

(1996-97) UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA (No. 5)

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
MAY 15, 1997**

The fifth meeting of the University Senate for 1996-97 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, May 15, 1997, at 2:00 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 122 voting faculty/academic professional members, 35 voting student members, 1 ex officio member, and 5 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

**I. ELECTION OF THE VICE CHAIR FOR 1997-98
Action**

Professor M. Janice Hogan was unanimously elected as vice chair of the Senate for the 1997-98 academic year.

**II. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Policy on Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships
Action**

PREAMBLE:

The policy on Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships is the result of substantial efforts by the Sexual Harassment Board to develop a policy that is broadly supported by the University community. The Board has spent over a year consulting with a wide range of university committees, groups, and administrators in order to achieve this goal. The policy has been unanimously endorsed by several Senate Committees (including SCFA, EOWC, and SSCC), and University committees representing other groups on campus (Academic Staff Advisory Committee, Civil Service Committee). The Executive Committee of the Commission on Women also has unanimously endorsed the policy as has the CLA Council of Chairs. Finally, the Board has consulted with appropriate administrators (including Marvin Marshak, Senior VP for Academic Affairs; Carol Carrier, Associate VP for Human Resources; and Stephanie Lieberman, Director of OEE/AA).

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following Policy on Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships:

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA POLICY ON
SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND CONSENSUAL RELATIONSHIPS
SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Section 1: Introduction

Sexual harassment in any situation is reprehensible and will not be tolerated in this University. It subverts the mission of the University and threatens the careers and well-being of students, faculty and staff. In a university setting, a power differential is inherent in a faculty member's or supervisor's relationship to his or her students or subordinates. However, this policy takes into account all instances of sexual harassment irrespective of university status. It is viewed as a violation of Title VII and Title IX of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Minnesota Human Rights Act.

Section 2: Policy

Sexual harassment is prohibited. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and/or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:

- (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic advancement,
- (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or academic decisions affecting this individual, or
- (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

This policy applies to the conduct of all persons involved in the mission and/or services of the University, except those whose conduct may be covered under separate university collective bargaining contracts.

Section 3: Procedures and Guidelines

It is the responsibility of department heads, supervisors, managers, deans, provosts, chancellors and vice presidents to take timely and appropriate action when they know or should know of the existence of sexual harassment. Other persons who suspect sexual harassment should report it to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action. Responsibility for administering the policy and procedures generally lies with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action with review by the Sexual Harassment Board. Each campus will develop procedures for investigating complaints of sexual harassment. These procedures will adhere to due process for all concerned. They must be approved by the Director of the University Equal Opportunity Office prior to implementation. Violations of this policy could lead to disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment or dismissal from an academic program.

CONSENSUAL SEXUAL OR ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Section 1: Introduction

Decision-making responsibilities should not restrict individuals' rights of association and expression unless the exercise of those freedoms conflicts with the institutional necessity of impartiality in academic and employment decisions. As a consequence, the University's Nepotism Policy prohibits persons who are related through blood, marriage or other committed

relationship to evaluate, supervise, or participate in employment decisions regarding the other person. The same rules apply to sexual or romantic relationships between supervisors and their subordinates who are not married or in committed relationships because these relationships may also call into question the ability of the supervisor to assess the performance of another solely on academic or professional merit. Similarly, the University Code of Conduct states that members of the University community must not abuse the authority they have been given and must take care to ensure that any personal relationships do not result in situations that might interfere with objective judgment.

The power disparity in supervisor/subordinate relationships make them vulnerable to exploitation as well as claims of exploitation. This is particularly true in faculty/student relationships. The respect and trust accorded a member of the faculty by a student as well as the power exercised by faculty in giving grades or recommendations for future study and employment make voluntary consent by the student suspect.

Section 2: Policy

For the purposes of this policy, the term supervisor refers to any employee, student, or other person in a position to hire, supervise, grade, advise, evaluate, or otherwise directly influence the academic progress or employment of another employee, student, or other person. The term subordinate refers to any employee, student, or other person who is hired, supervised, graded, advised, evaluated, or otherwise directly influenced by the supervisor.

Given the complexity of the University and the variety of relationships that can exist, different standards apply to different types of relationships that generally fall under the above category.

- (1) Sexual or romantic relationships between instructors and advisors and their current students, and between supervisors and their immediate subordinates, are always prohibited whether or not the relationship is consensual.
- In other situations involving less direct supervisory relationships, it may be possible to eliminate the conflict of interest by ensuring that the individuals do not evaluate or otherwise directly influence each other's employment. In these cases, the individuals must consult with an appropriate responsible administrator (e.g., a supervisor, Department head, human resources consultant, EEO officer, or Dean) so that such arrangements to eliminate the conflict can be made and documented.
- Individuals should be aware that consensual sexual or romantic relationship can result in claims of sexual harassment because the voluntariness of the consent may be questioned when a power differential exists. If a sexual harassment claim subsequently is filed, the argument that the relationship was consensual will be evaluated in light of this power differential.

Section 3: Procedures and Guidelines

The Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action may be consulted with respect to the appropriate procedures to be used in making alternative arrangements to eliminate conflicts of interest. It is the responsibility of the supervisor(s) of the parties to address violations of this

policy. Violations of this policy could lead to disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment or dismissal from an academic program.

This policy should be reevaluated three years following its adoption.

DANIEL FEENEY, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
VIRGINIA GRAY, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

DISCUSSION:

Professor Daniel Feeney, Chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA), presented the policy for action and told senators it had been modified to reflect suggestions made at the previous Senate meeting. The Policy, he said, has received support throughout the University community as well as unanimous support within SCFA. He then asked Professor Patricia Frazier, chair of the Sexual Harassment Board, to make some comments.

Professor Frazier reviewed the background of and consultation process for the Policy, as well as the changes that had been made since the previous Senate meeting. She noted the changes in the Procedures section of both the Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationships Policy and the language that was added to the Introduction of the Consensual Relationships section to clarify the distinction between this policy and the Nepotism Policy.

Next, Professor Frazier introduced a motion to substitute Section 2 in the Consensual Sexual or Romantic Relationships portion of the policy with the following language:

CONSENSUAL SEXUAL OR ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

....

Section 2: Policy

For the purposes of this policy, the term supervisor refers to any employee, student, or other person in a position to hire, supervise, grade, advise, evaluate, or otherwise directly influence the academic progress or employment of another employee, student, or other person. The term subordinate refers to any employee, student, or other person who is hired, supervised, graded, advised, evaluated, or otherwise directly influenced by the supervisor.

Consensual sexual or romantic relationships between supervisors and subordinates (as defined above) create conflicts of interest. If such a relationship exists or develops, an appropriate responsible administrator (e.g., a supervisor, department head, human resources consultant, EEO officer, dean) must be consulted to determine whether arrangements can be made to eliminate all conflicts of interest. If such arrangements can be made, they must be documented, and they must ensure that the individuals do not hire,

supervise, grade, advise, evaluate, or otherwise directly influence each other's academic progress or employment.

Some relationships involve such inherent conflicts of interest that the conflicts cannot be eliminated. Therefore, consensual sexual or romantic relationships between instructors and advisors and their current students are always prohibited whether or not the relationships are consensual. Similarly, relationships between supervisors and their subordinates are prohibited when the working relationship is such that it is not possible to eliminate the conflicts of interest.

Individuals should be aware that consensual sexual or romantic relationships can result in claims of sexual harassment because the voluntariness of the consent may be questioned when a power differential exists. If a sexual harassment claim subsequently is filed, the argument that the relationship was consensual will be evaluated in light of this power differential.

.....

The motion was seconded and the floor was opened for discussion.

Several friendly amendments were introduced to modify the wording in the second and third paragraphs of the substitute language, as follows:

Consensual sexual or romantic relationships between supervisors and subordinates (as defined above) create conflicts of interest. If such a relationship exists or develops, an appropriate responsible administrator (e.g., a supervisor, department head, human resources consultant, EEO officer, dean) must be consulted to determine whether arrangements can be made to eliminate all conflicts of interest. If such arrangements can be made that do not disadvantage the subordinate and are acceptable to the supervisor, they must be documented, and they must ensure that the individuals do not hire, supervise, grade, advise, evaluate, or otherwise directly influence each other's academic progress or employment.

Some relationships involve inherent conflicts of interest that cannot be eliminated. Therefore, sexual or romantic relationships between instructors and students currently in their classes and between advisors and their current advisees are always prohibited whether or not the relationships are consensual. Similarly, relationships between supervisors and their subordinates are prohibited when the working relationship is such that it is not possible to eliminate the conflicts of interest.

The motion to substitute section 2, as amended, of the Consensual Sexual and Romantic Relationships portion of the policy with the new language was then approved and the original motion, as amended, was approved.

APPROVED, as amended

**III. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
Resolution Recommending an Energy and Environment Policy
for the University of Minnesota
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following Resolution:

**University Senate Resolution Recommending an
Energy and Environment Conservation Policy
for the University of Minnesota**

WHEREAS, the University has established a tradition of energy conservation and a concern for the environmental impact of its actions, and

WHEREAS, the issue of energy conservation has become of critical importance in decisions on the purchase and operation of University properties, and

WHEREAS, the issue of global climatic change has emerged as an issue of paramount concern in the scientific community, and

WHEREAS, President Clinton has pledged that the USA should stabilize its emission of greenhouse gases at 1990 levels by the year 2000, and

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Urban CO₂ Project Plan offers a framework for substantially reducing metropolitan CO₂ emissions,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
RECOMMENDS:**

That the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota adopt as University policy the consideration of conservation of energy resources in the purchase and operation of University properties, and

That the Board of Regents should reaffirm the University's commitment to conserve natural resources in the construction, renovation, and maintenance of University structures for the optimal utilization of space in all future buildings and building site plans, and

That the Board of Regents should reaffirm the University's commitments to pollution reduction and waste abatement programs.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning and the Social Concerns Committee agree that the Facilities Management Subcommittee should serve in a liaison role between Facilities Management and the Committee on Finance and Planning with respect to the energy conservation and environmental impact issues pertaining to the operation and maintenance of University properties.

SUPPORTING STATEMENTS

- I. Guidelines for Internal Energy Use
 - A. Reduce energy loss in all University -owned and leased buildings
 - a. inventory current energy use
 - b. initiate retrofit programs on existing buildings
 - c. continue participation in EPA's 'Green Lights' and 'Energy Star Buildings' and Demand Side Management programs
 - d. evaluate energy and environmental costs of renovation versus rebuilding
 - B. Expand installation of centralized cooling systems serving multiple University buildings (they offer increased operating efficiencies and economies of scale)
 - C. Reduce energy use in other University operations through investment and purchasing decisions:
 - a. by introduction of new energy technologies (establish partnerships with utilities, businesses, and other governmental agencies to research and make available information on the latest technologies)
 - b. by creation of an Energy Investment Fund, to help implement funding for energy-saving programs
 - D. Promote solid waste reduction and recycling programs at the University
 - E. Reduce energy use and emissions in University's fleet of vehicles
 - a. encourage increased efficiency and use of alternative fuels
 - b. promote the purchase of vehicles with low CO₂ emissions
 - c. reevaluate current fuel efficiency standards for all University vehicles; increase standards where necessary
 - F. Increase public transit ridership
 - a. support municipal and other initiatives for increasing public ridership by University faculty, staff and students living in nearby urban areas
 - b. support U-Pass program
 - G. Increase multiple occupancy vehicle commuting
 - a. continue and expand incentives for car-pooling by staff and students
 - b. lower the parking fees for multiple occupancy vehicles
 - H. Support and extend Campus Connector and Campus Circulator bus services.
 - I. Aggressively promote bicycling as a major transportation mode
 - a. augment bicycle user-friendly policies, such as increased bicycle racks
 - b. introduce lockable racks
 - c. expand sheltered bike parking areas
 - d. introduce restricted campus bicycle lanes and paths.
 - J. Provide still more local energy-efficient housing for off-campus students
 - a. support low rent incentives

- b. modernize amenities
- II. Guidelines for External Energy Use

The University Board of Regents should encourage expanded use of renewable and low-carbon sources of energy production by its suppliers:

- A. Encourage use of natural gas in addition to coal and oil in steam plant operations
- B. Maximize steam plant efficiency by including cogeneration of electricity in steam plant operations
- C. Encourage expansion of wind power as an energy source in NSP's and other supplier's service areas
- D. Encourage implementation of biomass as an energy source
 - a. support and encourage the joint NSP/University biomass project
 - b. support implementation of biomass processing for energy production

ERIC BAUER, Chair, Social Concerns Committee

FRED MORRISON, Chair, Finance and Planning Committee

GARY MALZER, Chair, Facilities Management Subcommittee

DISCUSSION:

Professor Eric Bauer, Chair of the Social Concerns Committee, introduced this item. The University, he said, has a sizable impact on the economics of the state, as well as the ecology. It can be documented that the University has been responsible, and in some cases proactive, in its energy policies. Yet, no document is available that states the University's philosophy on policies of this kind. The proposed Resolution, he said, fills this need in two ways. First, it summarizes historically the University's policies and acts as a guide to future actions. Second, it serves as a reference document so that the community is aware of the University's commitment to the environment.

A senator asked why the steam plant was not included in the Resolution and Professor Bauer replied that in the committee's estimation the steam plant issue was already settled. The proposed Resolution, he said, deals with energy policies in the future.

Professor Bauer was asked to clarify what the committees are supporting in regard to the U Pass program since it would be funded from student fees. The committees, he said, are expressing support of the program itself, not how it is funded.

"Why is nothing included in the supporting statements that directs the construction of new buildings since it is a concern expressed in the Resolution?" inquired a senator. Professor Bauer replied that the supporting statements are not intended to be inclusive but just a list of some of the things that are now possible.

A suggestion was then made that the committee consider changing 'A' under Guidelines for External Energy Use to read, "Encourage use of natural gas to help reduce the use of coal and oil in steam plant operations."

Senator Warren Ibele said it is unfortunate that this kind of policy was not in force before the steam plant issue arose. Many University employees, as well as residents in the surrounding University neighborhood, the Minneapolis City Council, the Mayor, and the Governor have been disturbed with the proceedings concerning the steam plant. When this question was first raised seven years ago there was a proposal that natural gas be used, but that proposal was turned aside. The questions and concerns are still valid today and nothing has yet been resolved.

The vote was then taken on the Resolution and it was unanimously approved, as presented.

APPROVED

**IV. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Resolution on Student Study Space
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following Resolution:

Resolution on Student Study Space

WHEREAS, student study space on campus is of vital concern to the academic environment at the University of Minnesota, and

WHEREAS, in the administration there is no central advocate for student study space and no one person is assigned responsibility for study space, and

WHEREAS, student study space faces deterioration or conversion every year, with little or no student input, and

WHEREAS, there is not a set mandate for a certain percentage of student study space in new or renovated University buildings, and

WHEREAS, student study space in the residence halls is unavailable for use due to overcrowding, and

WHEREAS, student study space has been made increasingly unavailable in food service operation areas, and

WHEREAS, there exists a need for incentives for departmental student study space, and

WHEREAS, increased personal computer use at the University will require an increase in both internet and ethernet jacks across campus,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the University Senate advises the Administration to encourage ongoing examination of student study space on campus by explicitly identifying departments and/or individuals whose role it shall be to monitor the quantity, quality, ease of access and safety of student study space on campus in consultation with student representative bodies, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the University Senate advises that for each renovation of existing buildings and construction of new buildings, a certain percentage of space -- to be determined in consultation with the Senate Committee on Student Affairs and other appropriate student representative bodies -- should be dedicated for student study areas, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Food Services be encouraged to make space available in food service operation areas as student study space during non-peak hours, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the University Senate advises the Administration to encourage departments and other units to preserve and/or add study space, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the University Senate advises that student study space on campus include ethernet access for personal computers in the near future.

JOHN ROMANO, Chair, Student Affairs Committee

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair, Educational Policy Committee

VIRGINIA GRAY, Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

DISCUSSION:

Professor John Romano, Chair of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, introduced the Resolution. He explained that it was initiated by the student members of the committee and after several drafts was strongly endorsed by the committee as a whole. It has also received endorsement by the Educational Policy Committee and the Consultative Committee. Professor Romano then recognized Jesse Berglund, Vice Chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee and a Student Affairs Committee member.

Mr. Berglund told senators he had researched the issue of student study space on campus and it appears at present there is an adequate amount. The committees concern is that there is no oversight of student study space. From 1987-89 there was an effort to increase study space on campus which did lead to an increase in space. Without constant monitoring, however, the committees believe the space will disappear due to renovation or the conversion of study space for other uses. The Resolution asks for an administrative advocate for study space and the committees recommend this responsibility be incorporated into an existing administrative position.

Hearing no comments, the vote was taken and the Resolution was unanimously approved, as presented.

APPROVED

V. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching Data Action

MOTION:

To approve the following Resolution:

Resolution Concerning the Use of Student Evaluations of Teaching Data

The University Senate supports the optional use of student evaluations of teaching data for those questions, on a form to be developed, as a tool in student course selection decision-making.

The University Senate directs the Committee on Educational Policy to develop a plan (1) to implement the May 1, 1997 report of its subcommittee on teaching evaluation (including refinement of the list of proposed questions for the optional evaluation form), (2) to monitor its implementation, and (3) to plan for evaluation of the usefulness of the data for aiding students in course selection.

The University Senate requests that the necessary funding be provided by the University administration to support creation of the required information system.

The University Senate also directs the Committee on Educational Policy to bring back to the Senate, no later than the winter quarter, 1998, meeting, a proposal for action which responds to the three points outlined in paragraph two of this resolution.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair

DISCUSSION:

Professor Laura Koch, Chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), introduced this item and explained that last fall a group of students asked SCEP to look into the possibility of making student evaluations of teaching available as a tool to assist students in their course selections and that in response to their request SCEP appointed a subcommittee to look into the matter. At the same time this was occurring, a bill was introduced in the Legislature to change the Data Practices Act so that evaluations could be made public. The bill has now been referred to committee for review over the summer. While that is occurring, SCEP is continuing its review. Professor Koch then called on Dr. Darwin Hendel to provide the subcommittee's report.

The subcommittee, Dr. Hendel said, examined information internal to the University as well as models at other institutions. He briefly reviewed the subcommittee's report (available in the

Senate Office) which had been distributed to senators prior to the meeting, explaining that the subcommittee focused primarily on the options available to the University.

A senator objected to the Resolution for three reasons. First, senators are being asked to support a resolution of which the details have not been provided. Second, it is proposing to set up two sets of evaluations-- one which will be kept private and a second public one for use by the students which will be seen as fictitious if not hypocritical. Thirdly, the Senate is asking the University to fund the creation of a new information system at a time when the University has no extra money. "What fee then will be raised to pay for this?" queried the senator.

Professor Koch responded by saying SCEP supports the subcommittee report and believes the University should move forward as suggested in the Resolution. Evaluations, she said, are used for three reasons: for making personnel decisions, for improvement of teaching, and to help students make decisions in courses. Evaluations can fulfill these three goals, but the questions that are used for personnel decisions are very different from what students want for help with course decisions. The subcommittee focused on what type of information students would find useful in making course selections.

Another senator noted that the Carlson School of Management has for some time made its evaluations public and in his opinion it has been detrimental to the school. He therefore opposed the resolution. Faculty, he said, have been intimidated by the students which has led to grade inflation.

Mr. Don Ness, Chair of the Student Senate, said students in the Senate and the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) have been very supportive of the Senate process with the expectation that faculty would be willing to work with students to develop a policy rather than rely on the Legislature to change the Minnesota Data Practices Act. Faculty must realize the importance of this issue to students. The benefits would be tremendous and the costs would be minimal relative to the benefits of user-friendliness that the University claims is a priority.

Professor Virginia Gray, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), also spoke in support of the motion. She said she believes it is a responsible and moderate attempt to provide information that students might find useful. The alternative is the current state shield on all employee information. However, the proposal under consideration by the Legislature would remove the shield only for University of Minnesota faculty. This means that any data concerning teaching would become public information and its use would not be restricted to students. An alternative needs to be found which is what SCEP and the subcommittee are doing. The legislative bill is on hold, but the Senate needs to act or that process will resume.

Another senator recalled that several years ago there was student effort at other universities to make evaluations public. However, it was the students who distributed and collected the evaluations, compiled them in a book, and sold the information to the student body. Was this model considered by the subcommittee?

Dr. Hendel responded that other institutions were reviewed where there was a system in place that was separate from centrally collected data. A problem with that arrangement is that there are

two parallel data collection and reporting systems, both of which are asking similar questions and yielding similar results. That approach has been a long-standing tradition at some universities. At the University of Minnesota, there was a publication of this type in the 1970s and later there was an attempt to combine student evaluation information as well as course information into a single publication. What remains of that effort is the Course Guide which is used by students and endorsed by departments and collegiate units. This option was considered, but it does not work as well as other options.

Since the allocated time for discussion of this item had elapsed, a motion was presented to extend discussion for 10 minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

A student subcommittee member reiterated the importance of this matter to students. As he looked around the room he said that he could only identify perhaps 4-5 faculty members. Students talk with one another but should not have to rely on other students to learn about various courses and teachers. Instead, a publication with faculty and student comments would be much more helpful. He asked senators to support the motion allowing the subcommittee to develop questions over the summer that SCEP could bring back to the Senate in the fall.

Several other senators added their support noting that the questions really deal more with the courses rather than the instructors which is information the faculty should be delighted to provide students.

Speaking in opposition to the motion, a senator suggested that if students want descriptive information, they can already find that in the Course Guide. Furthermore, in light of the comments regarding the Carlson School, if there is money to be used for evaluations, it should be used on a study to evaluate the impact of the use of teaching evaluations over the years. The connection between grade inflation and teaching evaluations should be carefully looked at and discussed in a body such as the Senate.

At this time a friendly amendment was proposed and accepted to modify the first sentence of the motion as follows:

The University Senate supports the optional use of student evaluations of teaching data, on a form to be developed, as a tool in student course selection decision-making.

Mr. Rob Vanasek, Chair of the SSCC, informed the Senate that earlier in the day the Student Senate voted unanimously in support of the motion and he hoped the faculty would do the same.

With the extended time for discussion expired, another motion to extend the time by 5 minutes was introduced, but failed on a vote of 57 to 59. The vote on the main motion was then taken and the Resolution was unanimously approved.

APPROVED, as amended

VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Hasselmo first reported that the budget recommended by the legislative conference committee represents a substantial increase for the University even though it contains some non-recurring funds. It will now go to the House and Senate before it is sent to the Governor. The President expressed heart-felt thanks to faculty, staff, students, Regents, alumni, and community supporters in bringing before the Governor the needs, productivity, achievements, and necessity of the University. In June, a budget will be presented to the Board of Regents which will include investments in critical areas, one of which is an increase in the faculty salary pool. At the same time, it is expected that tuition increases will be kept at approximately 2.5%.

Second, the President reported that the administration has had extensive discussions with the Committee of Eight appointed to discuss the Faculty Senate's amendments to the Tenure Code. Progress has been made on both sides to the point where there is agreement on all nine amendments and two interpretations with slight language modification. It should settle the issue in a positive way with full protection of academic freedom and with post-tenure review, as well as flexibility on policies concerning reassignment. He expressed his deep appreciation to the Committee of Eight for their work in this matter.

The flood relief effort continues, said President Hasselmo, and he commended the efforts of University colleagues in Crookston in participating in the original rescue effort and for housing 400 evacuees on campus. They are now vigorously participating in the clean up effort and a crew of University employees will be leaving the Twin Cities Campus on Friday to lend a hand. Special funding has also been provided for students who need assistance. President Hasselmo extended his appreciation to all those who have helped during this difficult time.

Last, President Hasselmo thanked those individuals who have played major roles in University governance during the 1996-97 year.

VII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Question: What increase in tuition is to be expected for graduate students?

Response: There is no plan for anything more than the recommended 2.5% increase. There are two or three areas, however, where rates will be evaluated in terms of the market, impact on access, and impact on the quality of programs.

VIII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Virginia Gray reported that two major activities the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) has worked on since the last Senate meeting are the teaching evaluation issue and a review and discussion of the Kellogg Commission Report on Undergraduate Education. The Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) has focused its attention on the University budget and activities at the Legislature. Time has also been spent working with the Committee of Eight and the administration on tenure. She encouraged the faculty to attend the special Faculty Senate meeting on June 5, at which time senators will be asked to act on a compromise tenure document. The FCC, she added, has also held a number of briefings with the new President. Professor Gray also thanked Senate leaders and committee chairs for all their hard work this

year. Finally, she recognized President Hasselmo and expressed appreciation for his patience, leadership, and understanding over the years. President Hasselmo was then given a standing ovation.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

Senator Hy Berman said he had been moved by the earlier statement by Warren Ibele regarding the steam plant issue and hoped that a statement could be prepared and endorsed by the Senate expressing Professor Ibele's views. He then proposed the following motion:

It is the sense of the Senate to endorse the statements made earlier this afternoon by Warren Ibele in his historical presentation of the process by which the steam plant issue has been raised, and that we deplore the actions of the last seven years.

A motion to suspend the rules to consider the motion was approved and the matter was opened for discussion.

Several senators said they agreed with the statement made by Professor Ibele, but are concerned about adopting a statement at this time and in this way. It is very possible it could do more damage than good and they therefore spoke against the motion.

President Hasselmo said the issue has been under discussion for the past 10 years and a process has been followed, yet many people disagree with the decision that was made in 1992. A year ago, he said, the Chair of the Board of Regents did extend a proposal to the city of Minneapolis for an alternative. The proposal had a deadline of January 31, 1997, for finding financing alternatives, and locating available property. However, there was no response and the issue was then raised again in the Legislature.

A senator said that although this is not the most structured statement, it points out the general dissatisfaction with the process that has taken place and that the Senate does not endorse it or the results.

Professor Ibele expressed his appreciation to Professor Berman, but advised the faculty not to vote on the issue. He said that he finds it ironic that the University requires students to take a course on the environment yet turns around and commits a monumental blunder. The power of the University's autonomy should be used for high and noble purposes such as defending the work of its scholars and not to build a steam power plant.

Professor Berman withdrew his motion citing that the issue has been raised and the sense of discomfort and unhappiness has been voiced and that sentiment will now appear in the public record of the University.

X. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10.

Martha Kvanbeck
Clerk of the Senate