

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

April 19, 1990

The third meeting of the University Senate for 1989-90 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, at 3:15 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 127 voting members of the faculty/academic professionals, 47 voting members of the student body, 3 ex officio, and 7 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 15

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS, 1990-91

Information

In the recent election to fill faculty vacancies on the Senate Consultative Committee, Amos Deinard (Medical School) and Thomas Scott (CLA) were elected for 3-year terms (1990-93). Continuing members include Warren Ibele (IT), W. Andrew Collins (Education), Norman Kerr (Biological Sciences), J. Bruce Overmier (CLA), Charlotte Striebel (IT), and James Van Alstine (UMM). UMC will elect its representative in the spring.

Accepted

III. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1990-91

Action (5 minutes)

The constitution provides that a vice chair shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring quarter from among its members for a term of one year starting July 1.

Postponed

IV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

SCEP CHAIR

Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the Senate bylaws to add the chair of the Educational Policy Committee to the membership of the Senate Consultative Committee as an ex officio, nonvoting member

and to delete that chair from the ex officio membership of the Finance and Planning Committee as follows:

Bylaws Article III, Section 5, Membership, Educational Policy Committee, add at the end of the paragraph: The chair of the committee shall serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Senate Consultative Committee.

Bylaws Article III, Section 8, Membership, Finance and Planning Committee, make deletion as indicated: The Finance and Planning Committee shall be composed of 8 faculty/academic professional members, 4 students, 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate . . . The chairs (or their designees) of the Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs and Research Committee shall serve as ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee. The chair of the committee shall serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Senate Consultative Committee.

COMMENT:

It is the judgment of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) and the Educational Policy Committee that matters of educational policy are of the highest importance to the Senate, and thus to its executive committee (the SCC). At present (as indicated in the excerpt from Section 8 of the bylaws), the chair of the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning is an ex officio, nonvoting member of the SCC. This amendment is intended to make it clear that matters of educational policy are at least on a par with financial issues in the deliberations of the SCC by placing the chair of SCEP on SCC. The amendment is also intended to ensure close, continuing, and effective communication between the two committees.

The chair of SCEP is removed from the Finance and Planning Committee for two reasons. First, the burden of attending two SCEP meetings per month (and chairing), two Finance and Planning meetings per month, and three SCC meetings (two FCC and one SCC) per month is more than can be expected of any one faculty member. This would eliminate two of those meetings. Second, it is expected that the necessary interaction between educational policy and financial issues could take place at the level of the SCC rather than at Finance and Planning.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

Approved, 124 to 0

V. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
STUDENT GOVERNANCE
Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Senate constitution be amended to establish election rules for the Student Senate chair and vice chair and duties for the vice chair as follows:

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

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

MOTION:

That the Senate bylaws be amended to outline the duties of the vice chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee by adding the following paragraph:

Article III, Section 4. Consultative Committees

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

MOTION:

That the Senate bylaws be amended to provide for membership on the Consultative Committee of the chair or vice chair of the Student Senate as follows:

Article III, Section 4. Student Consultative Committee

Membership

"Student vacancies shall be filled . . . until the next regular election.

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

**WARREN IBELE
Chair**

The first motion was approved, 136 to 0, and will be brought back for a second reading at the next meeting.

The second motion was approved, 149 to 0.

The third motion was approved, 148 to 0.

**VI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL STUDENT ASSEMBLY
Action (15 minutes)**

MOTION:

That the Senate constitution be amended to create a Graduate and Professional Student Assembly separate from the Minnesota Student Association as follows:

Article III. University Senate

1. Membership

Change last sentence: "Student body Presidents of the Twin Cities, Duluth, Morris, Crookston, and Waseca campuses student bodies, and the president of the Graduate and Professional Students Assembly, shall, if not otherwise elected, serve as ex officio nonvoting members."

4. Election of University Senate Members

b. Change 2nd paragraph: . . . Graduate School students shall be eligible for election if they have nine credits in residence at the University and are full-time students at the time of voting or are certified as the equivalent of full-time students by the Graduate School . . ."

5. Removal for Neglect of Meetings

d. "A member of the University Senate who holds membership in a campus faculty assembly or a campus student assembly by virtue of holding a membership in the University Senate shall forfeit University Senate membership if membership in the other body is forfeited by failure to satisfy attendance criteria specified in the constitution or bylaws of the body."

MOTION:

That the Senate bylaws be amended to provide committee membership for graduate/professional students as follows:

Article III. Senate Committees

2. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Membership

"The Committee on Committees shall be composed of 9 elected faculty/academic professional members, 6 elected undergraduate students, and one elected Twin Cities graduate/professional student. and 7 elected students."

" . . . Of the undergraduate student members, 43 shall be elected from the Twin Cities campus, and 3 from the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Waseca campuses on an alternating basis, all elected by the Student Senate members from these campuses for one-year terms. Any undergraduate student committee positions that cannot be filled by October 31 will become at-large positions and can be filled by an undergraduate student from any campus. The Twin Cities graduate/professional student shall be elected by the Student Senate members of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Any graduate/professional student committee positions that cannot be filled by October 31 will become at-large positions and can be filled by any graduate or professional student."

"In case of a faculty/academic professional, undergraduate student, or graduate/professional student or student vacancy, the remaining faculty/academic professional, undergraduate student, or graduate/professional student or student members respectively, by majority vote, shall fill the vacancy by interim appointment until the next general election."

Duties and Responsibilities

"a. To forward annually to the Senate for approval names of faculty members, academic professionals, undergraduate students, graduate/professional students, and chairs it recommends for appointment to those committees of the Senate specified in the Bylaws of the Senate. The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various campuses and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the faculty/academic professional, undergraduate students or graduate/professional student member is serving; 3) the principle of rotation of committee assignments; 4) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate students, and graduate/professional student members; and 5) expressions of interest in committee service offered by faculty, academic professionals, undergraduate students, and graduate/professional students . . . The committee also shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, sex, and academic rank in constituting committees."

4. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE"

Student Consultative Committee

Membership

"The Student Consultative Committee shall be composed of 5 undergraduate student members elected from the Twin Cities campus, one student each elected from the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Waseca campuses, students from the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, and the chair of the Student Senate."

"The numbers of undergraduate and graduate/professional students on the Student Consultative Committee from the Twin Cities campus shall be in proportion to the numbers of students represented by their respective assemblies, rounded to the nearest whole number. The Assembly Steering Committee of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly shall determine the time and measures to be used in ascertaining the number of positions allocated to the two groups."

"Student members shall be elected in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses' student constituencies subject to the following provisions: . . ."

