

Minutes\*

**Senate Consultative Committee  
Thursday, April 30, 1998  
2:30 – 4:00  
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

- Present: Victor Bloomfield (chair), Kent Bales, Carole Bland, Mary Dempsey, Gary Gardner, Virginia Gray, David Hamilton, M. Janice Hogan, Laura Coffin Koch, Michael Korth, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison, V. Rama Murthy, Martin O’Hely, Harvey Peterson, Matthew Tirrell
- Absent: Heather Aagesen, Jesse Berglund, Gary Davis, Ryan Falk, Russell Hobbie, Eddie Kalombo, Leonard Kuhi, Brandon Lacy, Jason Mattson, Kevin Nicholson, Deanna Nordberg, Laura Taken
- Guests: Richard Bianco (office for animal care and usage); Professors Fred Amram and Katherine Sedo (for the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics); Professor Eric Bauer (for the Committee on Social Concerns)
- Others: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate); Maureen Smith (University Relations)

[In these minutes: docket review and approval]

**1. Animal Care Policy**

Professor Bloomfield convened the meeting at 2:30 and welcomed Dr. Richard Bianco to the meeting to discuss revisions to the animal care and use policy.

Dr. Bianco explained that the policy revisions had come through the Senate Research Committee and were long overdue. The policy relies on federal regulations and brings them up to date. This is essentially a whole new document that was debated thoroughly by the Research Committee; it reflects current practice, Dr. Bianco said, and he did not know of any problems with it.

One question was whether it was necessary to act on this policy at the May 14 Senate meeting, since the docket was full. Dr. Bianco expressed a preference for action,

---

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

because it is hard for him to defend the University from groups critical of the existing policy, and this is an issue that receives continued attention. It was agreed that if at all possible, the policy would be placed on the May 14 docket. If that proved not to be possible, because of the number of items already requiring attention, the Committee could take action on behalf of the Senate, and seek ratification of the action at the first meeting of Fall Quarter. (Committee action on behalf of the Senate is permitted by the Senate bylaws.)

## **2. Conflict of Interest Policy**

Professor Bales next explained the small changes that had been made to the Conflict of Interest policy. It has, over many meetings, been extensively debated and rewritten to cover only business or financial conflicts of interest. The policy is not perfect, he said, but is interpretable in a way that will work.

There is need for additional language clarifying royalties [which language was drafted following the meeting]. The policy was approved, subject to agreement on the additional clause that was needed.

## **3. Changes in Athletic Policies**

Professor Bloomfield now welcomed Professors Fred Amram and Katherine Sedo to present a large package of policies governing the Twin Cities intercollegiate athletic programs that had been revised and updated (and in some cases eliminated). Professor Sedo reported that the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics had looked at the policies, after appointing an ad hoc committee to review every policy on the books, and now required the approval of the Steering Committee.

Professor Amram explained who had served on the ad hoc committee, and said there were three kinds of changes: technical, to accommodate rules changes, stylistic, and substantive changes needed in order to reflect the changes to the semester system.

Committee members asked a few questions about specific provisions in some of the policies. Professor Bloomfield then commended the committee for its work and asked for Steering Committee approval. The policy changes were approved.

(These items do not require action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.)

## **4. Docket Items**

Professor Bloomfield next noted that FCC wished to nominate Professor Hogan for vice chair of the Senate; the nomination was approved. The students will nominate someone to serve as vice chair of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

Professor Koch explained that there were two changes in the academic policies that had been presented to the Assembly at its last meeting. The language about

prerequisites has been clarified, after long discussion, to provide that instructors may require students to have taken the course prerequisites and a student may obtain credit for a course that is a prerequisite even after taking the course that the prerequisite was for. Professor Morrison noted that the University appears not to mean what it says when it describes a course as a prerequisite, said departments should think about what prerequisites are, and suggested the Registrar should enforce them. Professor Koch responded that the Educational Policy committee had discussed this at length, and concluded that there was such wide variation in how “prerequisites” were used that it would be inappropriate to enforce a University-wide rule.

Professor Koch also reported that the Educational Policy committee had also concluded that there should be a limit on the number of credits students could take in physical education, applied music, study skills, and ROTC courses that would apply toward a degree (unless the credits were required by the student’s program); the limit was set at 6 semester credits in total. Following discussion, it was agreed that the provision would not cover ROTC courses, and that specific language covering them would be drafted in order to avoid a possible conflict with federal regulations.

Professor Bloomfield inquired if the attempt to bring consistency to these policies on the Twin Cities campus was leading to results that made little sense. Professor Koch responded that in many cases, colleges are doing things in 19 different ways (which are not necessarily policy matters) that are often educationally unimportant but a source of frustration to students. Professor Morrison pointed out that the University stands to save a great deal of money if it can simplify seemingly meaningless differences among the colleges; Professor Koch added that the University will spend MORE money if it does not bring consistency to the practices and policies. Professor Hamilton noted that the costs of the enterprise systems are going up considerably, and that there needs to be as much consistency and simplicity as possible.

Professor Morrison next explained the classroom renovation management recommendations. The thrust of the document is that there should be a single authority responsible for classroom renovation and maintenance, rather than simply the designation of someone responsible for scheduling them. Responsibility has been scattered and fragmented, and this proposal pulls it back together.

Professor Morrison clarified that the proposal does not cover departmental classrooms, but that it does cover all centrally-scheduled classrooms, including those in the AHC.

Ms. Kvanbeck reviewed with the Committee the dockets of the Senate and Assembly meetings.

Professor Eric Bauer joined the Committee to present a resolution calling for no further investments in Total Oil, in Burma (the University has already divested its ownership, for financial reasons) because the company, and Burmese government, rely on slave labor and is harming the environment. The Social Concerns Committee

obtained information from the Burmese government, which made it sound like a Garden of Eden, and from a group that advises investors on ethical investments with respect to social and environmental issues, which provided quite a different view. The committee has used the group before, as does the University, and accepted their judgment.

Professor Hamilton suggested slightly stronger wording in the resolution, which the Committee and Professor Bauer accepted.

In response to a query why the University is not more active in managing investments such as this, Professor Bauer explained that the University does not itself make investments; it uses investment managers. These managers are resistant to restrictions on investment policy, and if there are restrictions, they will wait to invest funds until after they have dealt with funds which do not impose restrictions.

The Committee suggested that if this was intended to be sent to the Regents, for adoption, then the President needed to be informed by the Senate that that was its will. The Committee unanimously approved the resolution.

Professor Bloomfield adjourned the meeting at 4:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota