

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

FEBRUARY 17, 1994

The third meeting of the University Senate for 1993-94 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, February 17, 1994, at 2:00 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 131 voting faculty/academic professional members, 32 voting student members, 2 ex officio members, and 5 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

I. MINUTES FOR DECEMBER 2, 1993
Action

APPROVED

II. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Faculty Senate Vice Chair
Action

MOTION 1:

To amend Article III, Section 6, of the University Senate Constitution, as follows (deleted language is ~~struck out~~; new language is underlined):

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE

....

6. University Senate, ~~and Student Senate,~~ and Faculty Senate Officers

- a. The president of the University shall chair the University Senate. A vice chair shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring of the academic year from among its current members for a term of one year and shall be eligible for re-election. The president, with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint a clerk and a parliamentarian of the Senate (non-members of the Senate), whose duties shall be prescribed in the Senate Bylaws.
- b. The officers of the Student Senate shall be
- c. The president of the University shall chair the Faculty Senate. A vice chair shall be elected by the Faculty Senate in the spring of the academic year for a term of one year and shall be eligible for re-election. The president, with the consent of the Faculty Senate, shall appoint a clerk and a parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate (non-members of the Faculty Senate) whose duties shall be the same as those of the clerk and parliamentarian of the University Senate.

MOTION 2:

To amend Article III, Section 4, of the University Senate Bylaws, as follows:

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES

....

4. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

....

Faculty Consultative Committee

Membership

The faculty of the Twin Cities campus and those faculty members on the Duluth campus eligible to vote in elections for the Senate shall elect 8 members, and the faculties of the Crookston and Morris campuses shall each elect one faculty member. . . .

In case of a faculty vacancy. . . .

The vice chair of the Faculty Senate shall serve as an ex officio, voting member of the Faculty Consultative Committee. The chairs of the Educational Policy and Finance and Planning Committees shall be ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee. [In the instance when a faculty member is elected vice chair of the University Senate, that individual shall also serve as vice chair of the Faculty Senate.]

There shall also be one ex officio, nonvoting member of the committee who shall represent the faculty on the Duluth campus. . . .

COMMENT:

These two motions, one a constitutional amendment requiring Regental approval and one a bylaw amendment that the Senate can approve on its own authority, create a vice chair of the Faculty Senate, to be elected by the membership of the Faculty Senate when the vice chair of the University Senate is a student. The vice chair of the Faculty Senate will also serve as a voting member of the Faculty Consultative Committee (but not the Senate Consultative Committee) when the University Senate vice chair is a student. When the University Senate vice chair is a faculty member, that individual will also serve as vice chair of the Faculty Senate--and serve as a voting member of both the Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees.

The Faculty Consultative Committee believes it necessary to establish the position of vice chair of the Faculty Senate for two reasons. First, if the President of the University is unable to chair a meeting of the Faculty Senate, there is no one who is designated to assume that responsibility. Second, it is sometimes the case, by accident of election outcomes, that major units of the University are not represented on the FCC; establishment of this position would present an opportunity for FCC to nominate an individual from an un- or under-represented unit when the position of University Senate vice chair is occupied by a student. While the FCC recognizes that those elected to the Consultative Committee "shall represent the faculty and students at large and not the individual campuses, institutes, colleges, schools, or departments of the University" [from the Senate Bylaws], FCC nonetheless finds it helpful to have the perspective and experience of faculty members from as wide a variety of colleges and campuses as possible. Having the chairs of the Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, and Finance and Planning Committees serve as ex officio members of FCC has contributed to that diversity of perspective. Creation of the vice chair of the Faculty Senate will provide the opportunity to ensure that the appropriate perspectives are present among the members of FCC.

The result of these changes would be that FCC would have 11 voting members and 4 ex-officio nonvoting members (chairs of the Educational Policy, Faculty Affairs, and Finance and Planning committees and a representative from the Duluth campus). Ten of the voting members would be elected by the faculty at large; the one who serves as vice chair would be elected by the members of the Faculty/University Senate.

If approved, appropriate editorial corrections will be made to Article III, Section 2 of the Senate rules (Ex Officio Members of the Senate).

JUDITH GARRARD, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

DISCUSSION:

As a constitutional amendment, Motion 1 requires approval by two-thirds of the voting membership at one meeting or approval by a majority of the voting membership at each of two meetings. The motion received majority

approval at each of the December 2 and February 17 University Senate meetings.

Motion 2, a bylaw amendment, also received approval by a majority of the voting membership.

MOTION 1--APPROVED
MOTION 2--APPROVED

III. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Report of the Review Committee on Awarding Credit For Advanced Placement
and International Baccalaureate at the University of Minnesota
Action

MOTION:

To approve the following Report of the Review Committee on Awarding Credit for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate at the University of Minnesota:

Report of the Review Committee on Awarding Credit For Advanced Placement
and International Baccalaureate at the University of Minnesota

This committee was charged with recommending clear, uniform policies for the awarding of University credit for several standardized examinations. The members of the committee were:

Carol Cline, Assistant Director, Admissions
Linda Ellinger, Associate to the Vice President for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering
David Frank, Professor, Mathematics
Kenneth Heller, Professor, Physics
William Hanson, Professor, Philosophy

The review committee met several times during winter and spring quarters to review current practices on granting credit for Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) examinations. We also looked at data on the subsequent success of University students who have been granted such credit. Summaries of some of our findings are included in the discussions below.

Advanced Placement

Advanced Placement (or AP) tests are administered by the College Board to high school seniors who have been enrolled in special Advanced Placement classes. In the fall of 1990, 170 NHS students who were admitted to the Twin Cities campus were awarded credit for one or more AP exams taken in high school; 51 students at Morris and 16 at Duluth also received AP credit. Appendices A and B show the credits granted in 1990–91 for both NHS and NAS students for IB, AP, CLEP, and Credit-by-Exam at all campuses.

For the fall, 1990 Twin Cities group, credit was awarded for a total of 237 exams (some students were awarded credit for more than one examination). The mean number of University of Minnesota credits granted for AP exams on the Twin Cities campus in fall, 1990 was 10.13; the range was 0–55. The examination for which students most commonly received credit was Calculus AB (79 students), followed by Literature/Composition (43), American History (25) and Language/Composition (23). Fewer than 15 students were awarded credits for any of thirteen other examinations.

The present University policy on awarding credit varies by campus. (A complete listing of current credit awards is included as Appendix C.) In most cases, the Twin Cities campus has given credit only for scores of 4 or 5 on the exam; Morris and Duluth tend to give some credit for scores of 3 and above. In some cases, variable credit has been awarded for different scores; for example, on the Twin Cities Campus, a score of 3 on the Art History exam allows exemption from a distribution requirement; a score of 4 is granted four credits of art history, and a score of 5 is granted 8 credits of art history. That same examination, regardless of score (3, 4, or 5) would be granted 10 credits at Morris, while at

Duluth a score of 3 would be awarded an exemption and a score of either 4 or 5 would receive eight credits. This situation, while it might be justifiable on each campus, renders the University incapable of giving a clear message to students about how we treat AP exams; it also prevents us from acting as a unified system in our discussions with other higher education systems. (For comparative purposes, a summary of practices at other Big Ten institutions is included as Appendix D.)

In reviewing data on the success of students on the Twin Cities campus who had been awarded AP credit, we discovered that the subsequent mean GPA of the 170 students admitted in fall, 1990 was 3.21. Only 24 of the 170 students had a cumulative GPA of less than 2.5, while 66 had a GPA of 3.5 or greater. Clearly, these students are quite successful at the University. In a more detailed follow-up, we looked at the subsequent success in math courses of students who had taken the Calculus AB exam. Of the 79 students who took the exam, 70 had taken a subsequent math course. The average "follow-up" math grade of students who had had a score of 4 on their Calculus AB exam was 3.22 on a 4.0 scale; the average grade of students who had had a 5 score was 3.45.

International Baccalaureate

The IB exams differ from the AP exams in that students enrolled in IB programs are taking a comprehensive curriculum rather than a set of discrete advanced courses. The following description is taken from the General Regulations for all IB programs: "The examination for the Diploma requires candidates to offer six subjects, each normally studied over a period of two years. At least three and not more than four must be offered at the higher level, and the others at the subsidiary level." Students may come to the University either with a full IB diploma, or with a certificate which recognizes specific higher level or subsidiary level test scores.

Present University policy on IB scores is the same for all three campuses. For most examinations, credit is given for a score of 5 or higher on a 7-point scale; in some cases, credit is given for a score of 4. With three exceptions, credit is given only for higher level exams; credit for subsidiary exams is awarded in Art/Design, Biology, and Computer Science. Appendix E summarizes current University policy on credit awards.

The IB program is still relatively new in Minnesota; in the fall of 1990, only 7 students received credit at the Twin Cities campus for IB exams. According to information gathered by Matt Dion in CLA, Minnesota schools awarded 11 IB diplomas and 308 IB certificates in 1990. He indicated that there was no data available on how IB diploma or certificate students perform after enrollment in college. Appendix F provides comparative data on credit awards for IB at other Minnesota institutions and at Big Ten schools.

Our committee was also asked by Associate Vice President Kvavik to review a request by Tom Keith, International Baccalaureate Coordinator at the Minneapolis Public Schools, to consider a comprehensive and attractive credit award for students who complete the IB diploma. As part of our discussion of such an award, we reviewed data provided by the Admissions Office on policies used by other major institutions in awarding IB credit. It generally appears that some institutions, including Harvard and Stanford, are more generous in their credit awards than is the University of Minnesota.

Assumptions Guiding our Recommendations

In making the following recommendations, we have operated according to a set of assumptions about the University's goals and about the students who are seeking credit awards for AP and IB.

1. The University wishes to encourage high-ability students to enroll here. We want to encourage policies that, while maintaining high academic standards, make the University an attractive place for the best students.
2. High-ability students have many educational opportunities, and they make intelligent comparative judgments about the schools they are considering attending, including the advantages offered by variations in policies on issues such as advanced placement.
3. AP and IB classes are usually taken by high-ability students. In most schools, these classes have the reputation of being tough and time-consuming. Furthermore, the exams themselves are not taken by all students who take the class, and not passed by all students who take them. Therefore, a student with a "passing" score has already gone through a

sorting process.

Given these assumptions, we have recommended a simplification of the granting of AP and IB credit, and have recommended offering credit to students with passing scores as determined by the nationally-normed exam results. Our recommendations have been drawn in large measure from draft recommendations prepared by Admissions Office staff (Newton Smith, Karen Lukas) and by CLA Admissions director Matt Dion.

Recommendations for Advanced Placement Credit
at the University of Minnesota

The following recommendations are for the Twin Cities, Morris, and Crookston campuses of the University:¹

1. The University should set 3 as the standard minimum score for awards on all tests. Where a department has conducted studies that show that a score of 3 is too low to predict success in sequential courses, a higher score may be established. No department is obligated to offer credit for any AP exam, although departments may be asked to provide to SCEP an explanation of any decision not to award credit for AP.
2. Where a test covers material that is substantially similar to an existing University course, credit for that course should be awarded. Departments will determine which courses(s) are covered by the exam.
3. Where a test covers material that is deemed to be college level but that is not substantially similar to an existing course, the University should award four "blanket credits" in courses numbered 1999 or 3999 in appropriate departments. This practice would recognize the college level achievement of the student without placing that student in advanced courses for which he or she may not be fully prepared.
4. "Exemptions" or "partial exemptions" should not be granted. These are confusing to students and advisers alike. Either grant credit under 2 or 3 above, or do not grant credit.
5. In most cases, differential credit should not be awarded for different scores (e.g., 4 credits for a score of 3, 8 credits for a score of 4, and 12 credits for a score of 5). The only exceptions may be in cases where the exam covers material that is clearly sequential in nature (e.g., mathematics), where a higher score represents more coverage of material, rather than a better grade on the material. SCEP may ask departments to make a case for any decision to award differential credit for different scores.
6. With the guidance and approval of the appropriate campus committee (e.g., the Council on Liberal Education on the Twin Cities campus), allow students to use blanket credit awards to meet certain liberal education requirements.
7. Require periodic review of the tests (at least every five years) to determine if changes should be made in the award schedule. In addition, a system should be established that will provide the capability to review and track the academic performance of students granted credit with an AP score of 3 for the first three years. Responsibility for setting up a tracking system and organizing a schedule of periodic reviews should rest with the Director of Admissions.

¹ These recommendations are also being forwarded to the administration at the University of Minnesota-Duluth for consideration and possible adoption.

Recommendations for International Baccalaureate Credit
at the University of Minnesota

The following recommendations are for the Twin Cities, Morris, and Crookston campuses of the University:

1. Students who complete an IB diploma with a score of 30 or higher and no examination scores lower than 4 should be offered 12 credits for each of three higher level examinations, plus 3 credits for each of the subsidiary exams, for a total of 45 credits. Credits should be transcribed according to the same rules as those suggested for the AP exams:

where a test covers material that is substantially similar to an existing University course, credit for that course should be awarded; where a test covers material that is deemed to be college level but that is not substantially similar to an existing course, the University should award blanket credits in courses numbered 1999 or 3999 in appropriate departments.

2. No credit should be given for subsidiary level exams other than those included as part of the IB Diploma as described in #1 above, but students may receive credit as in #1 for any Higher Level exams with a score of 5 or higher.

3. With the guidance and approval of the appropriate campus committee (e.g., the Council of Liberal Education on the Twin Cities campus), allow students to use blanket credit awards to meet certain liberal education requirements.

4. Require periodic review of the tests (at least every five years) to determine if changes should be made in the award schedule. In addition, a system should be established that will provide the capability to review and track the academic performance of students granted credit for IB exams. Responsibility for setting up a tracking system and organizing a schedule of periodic reviews should rest with the Registrar and/or Director of Admissions.

COMMENT:

The Senate Consultative and Educational Policy Committees have approved the report and endorse its approval by the Senate.

JUDITH GARRARD, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

KENNETH HELLER, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

DISCUSSION:

Professor Kenneth Heller presented the Report of the Review Committee on Awarding Credit for Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate at the University of Minnesota. The report recommends clear, uniform policies for the awarding of University credit for several standardized examinations. With no discussion, the policy was approved by a majority of the members present and voting.

APPROVED

**IV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Student Academic Grievance Policy
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the proposed University of Minnesota Student Academic Grievance Policy, as follows:

University of Minnesota Student Academic Grievance Policy

A. Scope and Purpose

1. This policy addresses academic grievances only. Academic grievances are complaints brought by students regarding the University's provision of education and academic services affecting their role as students. Academic grievances must be based on a University rule, policy, or established practice claimed to be violated. (This policy does not limit the University's right to change rules, policies or practices.)

2. This policy does not apply to conflicts connected with student employment or actions taken under the

Student Conduct Code. Also, complaints alleging violation of the University's policies of sexual harassment and academic misconduct are not grievances under this policy. Such claims shall be referred to the appropriate office for investigation and review. Any complaint alleging discrimination in the University/student relationship, other than sexual harassment, may be filed either under this policy or with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, but not both.

3. Students enrolled at any campus of the University of Minnesota may file academic grievances under this policy.

4. It is the goal of this policy to provide a simple and expeditious process, allowing for both informal and formal resolutions of conflicts. Resolutions may include student reinstatement or other corrective action for the benefit of the student, but may not award monetary compensation or take disciplinary action against any employee of the University.

B. Informal Resolution

1. The first step of any resolution should be at the lowest unit level, between the two parties involved or the two parties and the appropriate administrator. Students may wish to consult the ombuds service or similar support services for advice and possible mediation. If no informal resolution can be found at the lowest unit level, informal resolution may be sought at the collegiate level with the two parties and appropriate administrators. If the issue cannot be resolved informally, the complainant may move the case to the FORMAL level.

2. Grievances involving an instructor's judgment in assigning a grade based on academic performance may be resolved only through the INFORMAL RESOLUTION procedures.

C. Formal Resolution

1. Each collegiate unit and the Offices of Student Affairs will have an Academic Grievance Officer and Grievance Committee. Members will be drawn from faculty, students and academic staff, as provided by the committee structure of that unit. The Academic Grievance Officer of each collegiate unit will be a faculty member who holds no other administrative appointment. In the case of Student Affairs or other involved units without an established faculty, the Grievance Officer will be a member of that staff, with academic staff members drawn from the unit's professional staff and with students and faculty drawn from throughout the University.

2. There also will be an all-University Academic Grievance Committee and a University Academic Grievance Officer for grievances arising from the actions of College Deans or the Vice Presidents/Chancellors of Student Affairs. The University Academic Grievance Officer will serve as Grievance Officer for these matters. The University Academic Grievance Officer and the University Academic Grievance Committee will be appointed by the President in consultation with the appropriate appointing agencies and will be drawn from faculty, students and academic staff.

3. A complaint must be submitted in writing to the appropriate Grievance Officer, identifying the student grievant, the respondent individual(s) involved, the incident, the rule/policy/established practice claimed to be violated, and including a brief statement of the redress sought.

4. The grievance should be filed in the collegiate unit in which the incident occurred, which may not necessarily be the student's own college. For graduate students, the appropriate unit is the Graduate School.

5. The Academic Grievance Officer will meet with the student and individual(s) involved to determine whether a satisfactory resolution can be reached. If this cannot be achieved, the Grievance Officer shall obtain a written answer from the respondent(s) and refer the matter to a hearing panel of the Academic Grievance Committee.

6. Hearing panels will be chaired by a faculty member and will have a minimum of three and, if determined

necessary by the Grievance Officer, a maximum of five members. On a panel of three, one will be a student. If membership exceeds three, it may include more than one student. In the case of a graduate/professional school complaint, the student member(s) will be (a) graduate/professional school student(s). In the case of an undergraduate complaint, the student member(s) will be undergraduate(s).

7. Hearing panels will review the evidence and hold hearings as necessary. The panel will not substitute its judgment for that of those most closely acquainted with the field, but will base its recommendations on whether a rule, policy, or established practice was violated. The panel will prepare a written report recommending a resolution of the matter and will send the report to the parties and to the Dean of the collegiate unit for review and action. If the Dean does not accept the recommendation, the Dean will provide a written explanation of any non-concurrence.

8. If any of the parties are not satisfied with the Dean's resolution of the grievance, they may appeal to the all-University Academic Grievance Committee. Based on the written appeal and response, this Committee will determine whether there are sufficient grounds to hold an appeal hearing. The Grievance Committee will not hear a case *de novo*, but rather will determine whether the parties have been afforded due process. The all-University Grievance Committee will report its recommendation to the appropriate Vice President for review and action. If the Vice President does not accept the recommendation, the Vice President will provide a written explanation of any non-concurrence.

9. The decision of the appropriate Vice President is final and cannot be appealed.

D. Timeliness

1. All complaints must be filed within 90 calendar days after the incident being grieved occurred. A response to the complaint must be filed within 15 working days.

2. Deans and Vice Presidents must act upon the recommendations of the Committees within 30 calendar days. Appeals must be filed within 15 working days.

COMMENT:

The Senate Consultative Committee has approved the University of Minnesota Student Academic Grievance Policy and endorses its approval by the Senate.

JUDITH GARRARD, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

DISCUSSION:

Professor Judith Garrard presented the Student Academic Grievance Policy. The chair of the committee that developed the policy, Professor Gerhard Weiss, said extensive consultation had gone into its development and that it was consistent with the University Grievance Policy approved during 1992-93.

One person inquired about the time limit of 15 working days to respond to a complaint. Professor Weiss said that every attempt should be made to respond within the time limit; however, if a faculty member is on leave or is not available for other reasons, every attempt should be made to respond as quickly as possible.

Another Senator inquired about grievances not filed within 90 working days. Professor Weiss said it is the committee's opinion that if a grievance is not filed within the 90 day time limit, it no longer is a valid grievance. If there are extenuating circumstances, it would be up to the University Grievance Officer to make a determination.

The policy was then approved by a majority of the members present and voting.

APPROVED

V. U2000 UPDATE

Discussion

A. Institutional planning

President Hasselmo reported that 68 stakeholder meetings have been held throughout the State in recent months and that a comprehensive report from those meetings has been prepared and is available in the President's Office. Efforts have already begun to incorporate suggestions into the U2000 planning. There has been encouraging support for quality improvements and an understanding that the University does have specialized missions.

Consultation within the University in connection with U2000 has presented some problems, the President said. Those involved in planning have worked through the regular governance structures plus a series of open forums have been held. Students have raised concerns about student participation in the planning process and those most directly involved with planning are working with Student Affairs to ensure a consultative process that includes students. It is important to understand that the planning process is ongoing. In large measure planning is in the hands of the deans, department chairs, and vice presidents. As it goes through the regular line structure of the University the appropriate governance structures should be the mainstay of consultation. Extra structures will not be established unless it is necessary to supplement existing structures.

In March of this year, the Board of Regents will be presented the financial strategies accompanying U2000. In April, institutional benchmarks will be presented to the Board. Colleges have also been asked to develop appropriate benchmarks. It is vital that the University develop these indicators because if we do not, they will be imposed by outside sources.

President Hasselmo told senators that initiatives concerning University College (a working title which will be changed) will be available within several weeks. There are other initiatives related to the quality of the student experience that are also underway. The committee on research strategies has made four recommendations that are now being developed into strategic initiatives in the area of research. Similarly, the Outreach Council, chaired by Vice President Allen, has made a number of recommendations. Finally, in the area of user-friendliness, recommendations are being developed in the area of community-building.

B. Cluster planning

Unfortunately, the President said, the University is not off to a "rip-roaring" start in the area of cluster planning. He expressed confusion by this because he believes it is a way to bring faculty, staff, and students together to look at the intellectual frontiers in selected clusters of disciplines. It is not just looking at interdisciplinary possibilities, he said, but looking at future productive linkages among disciplines. The University can then set intellectual priorities before making decisions about structure, strategic investment, etc.

C. College planning

College planning instructions were distributed to collegiate units in January. In February and March there will be a review of the rough-cut plans, plans which will in many instances build on plans that already exist. A review of more complete plans will be undertaken in May and June. To the extent possible, it is the hope that those plans will be complete enough to inform the legislative request for the 1995-97 biennium. That request will need to be approved by the Board of Regents in July and submitted by late summer. The University intends to make a very aggressive approach to the State and in a meaningful way renegotiate its contract with the State, putting before it the essential need for investment in the University. It will be important to have the best possible plans in place to back up that kind of presentation to the Legislature.

Support units are going through a similar planning process, but delayed somewhat so that support unit planning can be informed by planning in the academic units.

D. Senate discussion

Professor Garrard reminded senators that the Consultative Committee meets on a regular basis with the President and Vice President Infante to discuss planning and other issues. She encouraged senators to pose questions at this time.

One senator inquired why the cluster planning process is not working. The President responded that it is his impression that colleges are suspicious that the administration has some kind of reorganization in mind, which is not the intent. The administration sincerely is looking for genuine intellectual discussion within the colleges. Some collegiate reorganization may need to be done, but that will be separate from cluster planning. Another concern may be that the process has been driven too much by administrators and not by faculty. If that is the case, it needs to be changed.

It was suggested by one person that the idea of what the clusters and disciplines and boundaries are is being prejudged. There is a feeling that something is being imposed upon the faculty rather than an initiative being sought from them to establish what the natural clustering should be.

Another senator said the timeline presents a problem for meaningful involvement. Moreover, sufficient support has not been given to deans for mobilizing faculty, staff, and student involvement. Trust in the process is likely to erode, he said, if employees and students are not included in a meaningful way.

What opportunities have there been for student involvement? Opportunities have been available through the University Senate structure and through the Student Representatives to the Board of Regents, the President said. MSA also held a forum to discuss planning issues, which President Hasselmo attended, and seven open forums were held on the Twin Cities campus, as well as some on the coordinate campuses. More casual meetings have also included student representation.

What are the major changes and the major thrust in the concept of University College, asked another senator? For one, the President said, it has been clarified that the concept of University College is an access system, not a separate collegiate entity. The students that enter the University through that channel will have access to the same faculty, the same courses, and the same degree programs as the daytime and fulltime students, but they will have special services that cater to their needs as parttime, evening, or weekend students. It will probably be system-wide rather than campus specific.

VI. UPDATE ON 1994-95 BUDGET

Discussion

A. Overview of Resource Allocation Guidelines as adopted by the Board of Regents, January 1994

President Hasselmo reported that the proposed Guidelines drew on additional resources available for the 1994-95 budget. Approximately \$16 million of new funding will be available, some of which is not continuing funding, however. The administration based its proposal on the assumption that 6% would be provided for salary increases. The State provided 3.25% for salaries and the University, through internal reallocation, is making up the difference.

On the issue of tuition, the original recommendation of the Administration was for an average 5% increase. The Board of Regents, however, changed that to 3%. The Administration is now evaluating composite rate changes and will be presenting a revised recommendation to the Board.

B. Timetable and process for finalizing the 1994-95 budget

The total reallocation for 1994-95 will be \$12 million, \$8.5 million for the strategic investment pool (SIP) and a \$3.5 million installment from the 1991 reallocation plan. This will leave the University with a shortfall in the \$10-\$11 million range. Budgets are currently being prepared and reviewed and will be presented to the Regents in April for information and action in May.

VII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Hasselmo reported on several issues other than U2000 which was discussed under item V above:

- The University has submitted to the Legislature a special appropriation request that focuses on four areas: 1) student services and campus development, 2) educational equipment and technology, 3) improving library resources, and 4) specific programmatic items.
- The Governor has recommended a little over \$100 million in capital improvements for the

University. They are somewhat different from the recommendations submitted by the University; however, they provide a good indicator. The University requested \$20 million for health and safety, \$20 million for building renewals, \$41 million for the Archives Building, \$25 million for the Carlson School of Management (to add to the \$20 million that was raised through private fund raising), and \$1.2 million for assessments. The Governor recommended \$15 million for health and safety, \$20 million for building renewals, planning funds for the Archives Building with construction funds scheduled for 1996, and funds for the Mechanical Engineering and Architecture buildings.

- Discussions concerning the reorganization of central administration are underway, particularly the responsibilities of the senior vice president for academic affairs. The purpose of a reorganization would be to streamline the current structure and to distinguish between campus and system-wide responsibilities. The President is reviewing separating the role of the senior vice president from the Twin Cities provost.
- The Legislature's Task Force on Post-Secondary Funding has proposed a funding formula for higher education that separates the base budget from inflationary increases from adjustments in funding that would be based on a State policy on tuition. The State would also establish performance criteria for higher education institutions and presumably would provide rewards for special types of performance.
- The Financial Aid Task Force appointed by the Legislature has completed its work. It has recommended strengthening financial aid for low income students and specifically that low income students be required to pay only 40 percent of their education. If implemented, it would cost the State between \$35-\$41 million in additional funding for financial aid. All public and private institutions in the State of Minnesota have endorsed the report of the Task Force.

VIII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Question:

With the health sciences provost search nearing its conclusion, what administrative arrangements for the health sciences are being proposed to candidates? How much administrative autonomy will the health sciences have?

Response:

A set of principles has been established for the administration of the health sciences which establishes the provost as reporting to the president. It also establishes basic authority and accountability for the provost and assigns major operating authority to him/her. That means that the provost will make decisions except when there is a special need for institutional coordination or for institutional monitoring of compliance with policies.

Question:

Will the health sciences handle their own research administration?

Response:

There is a responsibility on the part of the institution, through the vice president for research, to ensure compliance with federal rules and regulations. However, the provosts and deans will be responsible for areas of research development.

Question:

Will the health sciences be permitted to establish their own indirect cost rate and allocate the funds recovered?

Response:

Indirect cost rates are established by the institution. The University is moving to allocate indirect cost funds back to units on the basis of formula. Units will then be responsible for paying for the services that are being provided in support of research activities.

Question:

Organizational theory usually says that an administration proliferates during a time of growth. It appears that faculty ranks are either shrinking or staying the same. Why then is there a proposal to increase the layers of central administration and how much money is currently being expended on administrative positions as opposed to faculty and support positions?

Answer:

The University agrees with the policy to minimize administration, simplify administrative structures, and reduce administrative overhead wherever possible and that is the intent of the proposed reorganization. During recent restructuring and reorganization efforts, steps were taken that have lead to considerable savings in administrative costs. [The figures that were requested were not available at the meeting.]

IX. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Judith Garrard, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, reported that the Board of Regents had requested that the Policy Relating to Recombinant DNA and Hazardous Biological Materials approved by the Senate on December 2, 1993, be reviewed by the General Counsel's Office before being reviewed by the Board. It was the recommendation of the General Counsel's Office that the document be rearranged to separate the policy portion from the operating procedures. Professor Garrard assured the Senate the policy had not been changed, just rearranged. The new document was distributed for information.

With regret Professor Garrard announced the resignation of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) chair, Ms. Anne Sales. Ms. Sales has done an outstanding job this year and her leadership will be missed. Professor Garrard then welcomed Mr. Love Goel who was elected to serve as SSCC chair for the remainder of the year.

X. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

XI. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

XII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY

**Thomas E. Murphy
1918-1994**

Professor Emeritus Thomas E. Murphy died while working in his office at the University on the morning of January 4, 1994. He is survived by his wife, Elizabeth, three sons and their wives, Bruce Edward and Jeanette, Brian

John and Sandy, and Barton Bruce and Nancy, and four grandchildren, Kellie Jo, Andrew J., Traci, and Hannah.

After retirement, he continued, until the morning of his passing, to teach and pursue his career-long mission: developing and maintaining the now flourishing Mechanical Engineering Engines Laboratory, a mission he worked at faithfully and almost single-handedly throughout many lean years. It is symbolic of his devotion to the service of the University that, although retired, he died at work on a day when he had no classes or other duties scheduled.

Professor Murphy was born in Minneapolis and graduated from the University in aeronautical engineering, Pi Tau Sigma, Tau Beta Pi, during World War II. After a brief sojourn in the aviation industry in Connecticut he returned to Minnesota as a graduate student and instructor, training engineers for military service as officers. Upon receiving his master's degree he was commissioned by The United States Naval Reserve. He served at the Aeronautical Engines Laboratory of the U.S. Naval Experiment Station, Philadelphia. At the conclusion of the war, in 1946, he returned to the University as an assistant professor. He advanced through the academic ranks, retiring as a professor in 1989.

His service to the University thus spanned a period of 53 years during which he trained generations, literally thousands, of engineers in applied thermodynamics, power, and propulsion. Many of his former students have become leaders in the automotive and related industries. His classes were among the most popular in the Department, and his inspirational teaching has been acknowledged by the Distinguished Teaching Award of the Alumni of the Institute of Technology, and the Teeter Award for Distinguished Teaching of The Society of Automotive Engineers.

One of his colleagues, in supporting his nomination for a Horace T. Morse-Amoco Foundation Award for Outstanding Contributors to Undergraduate Education wrote:

"His dedication to teaching has been demonstrated by his devotion to the undergraduate Engines Laboratory, which he has kept operating and more up-to-date than anyone might have imagined, considering how little support the laboratory received during the many years when internal combustion engines seemed to be in a period of eclipse in academia,-- a period which must have been very disheartening to Professor Murphy, because he understood, as many of us did not, how important that kind of education was to the undergraduate engineering student. He kept it going by dint of his dedication and hard work. His reward has been that he could see that it was not only a most valuable service to the many students who passed through it, but that ultimately it was to become the nucleus about which an Engine Research Center, which is already an important contributor to our graduate education and to our relationships with industry, is flourishing and gaining international recognition. To those of us who are used to espousing the point of view that graduate education and research are of overwhelming importance because they contribute to undergraduate education, this is certainly a turnabout."

Actually, the colleague used a more pungent phrase than the word 'turnabout'. He also wrote, in referring to the many enthusiastic letters from former students that arrived in support of the nomination:

"If you happen to be a teacher, you also experience a little pang of jealousy and ask yourself what you have to do to achieve a similar status for yourself. With such an objective in mind, I've observed Professor Murphy very carefully, to see if I could learn the secrets of his amazing success in dealing with students so that I might make use of them myself. I think I've learned the important one, but, unfortunately, just knowing it is not enough. Applying it takes a lot of time and hard work.

It's dedication.

Tom Murphy is the most dedicated teacher of undergraduates I know. Being a dedicated teacher requires a lot more work at oft-times unpleasant jobs than most of us are willing to do--time-consuming tasks of grading examinations and homework, and consider the services of paper graders a necessity of life, Professor Murphy insists on grading his own papers. He's never explicitly told me why, but I've had to do it once in a while myself, and I know why. It's one way of knowing exactly what it is your students are learning, what they're not learning, and where they are having their difficulties. It's a device which permits one to pattern one's lectures so that they always meet the needs of the particular group one happens to be lecturing to at the moment, and, having been a

teacher for more than 30 years myself, I can attest to the fact that they change a great deal from day-to-day and year-to-year. . . . It is a modus operandi that not many of us are as able or willing to take the time to achieve as Professor Murphy is."

Professor Murphy was active in The American Society of Mechanical Engineers and The Society of Automotive Engineers. He presented research papers at their meetings and published in their media. He was an especially enthusiastic and hard working supporter of SAE, having played an important role in the organization of the Twin Cities Section in 1941. He served in all of its administrative ranks through Chairman, and as Chairman of its Student Activities and Continuing Education programs, and was a Continuing Education Seminar Course Director over a period of service that spanned 34 years. Concurrently, at the national level, he served on many service committees, as a member of the Board of Directors of SAE, and was elected Fellow of the Society.

He loved to build things and work with automobiles and engines. It was a real privilege, as well as a lucky break to be able to buy a used car from him.

Paul G. Gassman
1935-1993

Paul Gassman was born June 22, 1935 in Alden, New York, son of Joseph Martin Jasmine and Florence Marie Rautenstrauch Gassman, of German Swiss parentage. He attended Catholic schools and met his future wife, Gerda Ann Rozler, who was a freshman when he was a junior at St. Mary's High School in Lancaster, New York. They were married on August 17, 1957, the same summer he graduated with a B.S. degree from Canisius College in Buffalo, New York. He received his Ph.D. in 1960 from Cornell University, where he worked with Prof. Jerrold Meinwald, and continued as a postdoctoral fellow during 1960 before beginning an appointment as an Assistant Professor of Chemistry at Ohio State University. There, he rose through the ranks, becoming an Associate Professor in 1966, Professor in 1969, and held the post of Adjunct Professor, 1974-76, after moving to the University of Minnesota as a Professor in 1974. Here, he filled the void which had been left by the departure of Prof. William E. Parham in 1972 to become the R.J. Reynolds Professor at Duke University. Paul Gassman believed in a three-year rotating chairmanship, and helped set up the post, in which he served as chairman of the Chemistry Department from 1975-79, one year longer than he had expected, while he waited for his successor, Prof. John Overend, to take office. Paul Gassman was named a Regents' Professor in 1988 and held that post until his death.

Paul Gassman was active in professional society affairs, particularly the 140,000-member American Chemical Society (ACS) and the Council for Chemical Research, Inc. (CCR), and as an adviser to the Chemistry Division of the National Science Foundation (NSF). In the ACS he served the Columbus, Ohio Section as Treasurer (1967), Secretary (1968), Chairman-elect (1969), Chairman (1970), and National Councilor (1971-74). He served the ACS Division of Organic Chemistry as a member of the Executive Committee (1976-88), Chairman-elect (1980), Chairman (1981), and Councilor (1983-1988). He served as a member of the ACS Joint Board-Council Committee on Science (1984-88) and as its Chairman (1985-87). He served as ACS President-elect (1989), President (1990), and Immediate Past President (1991), and as a member of the ACS Board of Directors during that period (1989-91). He also served as a member of ACS Board Committees, including the Executive Committee (1989-91), Planning (1989), and Public Affairs and Public Relations (1989-91). He served as a member of the ACS Committee on Committees (1989), Council Policy Committee (1989-90), and ACS Society Committees on Publications (1989-90) and Budget and Finance (1991-93). In the Council for Chemical Research (CCR), a liaison organization between the chemical industry and academia, he became a member in 1981 and served on the Governing Board (1983-88) and its Executive Committee (1985-86) and Chairman (1986-87). At the National Science Foundation (NSF) he served on the Advisory Committee for Chemistry (1978-81) and as its Chairman (1980-81). He served on the Petroleum Research Fund Advisory Board (1977-79) and its Policy Committee (1978-79), and on the National Research Council Planning Committee on Synthetic Fuels (1979). Other organizational activities included membership on the U.S. National Committee for the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (1989-90), Council of Scientific Society Presidents (1987-88, 1989-91), the National Foundation for the History of Chemistry, Board of Directors (1989-92), and the National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) Governing Board (1991-93), as well as Co-chair of the Organizing Committee (1991-92) for the 6th NCUR Conference, held at the University of Minnesota in March 1992.

Paul Gassman was active on the Advisory Boards of Editors of several chemical journals or monograph series including the Journal of Organic Chemistry (1975-80), Reviews of Chemical Intermediates (1978-93), Chemical

Reviews (1983-85), Journal of the American Chemical Society (1985-87), and the Journal of Physical Organic Chemistry (1987-83). He was also active in organizing scientific meetings, including the Gordon Conference on Hydrocarbon Chemistry, Chairman (1972), the 14th National Conference on Reaction Mechanism, Co-Chairman (1972), the 32nd National Organic (Chemistry) Symposium, which was held at the University of Minnesota in June 1991, Co-chair of the Organizing Committee (1991), and the 6th NCUR Conference (1992) noted above. He served as a chemical consultant to Ricerca, Inc., SmithKline Beecham, and PPG Industries.

Paul Gassman's research was centered in the area of organic reaction mechanisms, and focused on mechanisms of catalysis (including hydrocarbon metathesis), X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy, chemistry of highly strained molecules, neighboring group participation in carbocation chemistry, cycloaddition reactions, enzyme mechanisms, organoelectrochemistry, carbanion chemistry, synthesis of heterocyclic molecules, oxidation of hydrocarbons, nitrenium ion chemistry, and electron-transfer reactions. The work resulted in over 300 publications in scientific journals, 32 patents, and 11 books in which he is listed as an editor, and provided training for 72 Ph.D. and 13 M.S. students, as well as dozens of postdoctoral fellows and a number of undergraduate researchers.

Befitting such an active career, Paul Gassman was the recipient of numerous honors and awards, including being designated a Fellow of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (1967-69), the ACS Award in Petroleum Chemistry (1972), Fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (1981), Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1982), Minnesota Award from the Minnesota Section of the ACS (1983), the ACS James Flack Norris Award in Physical Organic Chemistry (1985), an ACS Arthur C. Cope Scholar Award (1986), the University of Minnesota George Taylor/Institute of Technology Award for Service (1987), a Fulbright Scholar (1988), membership in the National Academy of Sciences (1989), a Doctor of Science, Honoris Causa, from John Carroll University (1989), the Chemical Pioneers Award of the American Institute of Chemists (1990) a National Catalyst Award of the Chemical Manufacturers Association (1990) for excellence in teaching, membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1992), and, from his undergraduate college, Census: the James R. Crowdle Alumni Award (1971), a Distinguished Alumni Award (1985), and the President's Medal (1991).

On January 5, 1990, the Minnesota Section of the ACS sponsored a Reception and Celebration for Paul Gassman on his assumption of the presidency of the ACS. Prof. Lyle C. Hall of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls was Chairman of the Organizing Committee, and it turned out to be a spectacular event celebrating chemistry in Minnesota. There were exhibitors from industry and colleges and universities. Attendees included industrial chemists, faculty and students from area colleges and the University of Minnesota, from Gassman students, members of this family, representatives of the media, the ACS President-Elect, the ACS Executive Director, and the Editor of Chemical and Engineering News. The program included President Nils Hasselmo of the University of Minnesota, Anthony Anderson, Chief Executive Officer of H.B. Fuller Co., Lt. Governor Marlene Johnson, and Governor Rudy Perpich. Governor Perpich proclaimed January 5, 1990 as Paul Gassman Day for the State of Minnesota and presented Paul with an appropriate certificate of the occasion.

Paul Gassman's success is due in no small measure to his loyal and charming wife, Gerda, who mothered their seven children, of whom they were both very proud, hosted hundreds of memorable dinners and social events for scientific colleagues at their home on Fairmount Avenue in the Macalester-Groveland district of St. Paul, and in 1969 began traveling regularly with him to the numerous scientific meetings which they attended. His able secretary, Christine M. Lundby, was quoted as saying "He was one of those people lucky enough to have a job he really loved and he really excelled in. . . He never forgot that much of what he accomplished could not have been done without the help of support staff." On the occasion of Paul Gassman's death, President Nils Hasselmo stated "'The Regents Professorship' is the highest distinction bestowed upon University faculty members, but even this honor does not quite do justice to Paul Gassman. He was one of the hardest working, intellectually demanding, and most productive members of the University community, a scholar whose inestimable contributions to his discipline, his colleagues, and his students will be sorely missed." The light shone very brightly while it was on, but it burned out too early, at age 57.

Paul Gassman was at home on the evening of April 17, 1993 when he suffered a torn aorta. the following day he underwent emergency open-heart surgery, but suffered irreversible brain damage and never regained consciousness. He died on April 21, 1993. Memorial services were held on April 26, 1993 at his parish church, Nativity Catholic Church, in the Macalester-Groveland district of St. Paul, and included moving tributes from friends and colleagues from overseas and around the country. He is survived by his wife, Gerda Ann; daughters Deborah Jordan, of Apple Valley; Vicki McMarrow, of St. Paul; Nancy Gassman, of Coconut Grove, Florida; Amy Bell, of Wayzata; and

Kimberly Klaylum, of Warrenville, Illinois; sons Michael, of South Euclid, Ohio; and Eric, of Madison, Wisconsin; a brother, Norbert J. Gassman, of Staunton, Virginia; a sister, Irene B. Sivecz, of Alden, New York; and six grandchildren.

Prior to his death, Gassman had established the Paul G. Gassman Research Fund in Chemistry at the University of Minnesota Foundation, to which he had made substantial contributions, and to which students, colleagues, and friends have made and can make contributions in his memory. It was his wish that after his death the funds be used to establish a Gassman Lectureship in Chemistry to bring distinguished organic chemists to the University of Minnesota. This wish is being implemented.

STUDENTS

Laura D. Ceithaml
Continuing Education and Extension

Craig L. Clark
Institute of Technology

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Martha Kvanbeck
Abstractor