COMMENT:

The proposal:

1. Creates and recognizes the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA) and separates it from MSA.

—Needed to elect graduate and professional students to Senate Consultative Committee/Assembly Steering Committee and Senate/Assembly Committee on Committees.

—Does not affect method of election of graduate/professional students to the Senate/Assembly (determined by each unit); graduate and professional student senators remain members of the University Student Senate and through this membership retain contacts with undergraduate students on issues of common interest.

—Changes to whom graduate/professional senators are responsible. Graduate and professional student senators would be responsible to GAPSA rather than MSA; MSA, predominantly undergraduate, would no longer have authority over, or the power to remove, graduate and professional student senators.

—GAPSA would consist of all graduate/professional student senators (about 13), representatives from each graduate and professional student council, and graduate and professional student members of Senate and Assembly committees.

—GAPSA serves as the coordinating link between graduate and professional student constituent groups.

2. Puts graduate/professional students on the Senate Consultative Committee/Assembly Steering Committee; does not affect coordinate campus representation.

3. Puts one graduate/professional student on the Senate/Assembly Committee on Committees; again, does not affect coordinate campus representation.

4. (a technical point): Permits the Graduate School to certify graduate students as full-time even though they may not be enrolled in coursers (consists primarily of graduate students working on their dissertations).

The proposal accomplishes three things:

1. Creates a body (GAPSA) which will:

—demand far less time of graduate and professional students than does MSA (1 + hour per quarter rather than 14 + hours per quarter required of attendance at MSA and MSA committee meetings);

—reflect and represent the views of graduate and professional students in University governance, which are often very different from the views of undergraduates on a variety of issues; and

—serve as the electing authority for graduate and professional students to serve on the Consultative Committee/Steering Committee and Committee on Committees

2. Provides specifically for graduate/professional student representation on Consultative Committee and the Committee on Committees.

3. Grants recognition to the Graduate School "certification of student status" form for the purposes of participation in governance.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

For the first motion, a call for a roll call vote was defeated. The motion was approved 117 to 30 with 3 abstentions and will be brought to the next meeting for a second reading.

The second motion was approved 119 to 29 with 4 abstentions.

VII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

UNDERGRADUATE TUITION

Information

The proposal for uniform undergraduate tuition was discussed at the March 29, 1990, meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC). The discussion was informed by an earlier presentation (March 1, 1990) by Mr. Nick LaFontaine, chair of the Tuition Study Group, and a statement (attached) prepared by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP). SCEP, in turn, had discussed the report of the Tuition Study Group on the occasion of several special meetings called specifically for that purpose. Professor John Clark, chair of SCEP, participated on the SCC discussions.

The sense of the SCC discussion was as follows.

1. There was agreement that there are problems with the current tuition structure—complexity, tendency to cause students to enter programs on the basis of cost rather than interest, and anomaly of students from different colleges taking the same course but paying markedly different tuition, among others. Certainly any institution at its founding would very likely have a uniform undergraduate tuition in order to encourage students to pursue their academic interests uninfluenced by different tuition charges. Thus, in principle a uniform undergraduate tuition is attractive. Difficulties arise when this policy is applied to an existing institution with its distinct history.
2. The policy of uniform tuition is a matter which can be separated from the allocation of resources. The educational value students receive depends upon the quality of educational programs and services which the colleges are able to provide, which in turn depends on the resources made available to the colleges.
3. Concern was expressed for those students, currently enrolled in low-cost programs, who would be adversely affected by tuition increases as a result of a uniform tuition policy, for this increase would be in addition to tuition increases already projected. This argues for distributing the impact of such a change over several years. It also makes urgent the need to provide increased student financial aid to offset the most serious impact of the policy as it is implemented, some say before it is implemented.
4. A policy of uniform undergraduate tuition will lead, understandably, to uniform expectations among undergraduates about instructional resources, educational services, and educational quality. Those students who enroll in programs which are currently low-cost (which cost less because of high numbers and inadequate resources rather than because of sound educational practice) will have legitimate reason to expect that the quality of education will improve in some reasonable proportion to the higher tuition they will be paying. Satisfying this concern is essential.
5. Because the impact of implementing the uniform tuition proposal is uncertain, its effects should be carefully monitored. This is particularly important for those students who will be faced with significantly higher tuition levels as a result of the implementation of the proposal.
6. The articulation of the schedule of the tuition study group and the processes of the governance proved less than optimum. Ordinarily in matters of this moment, had the schedule not been so compressed, this report would have been presented to the University Senate for its consideration.

The Senate Consultative Committee discussions give conditional approval to the uniform undergraduate tuition proposal. The conditions which concerned the committee are the need for careful planning of the implementation, the availability of student financial aid in order to preserve educational opportunity, the allocation of resources to the colleges for the improvement in program quality, and the careful monitoring of the impact of the policy as it is implemented.

Senate Committee of Education Policy
Statement on Uniform Undergraduate Tuition

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy, after careful scrutiny of the Report of the Tuition Study Group, concluded that the issues dealt with in the report are central educational policy matters for the University. The committee thus took seriously its responsibility to examine the recommendations and implications of the report. The committee offers the following comments and concerns about the report. It should be noted that not all members of the committee were present for all discussions and not all members of the committee may agree with each point; this statement does, however, reflect the views of the majority of the committee in general.

The committee acknowledges that there are problems with the current tuition structure. Having devoted five hours over four different meetings to the proposal for a uniform undergraduate tuition, however, the committee finds itself more perplexed and less able to make a reasoned statement, supported by data, either in favor of the proposal or against it. In part this is because the committee has been unable to determine the objectives of the proposal; in even larger part it is because virtually no data were presented to support the recommendation.

There is strong consensus among committee members that the current instructional costs in CLA are simply too low, particularly at the upper division level. The committee is of the view that resources for CLA should remain a high priority in budget allocations in order that such items as faculty/student ratios, access to courses, provision of adequate advising (including increased faculty advising), and ratio of credits to contact hours can be reasonably funded. The committee notes that were instructional costs in CLA upper division courses at the level they should be, the impact of the proposed tuition policy on CLA students would be significantly less than will be the case now.

The committee is frankly skeptical about the validity of the principal rationales presented in the report and by its proponents. It appears, on the basis of evidence presented to the committee, that the enhanced access for CLA students to courses and services in other colleges is largely chimerical. Access is not particularly restricted at present and those restrictions which do exist struck the committee as reasonable—and those restrictions would, in any event, be completely unaffected by whether or not there is uniform undergraduate tuition.

A second rationale, that retention would be enhanced, is also open to doubt. It is perhaps true that some students drop out when they encounter the higher tuition charged by all colleges for upper division work and that with a uniform undergraduate tuition that barrier would be eliminated. The committee also recognizes that with enrollment caps in place the number of students who will enter the University is likely to be unaffected even though the initial cost for a large group (primarily in CLA and General College) will be substantially higher. The committee is concerned, however, that students in some fields, confronted with significantly higher tuition, will be forced to work more and take fewer credits in order to attend school, thus lengthening the time it takes them to complete their degrees. The committee acknowledges it has no data on this point either, but this point of contention illustrates the general difficulty it faced in trying to reach conclusions.

Another concern of the committee is that entering students in the liberal arts, whose tuition in three years would be increased approximately 40% (assuming a 9% increase per year in the general rate, plus the 12% increase caused by the imposition of a uniform rate) will simply be paying a great deal more in return for which they receive virtually nothing except possibly an increased loan burden which they will be less able to repay than will graduates from other collegiate units. The committee noted the different beginning incomes paid to graduates in the liberal arts compared to those in scientific, biological, managerial, and technical fields. This change will impose a greater financial burden on a large group of students without corresponding benefits before or after the time they are at the University. The committee concedes that it is unlikely large numbers of students choose their majors or degree fields because of cost or expected pay-off after graduation; this is, rather, a question of fundamental fairness.

One very real problem which the uniform undergraduate tuition would likely address is those students who remain in a lower-cost college until the last possible moment before switching to the unit which offers the major in which they are actually interested. The committee was informed, for example, that there may be between 250 and 350 students who are in CLA but whose interests suggest they should be in the College of Biological Sciences; a uniform tuition policy would eliminate the disincentive to enroll in CBS at the upper division level. What the committee was unable to determine, however, was whether there are different ways to address that problem other than imposing a stiff price increase on CLA and GC students or even if these students would enter CBS earlier after the tuition adjustment.

On this same point but from a different perspective, the committee was provided with data about peer institutions—at its own request—which appeared to suggest that tuition policy relevant to this proposal has no identifiable impact on the distribution of students in major fields. Given that apparent lack of impact, the committee was once again put in the position of asking what the benefits of the uniform rate will be. If the pattern of enrollment in various liberal arts and scientific/managerial/technical majors is largely unrelated to tuition, what is it that the establishment of the uniform rate is intended to accomplish?

The committee, it should be said, finds much of the Tuition Study Group report to be admirable. In particular, committee members strongly endorsed the proposals to increase student financial aid and other steps to permit students to better afford the costs of higher education. The committee, however, strongly recommends that if the uniform undergraduate tuition is to be adopted, it not be implemented until the increased student aid funds are available in order to obviate the impact on students. The committee further recommends that specific amounts be identified as the increases necessary to offset the tuition increases before the proposal is implemented.

The committee also wishes to raise the more general question of the disposition of these study group and task force reports. Matters such as the one dealt with in the Tuition Study Group, it seems to the committee, should be routinely referred to the governance system for review and comment—and referred in a timely fashion. The committee readily acknowledges that the governance system must not be obstructionist and oppose all change. The hurriedness and lack of information available in this instance, however, leads the committee to express its considerable irritation at the manner in which it was treated with respect to this proposal. As an institution which relies heavily on the use of ad hoc groups to study matters and issue reports, the committee insists that the reports should be then integrated into the existing governance structure.

Finally, the committee believes that the issue of uniform undergraduate tuition should be—or should have been—brought to the Senate for its consideration. Action by the Board of Regents at their April meeting will preclude effective discussion by the Senate but the committee does request that the Senate Consultative Committee place this report on the docket of the April Senate meeting.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

Accepted

VIII. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE SEARCH COMMITTEES, STUDENT REPRESENTATION Information

Every time a search committee is formed it serves the vital duty of maintaining quality leadership in the ranks of the University. Necessary in serving this duty is for the committee to consist of individuals who can offer varying perspectives and knowledge that lead to the selection of the best candidates. Considering one of the University's fundamental functions is instruction, students, without a doubt provide an important perspective and knowledge in

the majority of searches. Although students have been selected to serve on search committees in the past, there unfortunately is no formalized procedure to guarantee student membership on search committees for positions that affect students. Former Regent Wally Hilke noticed this dilemma and suggested action be taken on its behalf. On November 18, 1988, a subcommittee of the SCC completed a report that recommended action but presented seven questions that need to be answered before a policy could be forwarded to the Senate. The following final report answers the questions and details a recommended policy to guarantee that a student's perspective will be made a part of the decisions of pertinent search committees in the future.

1. Should appointment of students on search committees be mandated or considered on a case by case basis?

The SSCC agrees with the original subcommittee's recommendation that appointment of students should not be mandated, as not all searches directly affect students.

2. Which search committees should include students?

Again the SSCC agrees with the original subcommittee's recommendation that positions that clearly involve students or directly affect students are such that require student participation in their respective search committees. These positions include appropriate administrative positions, faculty positions, and academic professional positions.

3. What is the appropriate mechanism for selecting students?

and

4. How are students identified who will broadly represent the University?

It is of the SSCC's opinion that broad representation of a University as large and diverse as Minnesota cannot be achieved in the selection of a handful of students. Instead, appropriate representation would be the objective. For example, if a search committee would be formed to select a new Law School dean, the student representation on the committee would consist of Law School students, as such input would be more appropriate for this particular search.

SSCC will survey incoming Form 16's in order to monitor student involvement on all search committees. Department and collegiate units will be free to choose their own selection method for students to serve at that level. Searches for positions involving many collegiate units, like vice provost, or at a systemic level, like vice president, will receive student candidate nominations from the SSCC.

A detailed description of the process for achieving this objective follows:

Form 16, "Description of Available Academic Positions at the University of Minnesota," should include the line, "_____ students will serve on the search committee (please contact the chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee at 625-9992 to request a list of student candidates)." The following line would assert, "If none, please explain."

At this point, the chair of the committee would either contact the SSCC requesting a list of student candidates or explain on the Form 16 why no students should serve on the search committee (as a safeguard, this decision could be disputed by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action).

Prior to being contacted for a list of candidates, the SSCC will compile a databank of student associations, college boards, and other student organizations including the name of a contact person for each organization. Upon being contacted, the SSCC would choose which organization(s) would be most appropriate for the search. A request for a list of candidates would be forwarded to the contact person of the organization(s). Instructions would be precise enough to prevent the organization from compiling a list of too many, too few, or under-qualified candidates. SSCC would be responsible through the organization(s)' contact person(s) for receiving the list(s) of candidates and forwarding the list(s) to the search committee chair in a timely fashion.

5. What will be the role of the students(s)?

Upon being chosen for a search committee, a student accepts the same duties and responsibilities as the other committee members. This includes attending all meetings on time unless excused, providing one's unique perspective and knowledge, and accepting one's fair

share of the workload. If the student is not fulfilling her/his obligations, the SSCC would be the appropriate body to contact to resolve the problem.

6. How will the necessary training for serving (understanding the nature of the position, the candidate field) be provided to the student?

Informing the student of the general responsibilities and duties of being a search committee member will be provided via an instruction handbook to be compiled by the SSCC and administration. More specific information concerning the position is adequately covered by the description of the position that all search committee members are given as well as the student's background, which would be the basis for choosing that student.

7. How to assess the necessary time involvement?

Upon receiving a request from the search committee chair for student candidates, the chair would be asked to estimate the time commitment. This estimate would be made known to all individuals interested in being a candidate so that they would be aware of the involvement from the very start.

In addition to guaranteeing student input on appropriate search committees, the policy described above also formalizes the accountability and training of the students that will serve in future search committees. In assuring student involvement as well as the quality those students involved, this policy serves the interests of all members of the University community.

WARREN IBELE
Chair, SCC
ERIC HUANG
Chair, SSCC

Accepted

IX. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT (15 minutes)

None. See abstract for President's Report.

X. OLD BUSINESS

none

XI. NEW BUSINESS (15 Minutes)

See abstract

XII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBER

GORDON W. O'BRIEN 1919-1990

Gordon Worth O'Brien, emeritus professor of English, died of cancer at his home on 14 April 1990. He had taught at the University from 1961 until retiring in 1987. He is survived by his wife Jackie and by his son Gordon and his daughter Amy, both children of his marriage to the late Priscilla O'Brien.

Professor O'Brien, born in Chicago in 1919, took his B.A. and M.A. degrees at the University of Kansas. He taught for a year at Penn State before entering the army, where he served with the Signal Intelligence Corps, mainly in India, from 1942 to 1945. He returned to Kansas for a year, then went to Ohio State, where he earned the Ph.D. in 1951. Appointed

as assistant professor at Youngstown University in 1950, he served there as associate professor and professor for eleven years before coming to Minnesota.

O'Brien's, *Renaissance Poetics and the Problem of Power* (1956) was called "a brilliant first book" by Ruth Wallerstein, among 17th-century scholars one of the finest philosophical minds of her generation. It also drew the praise of the eminent scholar Douglas Bush, who pronounced it "a difficult but suggestive book." The difficulty stems from O'Brien's ambitious effort to set forth a conception of the mirror of deity that he traces from Paul and Plotinus to Shakespeare and Milton. O'Brien places in his reader's hands a key to Renaissance thinking: the secret that man's mind is not an autonomous psyche but a phase of the dynamic creation. The spirit creates its own mirror, as man recreates himself in the act of apprehending the truth.

Gordon had "a mind reflecting ages past," and his learning was immediately apparent to anyone who spent five minutes in his company. But his distinctive gifts went beyond his erudition. He had the rare ability to impregnate knowledge with a vital wit. He exemplified what Sidney meant when he called poetry "a speaking picture," whose end is to move us to action by making beauty and truth vividly present so that our will inclines towards them.

Gordon acted as mediator between several generations of students and the great authors whom he hailed from their Olympian walks to the modern classroom. He accomplished this magical feat with his voice. A student recalled that, "Many times I have found myself following along in the text while Professor O'Brien was reading a passage, only to look up and find him strolling back and forth in front of the classroom reciting the work." A colleague reports that, "At a session of the MLA annual convention I had organized, Gordon delivered a dazzling paper on the subject of 'Milton, Hermes, and the Rhetoric of Mental Flight.' It was probably the most effectively delivered paper I have ever heard; the audience was enthralled. We all found ourselves, as Milton says, 'In willing chains and sweet captivite,' and when it was over we burst into applause."

A former student, now a professor, remembers that, "The tall, handsome, spoken gentleman from Kansas represented all that we apprentices in the graduate school aspired to be. Professor O'Brien gave the Department some class." Students obviously felt in him the power of the sage. Nominating Gordon for his Distinguished Teaching Award in 1987, a recent undergraduate said, "This man doesn't simply pass along information, he opens doors to new worlds." Similar testimonies from many students suggest that, as Gordon aged, he actually grew younger as a teacher. In that he continued to generate new ideas, he remained one of the more vigorous minds in the University.

In his book, Gordon writes that

The dignity of man, the good for man, is finally absolute power disposed to creative ends by discipline and clear intelligence. The objective of the magician, the moralist, the poet, and the saint is all one: it is to be the Artist-God. Peace (that is, calmness of mind induced by harmony and right order), though it is a necessary means to and a necessary concomitant of it, is not the essence of this objective.

This restlessly dynamic conception of man's dignity, formulated by Gordon before he came to Minnesota, turns out in retrospect to have been the nucleus of his career at the University. With unfailing vitality, for a quarter-century he carried on the work of propagating his knowledge through his students. The amiable description of Chaucer's Clerk of Oxford—"Gladly would he learn, and gladly teach"—does not quite reach the core of this Minnesota professor's intellectual fire. He seems, rather, to have enjoyed the power granted to Ezekiel: the power to make dry bones live.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the University Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 127 voting members of the faculty/academic professionals. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 15

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

MANDATORY RETIREMENT AND POST-TENURE EVALUATION

Action (15 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Faculty Senate advise the University administration that mandatory retirement for faculty should end effective July 1, 1991, and that the Faculty Senate, through its committees, devise a periodic post-tenure evaluation process pursuant to the recommendation (3.2) of the Task Force on the Elimination of Mandatory Retirement.

COMMENT:

The recommendation on ending mandatory retirement varies by two years from the recommendation of the Task Force on the Elimination of Mandatory Retirement. The task force called for the immediate elimination of mandatory retirement. Because many departments have already made plans for new faculty appointments based on projected retirements at the end of 1989-90, the Faculty Consultative Committee recommends that the elimination of mandatory retirement not be effective until after the end of the 1990-91 academic year.

It is the intent of this motion that any faculty member whose 70th birthday falls on or after July 1, 1991, will not be subject to mandatory retirement.

The recommendation on the periodic post-tenure evaluation process is related to faculty development and faculty vitality. It seeks to provide each faculty member with the assessment and support by colleagues to complement the self-assessment that each faculty member should continuously engage in. Such periodic major reviews by peers are believed to provide a better basis for planning self-improvement, represent a more effective investment of faculty time and effort, and provide the assurance of quality performance to the various constituencies which the University seeks to serve. The Faculty Consultative Committee believes that this post-tenure review system should be established prior to the elimination of mandatory retirement.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

A motion to divide the motion was approved. A motion to suspend the rules in order to amend the first motion failed 47 to 51.

The first motion, to end mandatory retirement effective July 1, 1991, was approved 63 to 43; the second motion for an evaluation process was defeated 44 to 57.

III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

FACULTY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University should eliminate the notch in the University contribution to the faculty retirement program at the \$5,000 level and have a uniform 13% contribution for each participant.

COMMENT:

Since the inception of the present faculty retirement plan the University contribution has been 2.5% of salary up to \$5,000 and 13% of salary above \$5,000 for each participant. This notch was initially instituted to take into account contributions to the social security plan. The result is that lower paid participants have a smaller percentage of their salary put into the plan than those who are paid at a higher level. The proposed change would add \$525 per year to the retirement plan for each participant. It has been pointed out that perhaps the only funds available for this change would be from the salary item. This would amount to somewhat under 1% of the salary increase. The net change would be a significantly higher percent increase for lower paid faculty, both in gross compensation and after tax compensation, than for higher paid faculty.

This recommendation has received unanimous approval from the Faculty Retirement Plan Subcommittee, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, the Mandatory Retirement Committee, and the Faculty Consultative Committee.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

Approved

IV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN COMMITTEE
WOMEN ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES POLICY STATEMENT**

Action (10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the following resolution with regard to a policy statement on women academic employees be approved:

Whereas the Rajender consent decree expires in January, 1991, and whereas the Regents of the University of Minnesota wish to adopt a policy which will guide the University with respect to the class of employees covered by the decree, that is, all female academic non-student employees,

Be it resolved that the following be the policy of the University of Minnesota with respect to its women academics:

The University of Minnesota shall not tolerate discriminatory practices against women in any personnel actions including instruction, hiring, evaluation, promotion, pay or any form of institutional reward or recognition.

In acting toward this end, the University will actively discourage and work toward elimination of actions and practices that devalue, trivialize, or make peripheral the contributions, perspectives or accomplishments of women.

The University recognizes and values diversity within its community and will act to take such diversity into account in institutional planning, organization and decision-making.

The personnel policy and practice of the institution shall not only be nondiscriminatory but will encourage active measures to increase the diversity of the academic community. The University will consistently seek to increase the number of opportunities to hire, promote and retain women in faculty and administrative positions. The University shall have in place procedures to assure achievement of these objectives.

The Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action shall develop and maintain appropriate statistical analysis of the gender composition of persons available for appointment to academic positions in accordance with law and shall develop and maintain numerical goals for the hiring of women in accordance with law. In any hiring decision for a position in which the availability statistics and numerical goals indicate an underrepresentation of women, the University shall consider gender in selecting between two or more candidates with approximately equal qualifications.

Another keystone of the effort will be the maintenance of an adequate and accessible data base and systematic review of all personnel policies and actions, such as salary equity, performance reviews, grievance procedures, promotion activity, for any indication of disparate treatment of women or disparate impact on them.

The implementation of this policy shall be the direct responsibility of the President of the University who shall appropriately delegate it to the line officers of the institution. The President shall offer strong incentives and training for administrators at all levels, especially the department level, to carry out these responsibilities, shall carefully monitor their setting of goals and achievement of objectives in this area, and shall hold them accountable for the full and faithful execution of them. Ultimate responsibility for such policies rests with this Board of Regents.

The Senate Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women will advise the Senate and the University administration regarding effective implementation of this policy.

The President shall direct the University's Equal Opportunity Officer to prepare an annual report on all phases of this policy for presentation to the Board of Regents and to the Senate Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women.

These procedures and policies shall not preclude the operation or adoption of similar policies regarding race or other protected classes.

COMMENT:

The *Rajender* Consent Decree expires in January of 1991. In the absence of the decree, there are no statements of University policy regarding academic women apart from the inclusion of gender in the general statement of nondiscrimination. The Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women has been engaged in a two-year process of converting the useful provisions of the decree into University policies and procedures and recommending changes to those policies and procedures where appropriate. This Regents' policy statement is part of that process. It has already been endorsed, without dissent, by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Faculty Consultative Committee.

WARREN IBELE
Chair, SCC

LAURA COOPER
Chair, EEOW Committee

Approved

V. JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

CASE FINDING

Information

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

The case heard by the Judicial Committee in 1988 involved two separate and distinct matters. The first matter involved termination for cause pursuant to Section 14 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure. The second matter concerned the appropriateness of the Complainant's resignation from an administrative appointment. With regard to the termination for cause matter, the President concurred with the findings of the Judicial Committee.

He concluded that there was a sustained refusal and failure to perform reasonably assigned duties by the Complainant, justifying termination of the Complainant's position for cause. For a period of ten months, the Complainant received normal salary without performing any duties at the University. The President concluded that the Complainant's disagreement with the Department Chair over the Chair's request that the Complainant resign an administrative position did not justify the Complainant's being absent from all duties for a period of ten months. The President concluded that the University had complied with the procedures for the termination of a faculty appointment for cause.

With regard to the second matter which concerned the appropriateness of the Complainant's resignation from an administrative appointment, the President found that the Complainant held that administrative appointment for a period of eight years. During that period of time, the Complainant received annual one year appointments to that administrative position. The position was not, as the Judicial Committee found, relatively permanent. In 1986, the Respondent requested that the Complainant resign the administrative appointment. Four days after that request for resignation, the Complainant submitted his written resignation, effective three months later. The President declared that the Complainant's administrative appointment was subject to annual renewal or nonrenewal. The President concurred with the finding of the Judicial Committee that the Complainant knew that the administrative appointment did not carry tenure. He also concurred with the finding of the Judicial Committee that there was no basis for a ruling of violation of academic freedom. The President found that there was no basis in the record to conclude that the action taken by the Respondent in requesting a resignation from the Complainant resulted from a position or belief held or expressed by the Complainant relating to academic or political matters. For important substantive reasons, the President departed from the ultimate conclusion of the Judicial Committee regarding the Complainant's academic appointment. First, he held that it was an academic appointment not covered by the Tenure Code or Judicial Committee review. Second, he held that the Complainant was appropriately asked for a resignation and did resign. The President concluded that the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure do not directly apply to the Complainant's position as Director, which was an administrative position. The President concluded that while the Senate Judicial Committee has full authority to hear and determine disputes concerning faculty tenure, it does not have such authority with regard to administrative positions. Since there was no violation of the Complainant's academic freedom in connection with the termination of the administrative appointment and since, pursuant to Section 3.5 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure, the Complainant's tenure rights were not impaired by the removal, the matter of the Complainant's administrative appointment was and remains an administrative and not a faculty matter.

The President held that the appropriateness of the administrative action in this matter is to be determined by administrative review of actions taken by the Respondent. While general principles of fairness are certainly appropriate considerations in that administrative review, the President concluded that there is no requirement of either particular due process or particularized cause in connection with making a request for resignation from an administrative position. As an administrative matter, the President found that the Respondent had a reasonable basis to request the Complainant's resignation. In addition, the President found that the Complainant resigned the position voluntarily.

While the Senate Judicial Committee found that the Complainant felt a degree of coercion in the request for his resignation, the President concluded that there was, in fact, no coercion directed at the Complainant regarding that resignation. The Complainant had testified that there was no coercion. The Complainant was simply asked for a resignation. The Complainant took several days to make the decision. There were no threats of any kind made in connection with the request for resignation.

The President concluded that the Complainant was appropriately terminated for cause pursuant to Sections 10.2 and 14 of the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure. The request for resignation of the Complainant's administrative position was appropriate in the circumstance and provided no basis for additional compensation to the Complainant. The President concluded that questions of whether certain of the Complainant's activities, as recommended by the Judicial Committee, were appropriate is a matter for the department and college administration. The President called for those recommendations of the Judicial

Committee to be made available to the appropriate responsible individuals. The President concluded that certain of the recommendation of the Judicial Committee related to matters beyond the scope of this particular hearing and will be forwarded to the Complainant's college for review and consideration.

AMOS DEINARD
Chair

Accepted

VI. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The University Senate was called to order at 3:15 p.m. in 25 Law Center by President Nils Hasselmo. Minutes of the last meeting were approved. The election of next year's vice president was postponed.

Educational Policy Committee. Warren Ibele, professor of mechanical engineering and chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), presented a bylaws amendment to add the chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to his committee as an ex officio nonvoting member, which he said would improve the consultative process. It was approved without dissent.

Student governance. Professor Ibele introduced a constitutional amendment which he said would perfect the governance system by establishing election rules for the Student Senate chair and vice chair and by outlining the duties of the vice chair. The vote to approve fell 14 short of the required number for one meeting; the chair announced it would have a second reading at the next meeting to fulfill the requirement of a majority of membership at two meetings. The related bylaws amendment was approved without dissent. A bylaws amendment to add the officer to the SCC as an ex officio nonvoting member was approved without dissent.

At this point Professor Ibele moved to recess the meeting and convene the Twin Cities Campus Assembly to take up the proposed creation of a graduate and professional student assembly, which the Senate would consider immediately thereafter (see Assembly abstract). His motion was then approved.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Following the session of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly, where the constitutional amendment was approved by a majority of the membership and would be brought for a second reading at the May meeting, and where related bylaws and rules amendments were approved, the University Senate reconvened.

Professor Ibele presented the constitutional amendment to create a graduate and professional student assembly. A motion to suspend the rules for a roll call vote was defeated. The motion was then approved by 117 votes and the chair announced that it would receive a second hearing at the next meeting to fulfill the two-meeting requirement for a constitutional amendment. The bylaws amendment to provide committee membership for graduate and professional students on two committees was taken up.

Anne Schindeldecker, student, asked about the number of students that would serve on the Consultative Committee; Professor Ibele said it would depend on the number of students on various graduate and professional student councils. Eric Huang, student, said that he had come to understand through participation in the mediation process that graduate students have specific concerns that are not addressed through the governance structure because of a lack of participation in the past two years and he wondered whether their participation would improve through the new arrangement. W. Phillips Shively, professor of political science and a past chair of the Consultative Committee, recalled that there had in fact been good participation several years ago in the service of graduate student Roy St. Laurent, but that interest had flagged since then. Mr. Boland asked whether an amendment would be in order; Professor Altholz said a vote would have to be taken to suspend the rules

first, and Mr. Boland withdrew the suggestion. He did want it recorded that he thought it deplorable that senators were unwilling to stand up and put their names to the vote, as requested earlier. The bylaws amendment was then approved.

President's report. ROTC/Equal Opportunity. The President made brief comments on a number of topics. With respect to the ROTC-equal opportunity matter, which the Senate had taken up at its November meeting, he said that the resolution adopted at that time had asked him to work with major national associations and to seek other means of addressing the issue. He reported he had been in touch with the American Council on Education, the Association of American Universities, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and he was one of several presidents to raise the issue with those associations, which were at various stages of considering action. At least at present, he said, he had nothing to report as to their response but all were placing the matter before their governing bodies. He thought the issue could be addressed in two ways: one, by action of the President of the United States issuing an executive order and the other by congressional legislation requiring that the military cease discriminatory practices against individuals of same sex orientation. He reported that the University had contacted the Minnesota delegation. He thought that the legislative route appeared to be the more promising and suggested that, as individuals, senators might want to contact their own representatives. He said he would be meeting with the Social Concerns Committee to inform them of developments as requested in the Senate resolution.

State Legislature. He said all were waiting with bated breath to know the fate of the bonding bill presented in a conference committee. The Senate version would require higher education institutions to provide one third of the cost of the debt service for bonding, which was a matter of concern, he said. The budget outlook appeared somewhat precarious, he warned, and the administration was going forward with its presentation to the regents as planned but further action might be necessary when the final figures came out of St. Paul.

Sexual Violence Task Force. He said he had appointed student, faculty, academic professional, and civil service staff members to the Sexual Violence Task Force chaired by Judge Joan Smith and County Attorney Tom Johnson, and a report was expected later in the spring.

Intercollegiate Athletics Task Force. He reported appointment of the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics co-chaired by Regent Allan Page and Professor Jack Merwin.

Tuition rate. Steve Boland reported that MSA had endorsed the proposed uniform undergraduate tuition rate with the condition that access and quality of education issues be strongly stressed and that fourth and fifth year financial aid be made part of the University's lobbying effort.

Representation. Mr. Boland suggested that the Senate should take up proposals for proportional representation for women and other under-represented groups, including economically disadvantaged students, and said he would get it on paper to forward to the "egalitarian" Senate.

Following silent tribute to two faculty members, the Senate adjourned.

The Faculty Senate was called to order by President Hasselmo. Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Mandatory Retirement and Post-Tenure Evaluation. Professor Ibele observed that there had been an open forum preceding the Senate meeting to review the report of the Task Force on the Elimination of Mandatory Retirement chaired by Stephen Scallen, professor of law. Hearings had been held on all campuses, he said, and the full report had been published in the *Minnesota Daily*. It had dealt with more than the issue of mandatory retirement, he said, by taking the occasion to look at the factors that would create conditions which would bring forth the greatest possible faculty productivity. Because a number of the recommendations had future significant financial implications, the motions that his committee thought were timely were being brought for Faculty Senate action.

The first recommendation was to end mandatory retirement effective July 1, 1991, and the second that the Faculty Senate, through its committees, should devise a periodic post-

tenure evaluation process in accordance with the recommendation of the task force report. He said the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) had decided after considering all pertinent factors that the July 1, 1991, date was appropriate. One of the major reasons was that the post-tenure evaluation process was considered to be a key item. The present procedure calls for annual review and there is some unevenness to that, he said. He emphasized that there was no intent to increase the faculty effort but to make it more effective. He said the nature of research is such that a periodic post-tenure review every three to five years would be the best way to determine what faculty members had accomplished. He said that the process should be one developed by the faculty, the criteria established by the faculty, and the procedures administered by the faculty. The task force had found, he said, that the atmosphere that the faculty itself creates in a department is the most significant determinant in terms of faculty productivity.

Hans Weinberger, professor of mathematics, objected to the proposed review process. He said that when the government faces an insoluble problem, it throws money at it, but, since the University has no money, it throws faculty time, which is considered an inexhaustible, free commodity. He said that with regard to termination, unless a flagrant breach of tenure is found, nothing can be done, so all the reviews in the world would not change that and would only waste faculty time. If review for every faculty member were to take place every five years, with a minimum of three faculty members on each review committee, and after eliminating junior faculty and others "whose advice you don't want," about one third of the most productive faculty would have to commit their time.

Clifford Hooker, professor of educational policy and administration, asked whether the motion could be divided into its two parts; the chair obliged by calling for a vote, and the suggestion approved. Mr. Hooker then moved to suspend the rules to amend the first motion. He was opposed to the delay in uncapping mandatory retirement as probably illegal and certainly unprincipled—illegal because it would treat persons differently who were similarly situated (one half in the faculty members affected by removal of the cap would be offered a benefit that would be denied to the other half in the same classification) and the basis would be age; and unprincipled because the recommendation was based on budget considerations, saying in effect, "Equal treatment to equals is a great idea but only if the price is right."

Professor Ibele defended the linking of the two recommendations and the date on the grounds that FCC recognized that for every right there is a responsibility: the Congress had uncapped retirement, but with that came the responsibility of the institution in terms of guaranteeing performance, which requires an assessment of some kind. He said FCC believed that assessment would be best done by the faculty. The date was set to give the governance system the right and the privilege and the responsibility of going forward with the assessment, and he opposed the date change.

William Boylan, professor of animal science, asked if he could change the date in the motion to July 1, 1990, and moved to suspend the rules to make that amendment. The motion was defeated 51 to 47, with two-thirds required.

Vernon Weckwerth, professor of public health, said he did not know that the law mandated a review process if mandatory retirement were removed, as had been stated, and he believed that was not true. He said he was deeply concerned about the implication of the faculty member shackling oneself to a procedure not agreed to when that person came to the University. Seymour Geisser, professor of statistics, asked if the second part of the motion could be taken up first, but he gave up when the parliamentarian said the rules would have to be suspended. Richard Kain, professor of electrical engineering, still could not see why the date could not be 1990 and worry about the review process later. The motion to approve July 1, 1991, was then approved 63 to 43.

Taking up the second half of the motion, Constance Sullivan, associate professor of Spanish and Portuguese, pointed out that the Scallen report contained many other recommendations that the FCC apparently did not want to highlight as they did the one under consideration, which as a consequence made it appear punitive and, in addition, an enormous waste of time. She asked Professor Ibele why the helpful recommendations of the task force had been omitted. Mark Brenner, professor of horticulture science, said the important point to raise was the objective of the review—whether for developmental purposes, thus assist-

ing faculty, or for administrative purposes. At the forum preceding the Senate meeting, he said, Professor Scallen had cited development as the principal objective of the review, but did not dismiss the administrative aspect. He pointed out that the guidelines would be written by the faculty and there would be an opportunity to put a strong emphasis on the developmental aspects. He said his department had been experimenting with the process during the last two years, using it for developmental purposes, and he thought it had had some merit, although not all of his colleagues would agree. Professor Shively said it was unfortunate that the issue came out of the task force because the proposal had been brought forward by the Campbell committee long before mandatory retirement uncapping was under consideration, and it had been brought forward solely as a measure for faculty development and for the quality of the faculty and not intended in any punitive way. That committee had thought it was a worthy proposal for looking at colleagues periodically, particularly after promotion to full professor because it realized that for a large number of such faculty members no one ever looked seriously at their work except for annual salary decisions which related only to work done during the past year. He noted that untenured faculty members get review from their colleagues regularly and in profusion. He said it would not be the exhaustive, five-year evaluation of a department head, as predicted by Professor Weinberger. The motion was then defeated 44 to 57.

Faculty Retirement Program. Richard Goldstein, professor of mechanical engineering and chair of the Subcommittee on the Faculty Retirement Plan, explained that since the early 60s the University had provided income to the individual's retirement account at the rate of 2.5% up to \$5000 of salary and 13% of the balance. He said it was a regressive formula and with the new tax act providing impetus for change, because the current plan could be viewed as discriminatory, the proposal was being made to make the rate uniform at 13%. All consulting committees had approved the proposal unanimously, he concluded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Women Academic Employees Policy Statement. Professor Ibele reminded the Faculty Senate that in January, 1991, the Rajender consent decree would expire, and he said it was important that a policy statement on women academic employees be adopted. Laura Cooper, professor of law and chair of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women, explained that the Rajender consent decree contained a number of major policy and procedure items that would not otherwise exist upon the expiration date. The motion, she said, was in the form of a recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Ian Maitland, associate professor of strategic management and organization, said he was troubled by some of the implications for academic freedom, citing the provision regarding "actions and practices that devalue, trivialize, or make peripheral the contributions, perspectives or accomplishments of women." He asked whether that would proscribe research into gender-related differences in intellectual or physical aptitude or achievement and the study or production of misogynistic works of art, for example. Professor Cooper said it certainly would not, that the purpose was to combat the kind of discrimination that had been experienced earlier and had been documented in a number of federal court discrimination cases. She cited as examples not counting research in women's studies and other kinds of similar research.

Professor Cooper was asked about the reference to statistical analyses in the law. She explained that under federal law one cannot take into account racial or gender composition of a work force unless certain kinds of numbers are collected. For example, she said, one must determine that there is underrepresentation in light of the actual qualifications for that position. Taking pharmacy as an example, she said one would have to know the proportion of women with appropriate degrees and experience that would qualify them for appointment to that faculty. Mr. Maitland asked for a definition of "approximately equal qualifications" in the same section. She responded that it would depend on the particular circumstances. In the case posed by Mr. Maitland of three candidates, where there was clear faculty support for a male candidate with a female candidate ranking third, the decision would depend on how close the ranking was of the top three. The language in the policy came from current court decisions, she said, to the effect that, where qualifications are approximately equal, questions of racial and gender composition may be taken into account. The factors that are

taken into account would depend on the discipline and the evaluation of that discipline. The motion was then approved with a few dissenting votes.
The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

Min
linke
stud

1. St
Than
the a
dure

2. Un
Initial
for ch
MSA

Pass
Be it
rate o

- 1)
- 2)

3. Ac
Havin
spons
and sp

4. Tw
Where
Where
Where
Be it re
MSA
wome
comm
while p
Be if fu
tion of

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

The third meeting of the Student Senate for 1989-90 was convened in 25 Law Center, Minneapolis campus, following the Faculty Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 47 voting members of the student body.

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 15

Action (2 minutes)

Approved

II. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Information

1. Students on Search Committees

Thanks to the work of Steve Ebel and others, the initial report is done. SSCC will work with the administration to develop a brief handbook to assist recruitment and training procedures.

2. Uniform Undergraduate Tuition Rate

Initial discussion of task force recommendations seemed favorable. However, the rationale for change is questionable. Specifically, Twin Cities accessibility has come under fire in the MSA Forum.

Passed by the MSA Forum:

Be it resolved that the MSA Forum endorse in principle the uniform undergraduate tuition rate on the preconditions that the University first place as top priorities:

- 1) improved quality of undergraduate education and access within the University; and
- 2) financial aid for fourth and fifth year equivalent students on the legislative agenda.

3. Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Free Speech

Having viewed Dr. Kwame Turé's speech and reviewed existing academic freedom and responsibility guidelines, SSCC will continue discussions surrounding controversial topics and speakers in the context of freedom of speech and discussion among diversity.

4. Twin Cities Item Passed by the MSA Forum: Keep Gopher Sports on Campus

Whereas student athletics lend to the sense of a university community; and

Whereas student athletics are important to the University business community; and

Whereas recent proposals threaten Gopher sports on campus:

Be it resolved that the MSA establish a Commission for Sports on Campus, appointed by the MSA Membership Committee, with participants from the University business community, women's and men's athletic departments, alumni, faculty, administration, students, etc.; the commission's sole purpose is to work toward the maintenance of Gopher sports on campus, while paying special attention to women's athletics programs;

Be if further resolved that MSA provide the necessary administrative support for the operation of the Commission for Sports on Campus.

SUZANNE DENEVAN
ROBERT JACOBSON
 CLA Senators
ERIC HUANG
 SSCC Chair

Accepted

III. STUDENT LOBBY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Information

The Education Finance Division of the Senate met on April 2 to approve the final version of the higher education bonding bill. The Senate Education Division acted within the constraints outlined in Senator Roger Moe's proposal. Senator Moe's proposal requires public higher education systems to fund one third of the debt service on bonds. As I indicated before, this proposal could have an impact on tuition. If tuition is used as a source of revenue for debt service, the increase would be about 3% phased in over a number of years. Ultimately the Board of Regents would make a decision whether to use tuition as a source of revenue for debt service on bonds. This is certainly an important issue for students and I will keep you informed of any further developments.

The following projects and amounts were approved by the Education Finance Division of the Senate:

1. Integrated Waste Management Facility, \$2.5 million
2. Wilson Library-Twin Cities Campus, \$2.2 million
3. Biological Sciences-Twin Cities Campus, \$15 million
4. Animal Sciences-Twin Cities Campus, \$2.1 million
5. Ferguson Hall, Twin Cities Campus, \$5 million
6. Duluth Campus Center, \$10 million
7. Recreational Sports, Twin Cities Campus, \$6 million
8. Mechanical Engineering Building, Twin Cities Campus, \$12 million
9. Agriculture Management Operations Center, Crookston Campus, \$5 million
10. Waseca Campus Center, Waseca Campus, \$4 million
11. University Supercomputer Center, \$1.5 million

This proposal now goes before the full Finance Committee and then to the Senate floor for a vote. The final version of the bonding bill will then be decided in a conference committee. The conference will be composed of 10 members: five from the House and five from the Senate. The differences between the House and Senate bonding bills will be resolved in this committee.

Note: All of the projects prioritized in the SLAC and L.R. agendas have been approved and will go to the conference committee. Hopefully, all of our projects will remain in the bill.

DAVID MINKKINEN
Legislative Director

Accepted

IV. UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION, INITIATIVE FOR EXCELLENCE

Discussion (10 minutes)

see Abstract for the Discussion

V. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

Rod Jorgenson, chair of the Student Senate, called the meeting to order following the Faculty Senate meeting. Coordinate campuses were linked by phone. The minutes of the February meeting were approved.

Student Senate Consultative Committee. Eric Huang announced that the finalists for the vice president for student affairs had been announced and that interviewing panels were being formed. He urged those interested in serving, including the Council of Graduate Students and GAPSA and the coordinate campuses, to contact him.

Student Lobby Advisory Committee. Mr. Jorgenson said that David Minkinen, student legislative director, reported that all eight capital improvement projects were still under consideration at the legislature, pending a decision with regard to use of the budget reserves and the latest revenue projections.

Undergraduate Education. Mr. Jorgenson said that President Hasselmo's statement with regard to the initiative for excellence in undergraduate education had been the topic of discussion with the President by the student representatives to the Board of Regents over the past four months. Randy Peterson, chair of those representatives, said he had compiled a list of documents that had been created concerning the issue, which would be available in the MSA office. In January the regents took up the need for the initiative, the fact that research, service, and teaching are not effectively integrated, that over the past 20 years the expectations of students and preparation standards had been lowered, and the problems in teaching-advising. In February, they discussed admissions—the common entry point and the content and importance of the preparation requirements. In March they discussed the teaching and learning environment, including advising and counseling, quality of teaching, the learning environment, and creating a sense of community. The latter, he said, was one that would be a primary responsibility of the vice president for student affairs. A further March topic, he said, was internationalizing the educational experience. In April, assessment of performance and progress were discussed and ways of measuring retention rates, graduation rates, and class sizes. Class size was taken up with the intention of reducing class size or, where there are large lectures, creating recitation sections. The nature of the approach to the legislature would be changed, he said, from one of numbers enrolled to quality of education. In response to a question regarding the assessment mechanism, he said it would be coordinated in the provost's office and implemented in the individual areas. Asked about the financial commitment by the administration, he said specifics had not been outlined yet and a summary document expected in June or July would be discussed by the Board of Regents at that time.

Mr. Jorgenson reminded the body that election for next year's chair and vice chair would take place at the May meeting, and he encouraged interested persons to contact him or members of SSCC. He announced a legislative reception at the MSA legislative office to take place following the Assembly meeting. Mr. Huang urged next year's SSCC members to attend the remainder of SSC's meetings in the current year. Steve Boland asked whether anyone present would be interested in joining the graduate and professional student assembly; he counted 3 out of a possible 20.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor