principal speakers for and against the motion 6 minutes each.

RICHARD PURPLE, Chair
Business & Rules Committee

INFORMATION:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy takes the position that the University is a community of scholars and that such a community relies on the involvement of both students and faculty, with mutual respect for each other, for producing a sound educational environment. The committee's scope is a broad one that extends to a variety of concerns in the University, such as curricula, student support, faculty interests, research and governance of the University. On this latter point we feel governance involves both faculty and students; without this mutuality, educational policy will suffer.

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has no doubt that there are problems concerning apathy and contributions to the debate in the Senate. There may be some evidence for the contention that the students do not participate as actively and as well as we might hope, but similar complaints could also be made about faculty participation. There are, no doubt, various ways of dealing with these problems, and several alternatives should be explored to improve the contributions that students and faculty make to debate and decision-making in this all-University body. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy considers the motion before us but one alternative, and one that does not serve the best educational interests of this scholarly community of students and faculty. We recommend that the motion being presented by Professor Swan be rejected.

F. GERALD KLINE, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

Defeated, 125 to 42

III. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

(5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Bylaws of the University Senate be amended as follows:

Article III, Senate Committees, A. Consultative; Duties and Responsibilities, (2) Faculty Consultative Committee (first clause): "to meet separately, when necessary, to discuss with the president, or others, matters of primary concern to the faculty."
Article III, Senate Committees, A. Consultative; Duties and Responsibilities, (3) Student Consultative Committee (first clause): “to meet separately, when necessary, to discuss with the president, or others, matters of primary concern to the student body.”

COMMENT:

The Consultative Committee at its meeting of January 17 voted 15-0 with one abstention in favor of the above change. Members believe the two subgroups (Faculty Consultative Committee and Student Senate Consultative Committee) should not be constrained as to what they discuss with the president or with others.

JACK MERWIN
Chair
Approved, 145 to 3

IV. RESEARCH COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
INDIRECT COSTS RECOVERY DISTRIBUTION
(5 minutes)

MOTION:

Whereas the effective use of recovered indirect costs requires flexibility in furthering the research activities in the different segments of the faculty and whereas there is a strong feeling among the faculty that the different colleges should have a voice in their distribution, the Senate Committee on Research moves that the Vice President for Academic Affairs implement the present flexible policy on recovered indirect costs distribution, submit a record of the distribution of recovered indirect costs to the Senate Committee on Research at the end of each fiscal year. The Senate Committee on Research will evaluate this record and report its findings to the Senate. If widespread objections are voiced, the Senate Committee on Research, in concert with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, will develop a new policy.

COMMENT:

In 1975, the Senate Committee on Research recommended a set of guidelines for indirect costs recovery which was approved by the Senate, but not submitted for approval to the Regents. It never became University policy. In fall 1983, the Vice President for Academic Affairs placed before the Senate Finance Committee the following proposal:

“To take advantage of this new situation, we propose the following plan: At the end of each fiscal year (beginning in 1983-84) the proportion of the total indirect cost recovery generated by each collegiate unit will be calculated and the excess indirect cost recovery (the amount over $11.9M, which is the required legislative offset) will be determined. One-third of the excess indirect cost recovery will be distributed to the colleges in proportion to the fraction of total indirect cost recovery that they were responsible for generating. The remaining two-thirds will be retained centrally but used only for purposes which have the effect of stimulating research at the University. An appropriate portion of the money made available to the central administration at the end of the first year will be set aside as a contingency fund to protect us against the need to tax colleges in the future should we encounter a shortfall in indirect cost recovery.”

No objections were forthcoming.

This proposal was read to the Regents without objection and has become University policy.
Faculty members who served on the 1975 Senate Committee on Research sent a protest to the Senate Committee on Research that the amount to be kept centrally was much higher than the 1975 guideline recommended. In his appearance before the Senate Committee on Research in March 1984, the Vice President for Academic Affairs demonstrated the need for flexibility in handling recovered indirect costs. He suggested that the Senate Committee on Research and, through them, the Senate judge his performance after the fact and expressed his willingness to submit a report on indirect costs disbursements to the Senate Committee on Research. The committee feels this policy offers the possibility of permitting the flexibility required for effective use centrally as well as a chance to verify adherence to the spirit of the faculty consensus. We recommend passage of this motion.

JOHN L. SULLIVAN, Chr.
Research Committee

INFORMATION:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has strongly and unanimously endorsed the proposal concerning distribution of indirect costs funds generated by research support agencies external to the University.

F. GERALD KLINE, Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

INFORMATION:

The Senate Consultative Committee has examined the motion from the Senate Committee on Research regarding policy on distribution of recovered indirect costs and annual reporting by the Vice President for Academic Affairs to the Research Committee. The Consultative Committee strongly endorses the motion in principle.

JACK MERWIN, Chr.
Consultative Committee

Approved

V. MOTION BY FACULTY SENATOR

SEMESTER/QUARTER SYSTEM
Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Senate adopt the following resolution: RESOLVED, that no definitive action be taken on the possible changeover from the quarter system to the semester system until there has been adequate opportunity—for the Senate Consultative Committee to discuss the matter thoroughly and for the Senate to debate the issue.

EDWARD P. NEY
Faculty Senator

COMMENT:

The Senate Consultative Committee will move to suspend the rules and take up Senator Ney’s resolution for action.

JACK MERWIN, Chr.
Consultative Committee
VI. EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-84

Fall quarter 1983 meetings were spent discussing the funding situation for development programs. In addition to the EDP grants and the Small Grants Program, there were three other items:

1. A request from the Office of International Programs (OIP) that we fund a part ($15,000) of their new grant program, which is partially funded by Exxon.

2. A prior commitment (1982) to financially participate ($34,000 in FY84 and $55,200 in FY85) in the Program for Active Learning, which is to be primarily funded ($150,000 over 3 years) by the Northwest Area Foundation.

3. An unspecified amount to support programs that are expected to emerge from the recently organized Student Experience Task Force.

The committee agreed to fund the OIP request, as it addressed development objectives that are similar to those of the Small Grants Program, but with a focus on international issues. The committee acknowledged the prior commitment to the Active Learning Program, but raised questions about the programs that would be forthcoming from the Student Experience Task Force. Relying heavily upon the judgment and experience of Tom Benson, Director of the Center for Educational Development, funding recommendations were developed and sent to John Wallace, Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs, on November 9, 1983.

There followed a process of informal negotiation, including meetings with John Wallace, where he shared what he knew about the Task Force and expressed confidence that effective programs would emerge. Funding levels were finally reported on February 7, 1984, through a letter from John Wallace which indicated:

- $160,000 College Level EDP
- $50,000 Small Grants Program
- $50,000 OIP/Exxon Program ($15,000) and Northwest Area Program ($35,000)
- $70,000 “Held Back” for New Programs Emerging from Student Experience Task Force

$330,000 Total

With funding established, the usual activities of soliciting, reviewing, and ranking proposals were carried out with subsequent awards. The OIP request utilized guidelines similar to ours, and a member of our committee participated in their review process.

In the College Program, 57 grants were awarded, totaling $157,004. In the Small Grants Program, 95 requests were received, amounting to $229,877. After many hours of spirited discussion, 38 grants were funded, for a total of $54,961, with the median grant being $1,574.

In summary, this was a transitional year, where the development programs were affected by retrenchment and an administrative restructuring. While the total allocation of $330,000 could be viewed as the University’s commitment to educational development, only the College Program, the Small Grants Program, and the OIP portion were subject to the quality control resulting from the proposal reviews by the committee. The EDP portion was up slightly from the 1982-83 allocation, but far below the 1981-1982 level of $265,000. The total for small grants and the OIP request was about $10,000 under the previous year’s allocation of $80,000.

The committee expressed concern over the belt tightening in the traditional EDP-Small Grants Programs, while making funds available for new programs that are not formally reviewed by the committee. This is an area that should be closely watched to see if it is a trend or merely a transitional phenomenon, as it affects the role of the Educational Development Committee.

PATRICK J. STARR
Chairman

Accepte
VII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT
(15 minutes)
None

VIII. OLD BUSINESS
(15 minutes)
None

IX. NEW BUSINESS
(15 minutes)
None

X. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

FRIEDRICH ACHBERGER
1948-1984

Our friend, colleague, and teacher Friedrich Achberger was killed in a tragic automobile accident on September 23, 1984. He leaves behind his wife, Karen, and his two children, Erica and Tilman. In Fritz Achberger the profession has lost a scholar who was internationally known at 36 and whose publications pointed to a future of great promise. All of us have lost in him an exemplary teacher and colleague and a genuine comrade.

Fritz Achberger was born in Graz, Austria, on June 29, 1948. He received his Magister Phil. at the University of Graz in 1973 and a Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin in Madison in 1977. In the fall of 1978 he came to the University of Minnesota as an assistant professor, and last spring he was tenured and promoted to associate professor. His chief scholarly interest was Austrian literature as well as the literature of the German Democratic Republic. His publications were concerned with German and Austrian literature of the turn of the century, the time between the two World Wars, and most recent literature. They, as well as his translations (some done in association with his wife), appeared in Europe and America. The manuscript for a book with the working title “Austrian Literature 1918-1938: Commentary on an Epoch,” which was to be published by Winkler Verlag, had progressed to the point where it would have been concluded during a sabbatical in 1985. His lectures and papers at numerous meetings impressed his audiences with their expertise, logic, lucidity, and the courage shown in presenting conclusions which were often unconventional.

But we, his colleagues and students, will remember him above all as a most unusual human being. From the first day of his work at this University his teaching was constantly enriched by new ideas and techniques, practices, and activities. Being the youngest member of the faculty, he often acted as the advocate of our graduate students, whose concerns he knew and made his own. His students, whether in the area of language teaching or literature, loved him and followed him with admiration. His colleagues recognized his talents as a scholar and teacher from the very beginning of his career, and the decision for tenure and promotion was made unanimously. When the tenure was granted, Fritz wrote to all of the people who had written letters for him: “I interpret my promotion as a charge and an obligation rather than a receipt for my modest achievements during the past. I accept your recommendation as the expression of your belief in my future and I promise that I will not disappoint you.”

He was a superb teacher but also an excellent listener. His frequent and intelligent wit, which often had a number of levels, never injured anyone. He had firm political and social convictions which he never concealed for motives of expediency; in his last years he was an active member of the peace movement, to which he devoted much time and energy. Wherever he was needed, he gave generously of himself and his substance. His life has enriched ours no end.
CHARLES CONLEY
1933-1984

Professor Charles C. Conley of the School of Mathematics died suddenly on November 20, 1984, at the age of 51.

Professor Conley was born September 26, 1933, in Royal Oak, Michigan. He received the degrees of B.S. in 1957 and M.A. in 1958 from Wayne State University, and the Ph.D. from M.I.T. in 1961. He was a member of the Department of Mathematics at the University of Wisconsin from 1963 to 1984 and a member of the Minnesota faculty for less than three months.

Conley was a most distinguished mathematician, perhaps the strongest person in the U.S. working in the area of differential equations and dynamical systems. He was known for his deep geometrical insight in dynamical systems theory, together with a wide range of interests, including contributions to celestial mechanics, mathematical biology, and nonlinear wave propagation. The "Conley Index" for vector fields is a widely used mathematical tool. Conley index theory, developed by him, his students, and collaborators over many years, has become a whole new field in mathematics. Conley's most remarkable work was his recent joint effort with E. Zehnder generalizing the fixed point theorem of Birkhoff and solving an important special case of the Ar'ndold conjecture on the number of periodic orbits for a class of differential equations. This paper settled a question which a number of major mathematicians had tried to solve without success.

One of Conley's greatest distinctions was his ability to train graduate students in mathematical research. He cared deeply about his students, of whom 13 received their Ph.D.'s under his guidance, and he was very proud of their later successes. At Minnesota Professor Richard McGehee and Assistant Professor Richard Moeckel are former Conley students, as is Professor David Appleyard of Carleton College.

Professor Conley is survived by his wife, Catharine Anastasia, and three children, Charles Henry, Catharine Anastasia, and John Alan.

LOUISE ROFF
1907-1985

Louise Roff died on January 25, 1985, at the age of 77. She served as director of Continuing Education for Women from 1966 until she retired in 1974.

Louise Roff graduated from the University of Minnesota with a degree in history in 1929, did graduate work in psychology at Cornell, lived and worked in Europe and six before becoming director of Continuing Education for Women. Under her leadership the program grew from a two-seminar experiment with a mini staff of one secretary to an expanded program of multiple alternatives and a staff of eight persons. Initially the program was designed to encourage married, college educated women to return to college because educated women were needed in the job market. It was during Roff's term as director that the program evolved into one offering options for women students of every age and status and began to attract men as well. Her creativity was largely responsible for that growth.

Following her retirement in 1974, Louise Roff moved with her husband (Merrill Roff, professor of psychology, University of Minnesota) to Goleta, Santa Barbara County, California. Although she enjoyed gardening, walking the beach, and roaming the hills of Santa Barbara, she never neglected her commitment to civic and social causes, working for the Santa Barbara League of Women Voters, and community committees on arms control and air pollution.

She will be remembered by many as an inspiration for continuing education. She never stopped continuing her own.
GEORGE J. SCHROEPFER
1906-1984

George John Schroepfer, professor emeritus of sanitary engineering in the Department of Civil and Mineral Engineering, died in Minneapolis on March 11, 1984.

Born in St. Paul, Minnesota, on September 7, 1906, George Schroepfer attended Cretin High School and graduated in 1924. He enrolled in civil engineering at the University of Minnesota, graduating in March 1928 with a B.S. degree. An M.S. degree followed in June 1930, and a professional civil engineering (C.E.) degree in June 1932. Ph.D. degree studies began, but Schroepfer was soon deflected from these by an exceptional opportunity and challenge to play a key role in the development of major new sewage treatment facilities (capital cost $16 million in 1933) for the Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan region. In November 1933, he accepted the position of assistant chief engineer for the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District (now the Metropolitan Waste Control Commission), with responsibility for the design and construction of the new facilities. In June 1938 he was appointed chief engineer and superintendent of the sanitary district.

These official duties notwithstanding, George Schroepfer retained an active involvement with the University and sanitary engineering education. From 1935 to 1943 he presented occasional lectures to students in public health and in civil engineering. In June 1943 he accepted part-time appointment as lecturer in the Department of Civil Engineering; and in September 1945 he became professor of sanitary engineering at the invitation of Civil Engineering Department Head, Dr. Lorenz Straub. Research laboratories were quickly established, doctoral graduate students from around the world were attracted to study under Professor Schroepfer's direction, and the University of Minnesota quickly became recognized as a leader in sanitary engineering research.

Recognition of the exceptional academic and professional talents of George Schroepfer came early. As a senior year undergraduate he was admitted to the national honor societies of Chi Epsilon and Tau Beta Pi and received the North-Western Section American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) senior student award. We was admitted to Sigma Xi in 1932. He was elected president of the N-W Section of ASCE in 1943. He was a consultant to the National War Production Board from 1942 to 1945, and in the post-war years became increasingly in demand as a consultant to companies both in the U.S. and abroad, especially in developing countries, and to agencies such as the Pan-American Health Organization, World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and the U.S. Agency for International Development. In 1957, he received the Harrison P. Eddy Award of the Water Pollution Control Federation (WPCF) followed in 1958 by the George W. Fuller Award of the American Water Works Association (AWWA); the Arthur S. Bedell Award of WPCF in 1959, the Radebaugh Award (with W.K. Johnson) of the Central States Water Pollution Control Association in 1966, and the Thomas R. Camp medal of the WPCF in 1970. These and other such awards, a long list of publications and consulting reports and his memberships, both regular and honorary, in many professional organizations are eloquent testimony to a most distinguished and productive professional career. In 1982, George Schroepfer was elected a member of the United States National Academy of Engineering, the highest professional recognition accorded a U.S. engineer by his/her peers, and received for a very select few of the U.S. engineering community.

The sanitary engineer, through the introduction of safe public drinking supplies and waste water treatment plants, has done more world-wide over the last 150 years to raise life expectancy than any other profession, including medicine. George Schroepfer was aware of these contributions, proud to be a member of his profession, and profoundly concerned that a large part of the world still suffers from a lack of these basic needs. He can take comfort that the many students who came to learn from him from all corners of the globe are now themselves pursuing the same objectives and multiplying his own effectiveness. Undoubtedly the most outstanding sanitary engineer in Minnesota and the University of Minnesota, Professor Schroepfer's influence was pervasive indeed and continues to spread unabated.

Those privileged to meet George Schroepfer quickly recognized a man of resolution, determination, and independence, a commanding figure and natural leader, attributes that had certainly helped him toward success in his professional career. Less immediately visible was his deep and abiding humanitarian concern for others, the wit and charm with which
he endeared himself to his colleagues, especially his graduate students. It is not surprising that these students have resolved collectively to equip a conference center to be named in his honor in the newly constructed Civil and Mineral Engineering Building at the University of Minnesota. It is fitting that future students be reminded of this outstanding man, engineer, and faculty member of the University of Minnesota. We join with Mrs. Catherine R. Schroepfer, son Dr. George J. Schroepfer Jr., and daughter Dr. Mary Catherine Schroepfer in sorrow at the passing of George, but are comforted in the knowledge that his good works and their influence will remain.

BRANDON B. SMITH
1936-1965

Brandon Smith, associate professor and director of the Minnesota Research and Development Center in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education, College of Education, died January 1, 1985, in St. Paul Ramsey Medical Center after hospitalization from a massive stroke.

Brandon was born in Kulm, North Dakota, on September 21, 1936. He completed B.S. and M.S. degrees in industrial education at Wisconsin’s Stout State University and from 1961 to 1964 taught in and later chaired the Department of Industrial Education at Ellendale State Teachers College in North Dakota. His Ph.D. in education was completed in 1968 at the University of Minnesota. That same year he joined the University of Minnesota faculty as an assistant professor.

Among his many accomplishments, Brandon served as president of the National Association of Research Coordinating Unit Personnel (1975-76) and as president of the American Vocational Education Research Association (1976-77). He was chairperson of the AVERA Task Force that laid the foundation to create the Journal of Vocational Education Research, now in its tenth volume. For six years he was responsible for the doctoral dissertation sessions in the research section of the annual meetings of the American Vocational Association. He served for nine years as director of the Minnesota Research and Development Center for Vocational Education.

Brandon will be missed by many as a friend, colleague, teacher, and scholar in our profession. In order to develop a continuing remembrance of his life and professional contributions, the Department of Vocational and Technical Education and the University of Minnesota Foundation have established the Brandon Smith Memorial Fund.

Brandon is survived by his mother, Mrs. Alvina Smith, of Lyndon Station, Wisconsin.

DORA V. SMITH
1893-1985

Dora V. Smith, internationally known educator whose career in the College of Education spanned 41 years, died January 28, 1985, at the age of 92.

Dora V. (as she was most often known) completed her B.A. at the University of Minnesota in 1916 and in 1917 joined the College of Education faculty as an instructor. She subsequently completed her M.A. and Ph.D. at the University and by 1937 was a full professor of education, specializing in the teaching of English and literature for children. She retired from University service in 1958.

Throughout her career, Dora V. won numerous honors and awards for her scholarship and leadership exhibited in her teaching and writing. She was named Minnesota Teacher of the Year by the Minnesota League of Women’s Clubs, received the W. Wilbur Hatfield Distinguished Service Award from the National Council of Teachers of English, and upon her retirement received the University of Minnesota’s Outstanding Achievement Award. She was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, served as president of the National Council of Teachers of English, chaired the National Commission on English Curriculums, and served for many years on the editorial board of Cadmus Books.

Walter Cook, former dean of the College of Education, said of Dora V. on her retirement: “Her devotion to learning, to children, to the enrichment of life through books has been continuous and contagious. From her presence, her listeners carry away some of her own indomitable courage, some of her generous warmth of spirit, her great humanitarianism, and her lifelong dedication to the welfare of children.”

The Minnesota League of Women’s Colleges, the University of Minnesota’s Alumni Association, the Minnesota Teachers Association, and the University of Minnesota’s Board of Regents have established the Brandon Smith Memorial Fund in order to develop a continuing remembrance of this outstanding man, engineer, and faculty member of the University of Minnesota. We join with Mrs. Catherine R. Schroepfer, son Dr. George J. Schroepfer Jr., and daughter Dr. Mary Catherine Schroepfer in sorrow at the passing of George, but are comforted in the knowledge that his good works and their influence will remain.
and her conviction about the importance of excellence in teaching." As a lasting tribute to these qualities, the College of Education has established the Dora V. Smith Memorial Scholarship Fund.

Dora V. is survived by her brother, George Smith, of Lawrence, Kansas, and two nephews, Stuart Smith, of Rome, Georgia, and Malcolm Smith of Indianapolis, Indiana.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Interim President Kenneth Keller at 3:40 p.m. The minutes of the November 15 meeting were approved.

Student governance, University Senate. President Keller reminded the Senate of its referral to the Consultative Committee of the motion to eliminate students (except for the student body presidents of the five campuses) from the University Senate. He then recognized the Consultative Committee chair, Jack Merwin, professor of education. Mr. Merwin said his committee had met three times, including a discussion with Professor Patricia Swan, professor of food science and nutrition, who had initiated the proposal. It had decided that there were ways to improve the governance of the Senate but that the Swan plan was not the best and therefore it recommended that the Senate reject it. Richard Purple, professor of physiology and chair of the Business and Rules Committee, announced that the item was of enough importance to warrant suspending the rules to permit six-minute speeches by the primary speakers for and against the motion. His motion was seconded and approved, with some dissent, and John Turner, Regents' professor of political science, rose to speak in support of the motion. First, he acknowledged that his position was not likely to make him Alumnus of the Year; then he reminded the Senate that before students became part of the Senate in 1969, the faculty had had a mechanism for a clear expression of its views. Then, he said, in 1969 the Faculty Senate was replaced by a new body that was constitutionally superior to the Faculty Senate, where about 37 percent of the total membership were students. He went on to cite other avenues that the students enjoy that are not available to the faculty, such as direct access to the Board of Regents, regular closed meetings with the President, and a Vice President for Student Affairs. He claimed the University is out of step with most other higher education institutions. He pointed out that the Consultative Committee, the executive body of the Senate, is composed of nine faculty members and nine students. He said that his experience with the current student leaders had proven that they are dedicated but that they have the very difficult task of trying to work with a student body that is made up largely of commuters and who for many reasons drop in and drop out of student activities, so there is little continuity. He noted that only seven percent of the student body voted in the last election and asked whom the current leaders spoke for. Attendance figures in recent years showed an average of 54 percent for the students and 81 percent for the faculty. Last year, he said, was especially unstable with many students resigning or being terminated for nonattendance; no faculty senators were terminated. He said there were 15 students absent from the fall meeting and, if they were not present at the current meeting, they should not be counted in the total for the Senate membership, thus making it impossible to determine what the required vote would be to pass an amendment to the constitution, bylaws, or rules. In conclusion, he said he favored a complete break, not a compromise—that autonomous faculty senate was what the University needed and the faculty deserved.

Richard Shope, Consultative Committee member and speaker of the MSA Forum, said there were two issues: whether the students should be part of the governance structure and student attendance and participation under the current structure. As to the first point he said both students and faculty are part of the University community and both should be part of its governance structure. He claimed the University is not out of step with other institutions but rather a step ahead. He admitted attendance is a problem as well as filling student positions in committees of the Senate and Assembly, but that orientation sessions had been held for new appointees and that committee slots had been filled. He said the Swan amendment
"throws out the baby with the bath water," and asked what the amendment's proponents really wanted. He urged the Senate to do what it believed was right and just.

Norman Garmezy, professor of psychology, said the amendment would not remove student influence in that the mechanism for interchange would still exist. He cited the recent dramatic changes in the University's mission being proposed by President Keller as a subject that called for a faculty position. He said that the climate in 1968-69 when the students entered the Senate constituency was one with a potential for strife, but that the situation was different now. Charles Farrell, Consultative Committee member and Student Senate chair, cited a number of examples from recent Consultative Committee agendas where student participation was critical, and concluded that the vast majority of issues on the Senate docket were important to students.

Ms. Swan said that, in 1969, giving up the Faculty Senate had cost the faculty a sense of common purpose, its understanding of the opportunities, problems, and constraints within various collegiate units, and its opportunity for dialogue with the administration. She said that the business of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly had been often ignored, and that student senators often attended only when they had a particular interest in a topic. She maintained that the Senate should be engaged in the long-term course of the University and that student tenure in the Senate was too short to make a commitment in that area. She said that the faculty deserved a governance structure in which it could speak with a clear voice after a thoughtful exchange of information and views with a broadly representative group of colleagues, and that under the current structure clear-cut faculty expression could not occur. Concluding, she said a new president would not be likely to be a party to a major restructuring of the Senate and that, if it were not done now, there could be a long wait.

Linda Hanson, student, pointed out that the amendment would destroy the governance structure at the all-University level, but leave the students on committees, which are part of the Senate structure. She thought there was negligence on the part of the faculty, too, in participation. She said the orientation of students had been very effective as had a recent booklet published by the Student Committee on Committees to explain to students the workings of each committee. Marilyn Rossmann, associate professor of home economics education, thought it was unfortunate that the motion was perceived as a move against students rather than an effort to frame a structure for lively discussions of the welfare of the University and its faculty. She said there was little commitment to dialogue by the faculty under the current structure, and cited Macalester where spirited debate and discussion takes place in its faculty body. She supported the Swan motion or creation of some other way for faculty participation. Kent Bales, professor of English, said he had an impulse to quote, "A plague on both your houses,"—that the University was beset by a chronic low-grade fever. He cited consideration by the Senate in December 1971 of a report, "1985 and Beyond," when a recess was called because there was not a quorum; by the January continuation meeting the first stage of the planning document had already taken place. He said that being a senator was like trying to represent a dinosaur, that it was very difficult to react to a planning document, for example. He said that a remedy was needed but tinkering with the Senate constitution would not help. At this point a 15-minute extension of time for discussion was approved.

Roger Stuewer, professor of physics, claimed it was unusual not to have an autonomous faculty body, that the quality of the University could not be separated from the quality of its faculty and its commitment to its mission of teaching, research, and service, and a faculty senate could be a useful tool in facilitating actions directed toward achievement of that mission, with the students the direct beneficiaries. Bert Ahern, professor of history, Morris, said he was a member of the 1968-69 Task Force on Student Representation, and he recalled that it was a time of optimism. He said possibilities exist for improving the structure but the current proposal was not the right way to do it. Marcia Pankake, assistant professor, libraries, said she knew she was "wrapping myself in the threadbare cloak of a lost cause," but she thought a more effective governance structure would be one where students could speak in one body and the faculty in another. She said that participation in the current structure meant diminished time for teaching and preparation. She said a "yes" vote would send a clear signal to the Consultative Committee that improvements are needed. Jacqueline Jodl, student body president on the Twin Cities campus, agreed that there should be a fac-
so a clear faculty voice could be heard, but that the Swan motion was not the solution. The voice, she said, should be blended with the students.

John Dahler, professor of chemical engineering and material science, asked how the student leaders could be representative of students when only seven percent of the student body participated in their election. Ms. Jodi said she was demographically representative of students. She said it was hard to reach students on a large, commuter campus, and she would seek suggestions from Professor Turner on ways to improve interest in the Senate. Another 15-minute extension for debate was approved.

Burham Terrell, professor of philosophy, claiming to be the “oldest beard on the campus,” said there was no Consultative Committee when he came to the University—that the University was run by the “barons.” Then, he said, the “barbarians” took over and in 1969 the Senate was opened to students. He was one of the architects of that plan, he said. He admired the courage of the movers of the motion, and said it was clear that something needed to be done by the Consultative Committee to provide for the faculty to speak with one voice. A motion by Delbert Hastings, professor of management, to postpone the vote until the next meeting failed for lack of a second. Mr. Turner moved that the vote be by written ballot. After a discussion with the parliamentarian and Mr. Turner, the President ruled that only a majority was needed on the vote. The Turner motion was defeated by a substantial margin, and the main motion was defeated 125 to 42.

Warren Ibele, professor of mechanical engineering, noted that the next agenda item was to move toward improving faculty consultation, and said that, for another step, he was prepared to move that votes taken at Senate meetings be recorded separately for faculty senators and student senators. His proposal was referred by the chair to the Consultative Committee.

Consultative Committee responsibilities. Explaining that the motion was similar to the earlier Assembly proposal, Mr. Merwin pointed out that it would broaden the agenda for meetings with the President by the Consultative Committees. The motion was approved without debate.

Indirect costs recovery distribution. John Sullivan, professor of political science and chair of the Research Committee, introduced a proposal for an annual report by the Academic Affairs Vice President on the distribution of recovered indirect costs to the Research Committee, which would review it and report to the Senate. He added that the Consultative and Educational Policies Committees supported the motion. Mr. Dahler asked if there were any time restrictions on developing a new policy if there were widespread objections to the proposed policy. Mr. Sullivan said objections could be voiced to his committee at any time. The motion was then approved unanimously.

Semester/Quarter system. Mr. Merwin moved that the rules be suspended to hear and take action on a motion by Edward Nye, Regents' professor of astronomy. His motion was approved. Mr. Nye moved that there should be no changeover to the semester system until all the facts had been collected for Consultative Committee discussion and Senate debate. Thomas Clayton, professor of English, reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee wholeheartedly supported the motion and urged approval, after which the Senate voted unanimously in favor of it.

There being no further business, the Senate rose in respect to its deceased colleagues and adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
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UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

The meeting of the Student Senate was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, following the University Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 60 voting members of the student body and 5 nonvoting members. Charles Farrell presided.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 15
   Action (2 minutes)

   Approved

II. COMMITTEES OF THE STUDENT SENATE

INFORMATION:
STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Eric Stroschein (UMC).
STUDENT LOBBY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (an extended subcommittee of Student Consultative Committee) Beth Emmanuelson, Charles Farrell (UMM), Nick Haugerud, Tim Leingang, Craig Miller (UMD), Greg Miller (UMW), Kathy Nelson, Paul Schulte (chair), and Eric Stroschein (UMC).

Accepted

III. STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

INFORMATION:
The Chair of the Student Senate has designated the following as interim officers for 1984-85: Clerk, Marilee Ward; Treasurer, Patricia Gearrick. (The constitutional amendments to formalize these positions as still pending before the Business and Rules Committee.)

Accepted

IV. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

Charles Farrell, chair of the Student Senate, called the meeting to order. The minutes of the last meeting were approved; the membership on two committees and interim officers were accepted, and the meeting was adjourned.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor