

1999-00

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

No. 4

**UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
APRIL 20, 2000**

The fourth meeting of the University Senate for 1999-00 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 20, 2000, at 2:05 p.m., as a joint meeting of the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 116 voting faculty/academic professional members, 23 voting student members, 1 ex officio member, and 4 nonmembers. President Mark Yudof presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Yudof announced that a sheet was distributed to senators which listed specific times at which some agenda items will be considered. He also drew the attention of senators to two favorable editorials in that day's Star Tribune.

**2. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 24, 2000
Action by All Bodies**

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URLs. A simple majority is required for approval.

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/u_senate/000224sen.html
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/faculty_senate/000224fac.html
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/000224tcca.html>

VIRGINIA GRAY, Clerk
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

3. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

Ernst C. Abbe
Professor
Botany

1905-2000

Duane E. Anderson
Associate Professor
Mathematics & Statistics – UMD
1940-2000

Willis E. Dugan
Professor
Educational Psychology
1909-2000

George P. Hager
Dean
Pharmacy
1916-2000

William S. Howell
Professor
Speech
1914-2000

Matthew J. Huber
Professor
Civil & Mineral Engineering
1924-2000

Richard A. Meronuck
Professor
Plant Pathology
1941-2000

E. Ruth VanAppledorn
Professor
Music – UMD
1918-2000

John Preston Ward
Professor
Law School
1929-2000

Caroline R. Weiss
Associate Professor
Education and Human Development
1931-2000

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

University Senate

Constitutional Amendments

Approved by the: University Senate November 5, 1998; April 22, 1999; May 20, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents PENDING

Constitutional Amendments

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration March 8, 2000
Board of Regents PENDING

Amendments to the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy
(<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/gradingpolicy.html>)

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration March 9, 2000
Board of Regents – no action required

Graduation Under the Quarter System Sunset Policy
(<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/graduationsunset.html>)

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration March 9, 2000
Board of Regents – no action required

International Activities and Exchanges
(<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/internationalact&exc.html>)

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration March 9, 2000
Board of Regents – no action required

Statement on Research Vandalism

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents – no action required

Policy on Use of Class Notes for Commercial Purposes

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents – no action required

Resolution on the Responsible and Ethical Conduct of Research and Scholarship

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents – no action required

2001-02 Academic Calendar

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents – no action required

Amendments to the Grievance Policy

Approved by the: University Senate February 24, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents PENDING

Faculty Senate

Amendments to Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration December 3, 1999
Board of Regents PENDING

Interpretation of Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration December 3, 1999
Board of Regents PENDING

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration December 3, 1999
Board of Regents PENDING

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 20, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents PENDING

Resolution Concerning Retention of Faculty Lines

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 30, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents - no action required

Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Constitutional Amendments

Approved by the: Assembly April 22, 1999 and May 20, 1999
Administration July 29, 1999
Board of Regents PENDING

Constitutional Amendments

Approved by the: Assembly December 2, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents PENDING

Constitutional Amendments

Approved by the: Assembly February 24, 2000
Administration March 8, 2000
Board of Regents PENDING

Resolution Concerning Intercollegiate Athletics

Approved by the: Assembly December 2, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents – no action required

Amendments to the Statement of Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies and Procedures
(<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/undergradpolicies.html>)

Approved by the: Assembly February 24, 2000
Administration March 9, 2000
Board of Regents – no action required

5. CLERK OF THE SENATE/ASSEMBLY REPORT
Assembly Steering/Senate Consultative Committee Election Results
Information

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill vacancies on the Assembly Steering/Senate Consultative Committee, Professors Muriel Bebeau, Daniel Feeney, and Billie Wahlstrom were elected to three-year terms (July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2003).

VIRGINIA GRAY, Clerk
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

6. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements
Information

FOR INFORMATION:

On February 18, 1999, in adopting a policy on "Collection and Reporting of Grade Data and Syllabus Requirements," the Senate Committee on Educational Policy was required to provide to the Senate "data on the mean grade point average by designator and course level, on the percentage of As awarded by course level, and overall collegiate grade point averages . . . for grades awarded each Fall Semester." The policy also provides that "data should be reported for all undergraduate students."

COMMENT:

These data were distributed at the meeting and copies are available from the University Senate Office.

JUDITH MARTIN, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

7. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
U-Pass Resolution
Information

FOR INFORMATION:

Whereas transportation is a major issue on the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities Campus;
and

Whereas it is a concern of both students who reside on and off campus; and

Whereas Parking and Transportation Services tends to steadily increase user fees for parking to pay for debt service on existing and new structures; and

Whereas students need to explore more efficient means of transportation to and from campus;
and

Whereas the discount currently offered to students to ride the Metro Transit buses is minimal; and

Whereas our campus is served by many bus routes with destinations or connections around the Minneapolis/St. Paul metro region; and

Whereas many of these routes are not utilized because the bus is not currently as cost effective as other modes of transportation;

Be it resolved that the Senate Committee on Student Affairs and the Student Senate Consultative Committee fully support the concept of an initiative to institute an unlimited-ride bus pass available to all university students, faculty, and staff.

COMMENT:

This resolution supports the concept of a discount mass transit pass for all students, faculty, and staff at the University, but not any particular plan that has been discussed. Both committees feel that the U Pass program would represent good public policy for the University and a definitive plan for all groups should be developed.

JESSE BERGLUND, Chair
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

JASON REED, Chair
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

8. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), and the Assembly Steering Committee (ASC), said that these three committees have been busy during the past few months. The ASC is currently working on establishing a task force on University Bookstores, for the Twin Cities, regarding concerns being raised about the availability of non-course books and is addressing remaining issues relating to athletics. The appointment process will also begin soon for the new Faculty Academic Oversight Committee and, in consultation with the President, for the Advisory Committee on Athletics. The committees are also concerned with next year's budget and the following year's biennial budget development regarding the issue of compensation and salaries.

Professor Morrison said that there will be a heavy University Senate agenda next year so three University Senate meetings per semester are being planned. In the fall, there will be the President's State of the University address in September, an October meeting devoted to the final report of the Health Plan Task Force, and then a November meeting. In the spring, meetings will be set for February, March, and April.

Finally, Professor Morrison extended thanks to Professor Virginia Gray for two years of service as Clerk of the Senate and her guidance as Chair of the SCC/FCC during the tenure debates, since she is leaving the University at the end of the semester. The University Senate extended a round of applause.

**9. CAPITAL CAMPAIGN
Information and Discussion**

Assistant Vice President Judy Kirk provided a PowerPoint presentation to the University Senate on the progress of the Capital Campaign. The presentation provided information on the time table for the campaign, the goals and priorities, University volunteers, campaign leadership, a summary of progress on objectives, gifts received, communications objectives, and success factors. She then opened the floor for questions.

Q: How much student participation is there on the volunteer committees?

A: There are no students on the Policy and Direction Committee although students are involved at the collegiate level.

Q: Can you reflect on the 32% that has been raised so far for student endowments?

A: At this point in the campaign, the differences in the percentages do not have more weight than reflecting which gifts have been received to date. Student support will be a significant part of this campaign since people want to give to create a flourishing environment for students. It is anticipated that the total received will exceed the goal.

10. HEALTH PLAN TASK FORCE Information and Discussion

Robert Fahnhorst, Director of Employee Benefits and Health Plan Task Force (HPTF) member, reported that the HPTF was created in 1997 to investigate the possibility of the University separating from the state for health insurance coverage. Membership of the HPTF now totals 30 with representatives from all campuses and employee groups.

Two months ago, an outside consulting firm, Buck Consultants, was hired to help the HPTF. A month ago, focus groups were conducted by the consultants to find out what issues employees had with their health insurance. With the information from the focus groups, the HPTF decided to conduct a University-wide survey on health insurance satisfaction. Also included in the survey process will be retirees and graduate assistants.

The next step is for a Request for Information (RFI) to be sent to Twin Cities health insurance companies asking what they could provide if the University separated from the state. The consultants are also looking at University claim utilization data to determine how University claims compare to those from the state. During this process, the HPTF is also working with the state on supplemental insurance in addition to what is currently being offered.

The HPTF will be making a recommendation on whether the University should separate from the state in August and then consultation will be held with all employee groups and campuses before being brought back to the University Senate for action in the fall. If separation were to occur, the earliest date for implementation of the new system would be January of 2002.

11. LIBRARY COMMITTEE Information and Discussion

Professor Robert Seidel, Chair of the Library Committee, discussed studies done over the past century about the exploitation of common resources. Once a resource is being utilized at a rate near its carrying capacity, additional utilization will degrade value to current users. At the University of Minnesota, the library is such a common resource.

During the past year steps have been taken to renew the libraries, such as the opening of the Elmer L. Anderson Library, although the facility is one-third smaller than what was originally planned because of budget constraints. The second project underway is the Walter Library restoration to house the new digital library center, which will decrease space for resources previously housed in this facility. To help faculty during the renovation, steps have been taken to provide materials by delivery. The Library Committee has also taken initiatives to preserve means of access, such as Telnet, which are used by many individuals.

These measures are small in comparison to greater pressures being placed on the libraries. One pressure is the cancellation of 650 technical journals over the past few years because the rising cost and increased profit margins for publishers have made them unaffordable. Faculty do not help this process by being placed in a publish-or-perish situation which forces them to contribute to for-profit journals. The rising cost of journals has also led to a transfer of funds from the book acquisition budget to maintain collections.

A Library Task Force report was published a few years ago and outlined the need for \$10 million of additional recurring funds for the library to keep up with all its responsibilities, especially in the digital arena. When this sum was presented to the legislature, it was reduced to \$1.6 million, of which only \$600,000 was in recurring funds. Also, only 1% of the \$15 million being raised during the capital campaign has been collected to date.

In order to protect the commons, the idea of charging the public what it costs to serve non-members of the University community was considered. Students pay roughly \$400 per year in student fees while the Alumni Association charged its members \$30 a year to be a library member, without contributing any of this fee to the libraries. The alumni rate has been raised to \$60 per year and the libraries now receive a portion of this fee.

The decline in financial support of the libraries stems from the switch to IMG since the libraries do not receive tuition dollars like collegiate units. Instead, the libraries must rely on central funding, which is not always available.

12. ELECTION OF SENATE/ASSEMBLY VICE CHAIR(S) FOR 2000-01 Action by the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales was elected Vice Chair of the University and Faculty Senates and Khaled Dajani was elected Vice Chair of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

13. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION Action by TC Faculty and Academic Professional Members

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Faculty Assembly approve the following slate of nominees to fill two 2000-03 Twin Cities faculty/academic professional vacancies on the Committee on Committees. A simple majority is required for approval.

MARILYN DELONG: Professor of Design, Housing, and Apparel, College of Human Ecology. University Senate member: 1994-95. Committee participation (past and present): Research (ex officio), 1995-99.

JAY HATCH: Associate Professor of Sciences, General College. University Senate member: 1992-95. Committee participation (past and present): Student Behavior, 1998-01.

PAUL STRYKOWSKI: Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Technology. University Senate member: 1995-97. Committee participation (past and present): NONE.

CARL ADAMS: Professor of Information and Decision Sciences, Carlson School of Management. University Senate member: 1984-87 and 1994-97. Committee participation (past and present): Committee on Committees, 1991-92; Consultative, 1994-97 (Chair: 1995-96); Faculty Affairs, 1990-94 (Chair:1992-94); Planning, 1985-88 (Chair: 1986-87); Finance, 1986-87.

INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Assembly shall elect by written ballot at its spring semester meeting faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Assembly Committee on Committees from a slate of candidates provided by a special nominating committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Assembly. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the slate must be in the hands of the Clerk of the Assembly on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted. The elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional members of the committee whose terms continue at least through 2000-01 are:

John Anderson, College of Biological Sciences
Muriel Bebeau, School of Dentistry
Francisco Ocampo, College of Liberal Arts
Naomi Scheman, College of Liberal Arts

JOHN BEATTY, Chair
MARY DEMPSEY
JOHN EYLER
ALLEN ISAACMAN
TONI McNARON
DEON STUTHMAN

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**14. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Classroom Expectations Guidelines
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following guidelines. A simple majority is required for approval.

Guidelines on Classroom Expectations

Preamble

All students at the University have the right to a civil, productive, and stimulating learning environment. In turn, instructors have a responsibility to nurture and maintain such an environment. Lively, even heated, discussion is not disruptive behavior. Both instructors and students have a fundamental obligation to respect the rights of each other and an equally fundamental obligation to respect the instructional setting as a place for civil, courteous behavior.

Teaching and learning are vital to the mission of the University. The University believes teaching responsibilities to be of primary importance for its instructors (faculty, graduate teaching assistants, instructors, teaching specialists, etc.) such that performance by instructors shall be taken into consideration in determining salary increases, tenure, retention, and promotion.

I. Expectations of the University:

1. Provide clean and appropriate classrooms and facilities. People using the classrooms also have an obligation to help keep them clean and in order. See III(7) and IV(8).
2. Provide sufficient and suitable classroom, laboratory, and other instructional space.
3. Provide, in consultation with instructional staff, audio, visual, and technological equipment that is capable, current, and appropriate for classroom teaching and learning. Equipment should be in good working order and be adequately maintained and adequately supplied. Operating instructions should be provided so those unfamiliar with the equipment can use it.
4. A telephone number should be posted in all classrooms for contacting appropriate personnel to report equipment malfunction or need for supplies.
5. To provide training that supports excellence in the classroom: that provides instructional improvement and effective classroom instruction, including the use of technology.

II. Expectations of Departments/Divisions:

1. The course descriptions published in University catalogs and/or in the Course Guide must be consistent with the content of the actual course taught. Descriptions should make it clear that courses evolve, and content may vary somewhat with the individual instructor.
2. All instructors are encouraged to provide timely course descriptions for appropriate printed materials and web sites.
3. Courses must be offered on a schedule, or frequently enough, that permits students to graduate in a timely fashion. All departments are to have a four-year graduation plan in place; they need also to have course offerings that support it.
4. Classes must be offered at standard times. Abuse of standard class periods leads to inefficient use of classrooms and is disrespectful of students and faculty: students are forced to be late to other classes, and faculty access to classrooms they need is reduced. See <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/semclasses.html> (1(a)) and, for the Twin Cities, see <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/TCclassschedule.html>.

5. Any unclaimed final examinations or other major submitted student work should be retained by the department for at least one year so that they may be reviewed and/or claimed by students.
6. Departments must maintain gradebooks or their equivalents for a minimum of five years. Faculty leaving the University must give all grading records to the department.
7. Departments should communicate with the Classroom Management Office about problems in classrooms so the responsible party can solve the problems.
8. Departments are to communicate with faculty about these expectations.

III. Expectations of Instructors:

1. Instructors are responsible for clearly communicating the course objectives at the beginning of each course. Class activities should be directed toward the fulfillment of these objectives and student performance should be evaluated in relationship to these objectives. If an instructor changes the course requirements or materials, students should be given timely notice consistent with the magnitude of the change (e.g., a few days for an additional article to read; some weeks if a research paper is to be added). See also #9, following. No major change should be imposed after the second week of the semester (e.g., adding a research paper or major examination). At the same time, instructors are not barred from adding material, or from announcing at the outset of the term that additional materials will be required as part of the course as the term progresses.
2. Instructors are responsible for informing students in their classes of the methods to be used in determining course grades, i.e., evaluation criteria and the contribution to the final grade of each graded component.
3. Instructors are responsible for informing students of any requirements related to course attendance and participation.
4. Instructors are responsible for informing students of any special attendance requirements for each class taught. This includes, insofar as possible, specific dates, times, and places of additional outside-of-class work such as field trips, study sessions, or extra class meetings, and whether or not attendance at these additional activities will be reflected in the grade.
5. Instructors are responsible for evaluating and returning examinations and other student work with sufficient promptness to enhance the learning experience. Instructors should specify a time frame for retaining student work (e.g. homework, midterm exams, etc.) during the semester. Term papers and comparable projects are the property of students who prepare them; instructors who desire to retain a copy for their own files should state their intention to do so. (It is permissible for a faculty member not to return examinations, but students must then be permitted to review the exam in order to request clarification of a grade.) Instructors are strongly encouraged to provide sufficient graded feedback early in the term and before the deadline for withdrawing from classes to enable students to assess their progress in the course.
6. Instructors are expected to meet their classes at the scheduled times and be prepared for all class sessions. When instructors know in advance of conflicts with particular class dates, they are responsible for working with their unit to make appropriate alternate arrangements. Instructors are also expected to honor class periods; to consistently run longer than the class period is disrespectful of students who may have a class the next

hour and it is disrespectful of faculty who are scheduled to teach in the room the next hour.

Instructors are also required to adhere to Senate policy concerning in-term and final exams: Exams during the term may NOT be offered outside of the regular class time unless there is notice in the class schedule. (See <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/semclasses.html>, Section 1(b).) Final examinations must be offered at the time established by the schedule (but can be changed if certain criteria are met) and it may not be offered during the term (e.g., the last day of classes). (See <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/semclasses.html>, Section 4, particularly (d), (e), and (f). See also Section 5 about students who are granted absence from a final exam.)

7. Instructors are expected to leave the classroom and its equipment in good order (e.g., clean the blackboards, chairs straightened, electronic equipment shut off). Students may be requested to help neat and straighten a classroom and furniture. (See Section IV (8).)
8. Instructors are expected to schedule and keep a reasonable number of office hours for student conferences. Office hours should be scheduled at times convenient to both the students and instructors with the additional option of prearranged appointments for students when there are schedule conflicts. The minimum number of office hours is typically to be agreed upon by the teaching unit.
9. During the first class session of the term, instructors should:
 - Introduce themselves and any teaching assistants
 - Provide a detailed written syllabus (if it is available on a web site, it must also be available to the class in a hard copy) containing the following information:

About the Instructor:

Instructor's name
Office location
Office hours
Phone number(s)
Fax number
Email address
Preferred method of contact (phone, email, fax, etc.)

About the Course:

Course title
Course designator
Course number
Number of credits
Day, time, and place of class meetings
Brief description of the course
Required and recommended materials and the location of the materials
Course goals, objectives, and expectations
Course prerequisites
Schedule of assignments, papers, projects, etc.
Criteria for grading and grading standards (definition of grades)

- (see <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/gradingpolicy.html>)
- Make-up exam policy
 - (see <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/semclasses.html>, Section 4 (d) to (f) for Senate policy on final examinations and Section 5 (b) concerning mandatory make-up exams for certain students)
- Senate student academic workload policy (see <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/grades&acadwork.html>, last paragraph)
- Statement on accommodations for students with disabilities (1)
- Statement on classroom conduct (2)
- Statement on academic misconduct (3)
- Statement regarding sexual harassment (4)

For sample statements that can be used on a syllabus, go to [www. _____](http://www1.umn.edu). Syllabi may also include this web site, rather than the statements. Note, however, that Senate policy requires on every syllabus language about the meaning of grades, student academic workload, and the penalty for cheating.

10. Instructors are obligated to report suspected academic misconduct to their department.
11. Instructors should take steps to have removed from class students who disrupt the educational process because of discourteous, threatening, harassing, or other aggressive behavior.

IV. Expectations of Students:

Students are responsible for being prepared to take the courses for which they register. They should not register for courses in which they lack the prerequisites unless they have permission from the instructor.

1. Students are responsible for all class meetings and materials, including any information contained in the syllabus. Students are expected to attend all meetings of their courses. They may be excused from class, however, to participate in religious observances and for approved University activities. Instructors should be notified at the beginning of the term about such planned absences.

Students must attend the first class meeting of every course in which they are registered, unless they obtain approval from the instructor before the first meeting. Otherwise, they may lose their places in class to other students. (See <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/semclasses.html>, Section 3.)

2. Students are expected to do their own assigned work. If it is determined that a student has cheated, he or she may be given an "F" or an "N" for the course, and may face additional sanctions from the University. (See <http://www.gen.umn.edu/courses/1137/conduct.html>, Subd 1, Scholastic Dishonesty, and <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/gradingpolicy.html>, Section II (2).)
3. Students are responsible for being on time and prepared for all class sessions.
4. Students are responsible for meeting all course requirements, observing all deadlines, examination times, and other course procedures.
5. Students are responsible for seeking academic help in a timely fashion.

6. Students who need special accommodations are responsible for working first with the relevant University offices and then with the instructor at the beginning of the course.
7. Students may not make commercial use of their notes of lectures or University-provided materials without the express written consent of the instructor. (See the Senate policy at <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/policies/classnotes.html>.)
8. Students may be responsible for helping straighten up a classroom at the end of a class period, if requested to do so by the instructor (see Section III (7)). Keeping a classroom in good order includes taking away or disposing of everything one came in with, such as pop cans/bottles, food containers/wrappers, newspapers, etc. Students shall also not deface or damage classrooms or classroom furniture or equipment.

COMMENT:

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy presented this set of guidelines in draft at the February 24 meeting of the Senate. At that time we wrote the following Comment:

"The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has received many comments, complaints, and suggestions over the years that relate to classrooms and teaching. We finally concluded that it would perhaps be useful to prepare a set of guidelines on classroom expectations that could routinely be distributed to faculty and students. At a minimum, we would likely urge that it be placed in a readily-accessible place on the University's web site.

"We note explicitly that this document, if and when it is approved by the Senate, would NOT be POLICY; it would be, as the title indicates, GUIDELINES. The document is intended to identify good practice. It does not bind any faculty member or student; except in those instances where it makes reference to policies the Senate has approved, it is intended only to provide a set of modest principles and to serve as a helpful checklist.

"The guidelines also set out expectations for the University and for departments/divisions. While not all of the standards may, at present, be met at all times (we recognize that may be an understatement), they set a standard to which we believe faculty and students should aspire--and which they should insist that their departments and the University aspire to as well."

SCEP has made some additional (minor) changes to the draft that it presented in February, and now requests Senate approval of the guidelines. The blank space at the end of Section III (9) will be filled in as soon as appropriate language can be developed, in consultation with appropriate University offices. The web site will then offer faculty standard language that they can use on syllabi.

JUDITH MARTIN, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**15. SENATE/ASSEMBLY EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Resolution on PeopleSoft
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the following resolution. A simple majority is required for approval.

Resolution on PeopleSoft

Be it resolved, the University Senate requests the administration to make changing the PeopleSoft system a very high priority. The system must automatically prevent students from registering for courses which end and start too close together to permit students to arrive on time at their next class.

COMMENT:

The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy (ACEP) has been concerned for years about students who register for overlapping classes, or who register for classes with end and start times that prevent the students from reaching their next class on time. In the spring of 1997 both the Senate and the Administration approved the Policy on Classes, Schedules, and Final Examinations For Semesters, which includes the following provision:

"2. Overlapping Classes

"No student shall be permitted to register for classes that overlap. Classes that have any common meeting time are considered to be overlapping, as are any back-to-back classes that have start and end times closer together than the standard change period for that campus.

"Only under extenuating circumstances shall petitions for overrides for such conflicts be permitted, and shall require the signatures of all faculty members involved. The decision to approve or disapprove such a petition for override is entirely discretionary with each faculty member involved."

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly adopted an additional statement implementing this policy for the Twin Cities Campus:

"c) Overlapping Classes

"Students shall not be permitted to enroll in back-to-back courses, when both are on either the Minneapolis or St. Paul campus, where the ending time of one class is less than 15 minutes before the starting time of the next class. Students shall not be permitted to enroll in back-to-back courses, when one is on the Minneapolis campus and one on the St. Paul campus, that start or end within 30 minutes of each other."

SCEP/ACEP recommended these policies to the Senate and Assembly because of the educational implications of students constantly arriving late to a class. Late entrances are disruptive for other students and for the instructor. Constant late entrance means the student always misses part of the class period. Inasmuch as SCEP believes that what happens in a class is important for the educational experience of students, it does not believe the University should permit students to enroll for classes for which they will always be late. SCEP understands that all students may, from time to time, be late for a class period, for a variety of legitimate reasons. What it finds objectionable, however, is that one or more students may consistently arrive late, often considerably after the class period has begun.

Part of this policy has not been enforced. The PeopleSoft system does bar students from enrolling in courses which actually overlap. But the system, as presently configured, cannot preclude student enrollment in back-to-back courses with less than a 15-minute interval between them, or less than a 30-minute interval when one class is in St. Paul and one is in Minneapolis.

This problem is endemic because 5-day classes use only the MWF schedule. But some of the problem would be solved if classes met ONLY at the standard class periods. SCEP has been informed that some students are late for class because their previous class did not meet at a standard time, so they did not have 15 minutes to get from one class to the next. Even then, however, students who have courses on Minneapolis and St. Paul may enroll for classes that are too close together, so they are always late.

JUDITH MARTIN, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**16. SENATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To amend the Uniform Grading and Transcript Policy as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined). A simple majority is required for approval.

IV. OTHER PROVISIONS

1. ~~In those instances when a college or campus permits a student to repeat a course,~~ A student may repeat a course once. When a student repeats a course, (a) ~~all~~ both grades for the course shall appear on the official transcript, (b) the course credits may not be counted more than once toward degree and program requirements, and (c) only the last enrollment for the course shall count in the student's grade point average. The preceding sentence of this policy shall not apply to courses using the same number but where students study different content each term of enrollment; all such courses falling under this provision must be approved by the college.

COMMENT:

At the last Senate meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) proposed a revised policy on repeating courses which provided that a student who earned a C- or better could repeat a course but that any subsequent grade would not count in the gradepoint average. This proposal had originated with the Council of Undergraduate Deans and addressed several issues, including course access and inequity based on income (because under the present policy students with enough money could enroll in a course a number of times to try to improve their grade). A number of members of the Senate objected to this proposal; the matter was referred back to SCEP for further review.

SCEP and the Council of Undergraduate Deans have discussed briefly what the alternatives might be. It is our conclusion that one which both find acceptable (although not the most desirable) is the one now presented. Students may repeat a course once and the grade earned the second time is the one that counts in the grade point average.

Other options which SCEP considered and did not recommend included barring all repeats (that seemed too draconian as well as educationally inappropriate), allowing an averaging of grades when students repeat a course, reaffirming the recommendation made to the Senate at the last meeting (with a better explanation of what was intended), and allowing existing policy to stand. None of these seemed to the Committee to be educationally sound, politically acceptable, and equitable. This recommendation seems to meet all three criteria.

JUDITH MARTIN, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Judith Martin, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that this item was pulled from the February University Senate agenda because there was disagreement about what was being proposed. The item was brought back to SCEP and the Council of Undergraduate Deans, and while neither group is completely happy, they feel that this proposal is a reasonable compromise.

Q: Is there a separate provision for students to take a course multiple times for classes in which an 'F' or 'W' was earned?

A: Even if a student earns an 'F', they would only be allowed to retake the course once. A 'W' does not count towards the one course repeat limit.

With no further questions, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

17. RESEARCH COMMITTEE Policy on Controlled Substances Action by the University Senate

MOTION:

To approve the following policy. A simple majority is required for approval.

POLICY 2.1.4 - Using Controlled Substances for Research and Teaching

Policy

Effective July 1997
Revised January 2000

The following are responsible for the accuracy of the information contained in this document

Responsible University Officer

Vice-president for Research

Responsible Office(s)

Department of Environmental Health and Safety
Office of Regulatory Affairs

Policy Statement

In conducting research and teaching activities with controlled substances, University authorized departments, units and employees must comply with federal and state laws and regulations regarding their uses, including registration with DEA and MNBP, storage requirements, inventory maintenance, and substance disposal.

Failure to comply with this policy may be grounds for discipline by the University, suspension or termination of research by the University Institutional Review Board or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, referral for academic misconduct proceedings and/or reporting to external licensing authorities. Any disciplinary action taken by the University will follow the employment rules governing the individual's employment category.

The Department of Environmental Health and Safety and the Office of Regulatory Affairs are responsible for monitoring compliance.

Reason for Policy

The University has responsibility to assure that departments, units and employees will comply with all applicable laws and internal requirements to safely handle and prevent diversion of controlled substances used in research when procuring, storing, using and disposing of them.

Who Should Know This Policy?

President
Provost / Chancellor / Provost
Vice President / Vice Chancellor
Dean
Director / Department Head / Chair
Principal Investigator
Faculty
Resource Responsibility Center Mgr
Area Manager
Other Accounting / Finance Personnel
All Employees
Other Groups -Those involved in using controlled substances.

Related Information

Regents Policy - <http://www.umn.edu/regents/policies/academic/AnimalCare.pdf>
Regents Policy "http://www.umn.edu/regents/policies/academic/HumanSubjects.pdf Use of Human Subjects in Research
Controlled Substances Act, Code of Federal Regulations (21 CFR, part 1300 to end)
Minnesota Rules (Minnesota Board of Pharmacy, Chapter 6800. 4210 to 6800.4250)

Advising, Consulting, Notification, and General Questions Regarding Policy

CONTACT U of MN Dept of Environmental Health & Safety

(612)626-6002
(612)624-1949 FAX

Effective July 1997
Revised January 2000

This policy does not apply to controlled substances dispensed by a licensed practitioner to a patient in the course of professional practice as authorized by his/her license.

DEFINITIONS

Location

A building, room, or set of contiguous or adjacent rooms where controlled substances are stored or used. A location is managed by a single University employee, has a single address and is designated by a Unit or by DEHS to serve as a single MNBP registration site.

Unit Registrant

A University employee delegated by his/her Unit to hold a DEA and MNBP registration in the name of the Unit and to order, store, distribute, use and dispose of controlled substances within that Unit.

Location Registrant

A University employee authorized by his/her Unit to hold a MNBP registration to obtain controlled substances from a designated Unit Registrant, and to store, use and properly dispose of controlled substances at a single location. Location Registrants who use Schedule I or II controlled substances in their research or meet other relevant criteria may qualify to hold individual DEA licenses. The exemption requires approval of DEHS, Regulatory Affairs and the Unit head.

Authorized Personnel

A University employee authorized to use controlled substances by a Location or Unit Registrant who also serves as his/her direct supervisor.

Controlled Substance

Any substance listed in the Controlled Substances Act, Code of Federal Regulations(21 CFR, part 1300 to end) Minnesota Statute 152.01-.02 and Minnesota Board of Pharmacy, Chapter 6800. 4210 to 6800.4250.

Extracted guidelines are available on the DEHS web site: <http://www.dehs.umn.edu/>

Unit

A unit is a department or other administrative structure which by size, non-contiguous locations or nature of activity requires separate registration as directed by DEHS.

Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)

The section of the United States Department of Justice that establishes regulations for the handling and use of controlled substances.

DEHS

The University of Minnesota Department of Environmental Health and Safety

Disposition Records

An accurate, continuous and current record used to track the acquisition, use and disposal of controlled substances.

Disposal

Disposal of controlled substances that are in the original container or original form and that are outdated, surplus or no longer intended for use. This does not include discarding small quantities of controlled substances that are residual or have been adulterated through use.

Employees/Members of the University

Faculty, staff and any other individuals employed by the University, using University resources or facilities, or receiving funds administered by the University, and volunteers and representatives who may speak or act as agents for the University. Members do not include students taking courses, attending classes, or enrolled in an academic program unless they meet one of the other criteria.

IACUC

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee for animal subjects use managed by the Research Subjects Protection Program (RSPP) in the Office of the Vice-President for Research

IRB

The Institutional Review Board for human subjects use managed by the Research Subjects Protection Program (RSPP) in the Office of the Vice-President for Research

Licensed Practitioner

A physician, dentist, veterinarian, or other individual licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted by the United States or the jurisdiction in which they practice, to dispense a controlled substance in the course of professional practice.

Minnesota Board of Pharmacy (MNBP)

The agency authorized by Minnesota statute to regulate controlled substances.

Registration

Formal grant of specific authority by the DEA and/or Minnesota Board of Pharmacy (MNBP)

Regulatory Affairs

The Office of Regulatory Affairs in the Office of the Vice-President for Research which is responsible for ensuring compliance of University of Minnesota personnel with internal policies and with local, State and Federal regulations.

Research

Any investigative activity engaged in by University personnel using University facilities or resources regardless of funding source.

Teaching

Teaching activities include classroom demonstrations, laboratory exercises and research projects that are required for completion of a course at the undergraduate, graduate or professional level. This policy does not cover teaching activity performed within a clinical environment. However, clinical teaching activities must still comply with DEA and MNBP regulations applicable to practitioners and pharmacies.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Department/Unit Head

Designate the Unit Registrant for the unit and sign registration applications for all registrants in the unit. Maintain a record of applications for licensure for all registrants within the unit. Maintain a record of justification for each controlled substance used by each registrant. Provide a list of all registrants and record of justifications to DEHS.

Authorized Personnel

Properly use and maintain disposition records of controlled substances.

Location Registrant

Maintain a MNBP registration. Provide the Unit Head with a justification for each controlled substance to be acquired for use in research or teaching. Justification may be evidenced by the number of an approved IACUC or IRB application, the number of a funded research project, a course description or syllabus, or other written description of the research or teaching activity in which controlled substances are used. Properly store and use controlled substances, and maintain appropriate disposition records. Supervise use by authorized personnel. Conduct annual inventory of controlled substances used at that location. Notify Unit Registrant and DEHS of discrepancies found in the inventory.

Unit Registrant

Maintain DEA and MNBP registrations. Exercise signature authority to purchase and dispose of controlled substances used within that unit and for which a justification is on record. Maintain current list of Location Registrants and authorized users within the unit. Properly store and use controlled substances, and maintain disposition records. Conduct annual inventory of Unit Registrant purchase and disposition records. Notify DEHS of inventory discrepancies.

Department of Environment Health and Safety

Maintain a current list of all registration holders. Approve security of storage facilities of all registrants. Conduct a final inspection when a registration holder or registration address becomes inactive. Periodically review each registration holder's purchasing process, disposition

and inventory records, and security measures. Periodic site reviews. Establish unit definitions.

Regulatory Affairs

Perform periodic site reviews and reviews of registrant's purchasing process, disposition and inventory records, and security measures. Monitor acquisition of controlled substances and verify registration and justification for use. Provide training in controlled substances policies and procedures for registrants and authorized users.

Research Subjects Protection Program

Assist DEHS and Regulatory Affairs in collecting information on authorized use of controlled substances by investigators using animal or human subjects.

Sponsored Projects Administration

Assist DEHS and Regulatory Affairs in collecting information on authorized use of controlled substances by investigators managing a sponsored project.

PROCEDURES

To ensure compliance, the following procedures are included:

http://groups/ppd/documents/procedure/cs_receive_use.cfm - 2.1.4.1 - Receiving and Using Controlled Substances

http://groups/ppd/documents/procedure/cs_store_dispose.cfm - 2.1.4.2 - Storing and Disposing of Controlled Substances

Policy Library

<http://groups/secure/documents/index/process.cfm> - Policies by Process

Comments: process@tc.umn.edu

© 1998 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota

Policy and Process Development Office. All Rights Reserved

The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer

http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/groups/ppd/documents/Policy/controlled_substance.cfm

Updated:

June 26, 1998

REVISED January 27, 2000

Receiving and Using Controlled Substances

Using Controlled Substances for Research and Teaching Academic/Administrative Procedure

The following are responsible for the accuracy of the information contained in this document

Responsible University Officer

Vice President for Research

Responsible Office

Department of Environmental Health and Safety
Assistant Vice President for Regulatory Affairs

RECEIVING AND USING CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

Registering to Receive Controlled Substances

A department or unit intending to use controlled substances for research or teaching must have one Unit Registrant with DEA and MNBP registrations held in the name of the Department or Unit. The Unit Registrant purchases or authorizes purchases and disposal of controlled substances for Location Registrants within the department or unit. Unit registrants, using a form obtained from DEHS, may grant power of attorney to another person in the Unit to order controlled substances and execute DEA order forms when the Unit registrant is unavailable. The power of attorney form must be attached to each order form and may be revoked at any time.

Every principal investigator or other primary responsible persons within the department who stores and/or uses controlled substances at a specific location for research or teaching must be registered with the MNBP (i.e. be a "Location Registrant") and be administratively associated with a Unit Registrant. Purchases may only be made using the Unit Registrant's registration number. Upon approval of the Unit Head, DEHS and Regulatory Affairs, an investigator who uses Schedule I or II drugs in research or meets other relevant criteria may be excepted from this system and may hold an individual DEA licenses for purchase and use of controlled substances in research or teaching at the investigator's location. Requests for exemptions must be made in writing on a form provided by DEHS. Exemptions are renewed annually at the time of registration renewal.

Each Unit Registrant must provide DEHS with a copy of the Unit DEA and MNBP registrations at the time of registration and renewal. In addition, the Unit Registrant must provide DEHS with a list of MNBP registrants (and other DEA registrants if they occur) and authorized users within the Unit on an annual basis, including name, registration number and location. DEHS must be notified when a registration address changes or becomes inactive.

Along with each registration there must be a record justifying use of each controlled substance used in research or teaching. This justification may be the number of an approved IACUC or IRB application, the number of a funded grant, a classroom syllabus or course plan, or other description of research or teaching activity.

Receiving Controlled Substances

Once the controlled substance(s) is received, the package must be opened by the registrant to verify the contents and any discrepancies should be rectified with the sender. If necessary, DEHS should be contacted. The Unit Registrant must maintain a record (disposition record) creating a chain of custody at each point where the substance changes hands or is used. The record is completed at each point by the person delivering the substance and must include the name of the substance, the quantity, and the signature of the person receiving it. The authorized person making the withdrawal must sign all records of withdrawals of controlled substances from storage.

Pharmacies

Pharmacies dispensing controlled substances must maintain internal policies and procedures governing procurement, use, storage, dispensing and disposal of controlled substances. These policies and procedures must be available for review by the DEHS. Controlled substances shall not be dispensed for use in human and animal research unless the appropriate oversight committee has approved the protocols for their use.

Oversight

DEHS will review each registration holder's purchasing and inventory processes and records, and security measures when a registration or registration address becomes active or inactive. DEHS or the Office of Regulatory Affairs will review registrants periodically during the active registration interval.

Policy Library

<http://groups/secure/documents/index/process.cfm> - Policies by Process

Comments: process@tc.umn.edu

© 1998 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota

Policy and Process Development Office. All Rights Reserved
The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/groups/ppd/documents/Procedure/cs_receive_use.cfm

Updated:

June 26, 1998

Revised January 27, 2000

STORING AND DISPOSING OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

Using Controlled Substances for Research Academic/Administrative

Procedure 2.1.4.2

The following are responsible for the accuracy of the information contained in this document

Responsible University Officer

Vice President for Research

Responsible Office

Department of Environmental Health and Safety
Assistant Vice President for Regulatory Affairs

STORING AND DISPOSING OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

Storage

All registrants must provide effective controls and procedures to guard against theft and diversion of controlled substances. Controlled substances must be stored separate from other

drugs or materials in a securely locked, substantially constructed cabinet. The following are considered in determining security requirements: the type of activity, the type and form of controlled substance, the quantity of controlled substance, the location of the premises, the type of building construction, the type of vault, safe, and secure enclosures, the adequacy of key control systems, the adequacy of electric detection and alarm systems, the extent of unsupervised public access, the adequacy of supervision over employees with access, procedures for handling visitors, the availability of local police and the adequacy of the use and disposal tracking system (detailed security requirements are in sections 1301.71-1301.76 of the Code of Federal Regulations).

Maintaining Disposition Records

An accurate, continuing and current record of the acquisition, use and disposal of controlled substances shall be maintained at each location. Separate records shall be maintained for each Schedule I and II controlled substances. Separate records shall be maintained by the registrant for each registered location and for each independent activity for which the registrant is registered. Purchasing and inventory records must be maintained for 3 years. The registrant shall conduct an annual inventory and reconciliation as part of a self-audit. A copy of the completed self-audit must be submitted to DEHS prior to registration renewal. The disposition records or log will be reviewed by DEHS or the Office of Regulatory Affairs when it conducts a periodic on-site review of controlled substances as required by the DEA and the MNBP.

The log, or disposition record, will include the following information:

- Name of the substance for each finished form of the substance.
Number of units or total volume of each finished form in each commercial container.
- The number of commercial containers of each finished form received
- The expiration date and lot numbers of the containers received
- The name, address, and registration number of the source from which the containers were received.
The amount of each finished form transferred or used, including the name and address of the person(s) to whom it was given, the date of transfer, the name of the individual who used the substance, and the reason it was used.
- If controlled substances are compounded or aliquotted, each new container must be labeled and tracked as with the original container. (Note that Federal law and IACUC guidelines prohibit use on non-pharmaceutical grade drugs for anesthesia, analgesia, euthanasia or for any survival procedures in live animals, unless there is no adequate commercial preparation available.)
- The number of units or volume of the finished forms and/or commercial containers disposed of in any other manner, as well as the date and manner of the disposal.

For damaged, defective, or impure substances awaiting disposal, see 21 CFR 1304.15 (d).

Any inventory discrepancy of controlled substances must be reported to the University Police and DEHS immediately upon discovery.

Disposal

The person having custody of the controlled substance shall dispose of it according to federal regulations. Individual arrangements can be made with companies that dispose of pharmaceuticals. If there is difficulty with disposing of the substance, it shall be transferred to DEHS.

Oversight

DEHS or Regulatory Affairs will periodically review each registration holder's purchasing process, inventory and security measures.

Policy Library

<http://groups/secure/documents/index/process.cfm> - Policies by Process

Comments: process@tc.umn.edu

© 1998 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota Policy and Process Development Office.

All Rights Reserved

The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

http://www.fpd.finop.umn.edu/groups/ppd/documents/Procedure/cs_store_dispose.cfm

Updated:

June 26, 1998

Revised January 27, 2000

COMMENT:

Overview of Proposed Changes to Policy for Use of Controlled Substances in Research

Regent's Faculty Committee on Research

February 21, 2000

Current Policy	Proposed Changes
Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only explicitly covers controlled substances used in research	Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Covers controlled substances used in research and non-clinical teaching activities
Responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of Environmental Health and Safety has oversight	Responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of Environmental Health and Safety <i>and</i> Office of Regulatory Affairs have oversight• The Research Subjects Protection Program and Sponsored Projects Administration will assist in collecting information on controlled substances use
Registration Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each registrant or Department chooses if they want an individual or Unit registration	Registration Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requires that controlled substance purchases be made through a Unit DEA registrant, unless the investigator qualifies for an exemption• Each investigator or laboratory using controlled substances will be registered with the State Board of Pharmacy• Exemptions allowing individual licensure

will be made for certain activities that would present excessive risk to the Unit registrant

General Changes

- Clarifies definitions and responsibilities, and consequences for failure to comply with the policy
- Modification of "Procedures" section to clarify issues
- Implementation of the revised policy will include a commitment to training and auditing

LEONARD KUHI, Chair
RESEARCH COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Len Kuhi, Chair of the Research Committee, said that these policy changes are being introduced in response to problems that occurred in the Academic Health Center (AHC). The proposed changes tighten the regulations for the use of controlled substances and thereby reduce the risk to the University.

Q: There is wording in the policy which refers to the responsible officer. The two responsible offices are the Department of Environmental Health and Safety (DEHS) and the Office of Regulatory Affairs. Therefore, which office serves as the responsible officer according to this policy?

A: Both offices must approve all forms.

Q: If a department investigator has their own DEA registration, they can petition to be allowed to maintain this registration. It is unclear whether the DEA or the location registrant, that is the department's registrant, has authority over that investigator's activities or reports. Are there three responsible parties to which an exempt DEA registrant would need to get approval from in terms of purchasing, location, and inventory?

A: The DEA has overriding authority. An exempted investigator would control the location registrant. Registration is done with the DEA and the Minnesota Board. An investigator is then responsible to the oversight functions of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and the DEHS. There would not be recurring approval from the DEA and the Minnesota Board.

The senator then said that the proposed policy includes this complexity which may be hard for some people to understand.

It was noted that these complexities would be dealt with in the implementation procedures.

With no further questions, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

18. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

**Student Body Presidents as Ex Officio Members
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly**

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the Constitution, this motion requires a 2/3 majority of all voting members (117) at one meeting for approval, or a majority (89) of all members at two successive meetings. This is the second meeting at which this motion is being presented. It did not receive a majority of all members at the February 24, 2000 meeting. Therefore, it requires a 2/3 majority of all voting members (117) at this meeting for approval.

MOTION:

To amend the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Constitution, Article III, Section 1, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~; language to be added is underlined).

Twin Cities Campus Assembly Constitution - Article II. Twin Cities Campus Assembly

1. Membership

The Assembly shall be composed of the following voting members: (a) the president of the University; (b) the Twin Cities campus members of the Senate Consultative Committee, who shall serve as ex officio voting members; and (c) the elected faculty, academic professional, and student representatives of the various institutes, colleges, and schools of collegiate rank, and the Graduate School. Only elected faculty/academic professional representatives or properly designated faculty/academic professional alternates shall serve as the Faculty Assembly; the elected student representatives shall serve on the Minnesota Student Association Forum, or the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, as designated by the Student constituency in the electing college. Each member of the Assembly shall represent the Twin Cities campus as a whole. The Twin Cities campus deans, vice presidents, provosts, the University Librarian, and the General Counsel shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members. The student body presidents shall, if not otherwise elected, serve as ~~an~~ ex officio nonvoting members.

COMMENT:

In the course of reviewing a bylaw change for the Twin Cities Campus Assembly, it was discovered that the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Constitution states that there is only one student body president that is an ex-officio member of the Assembly when, in fact, there is currently more than one. The Student Senate Consultative Committee recommends that the requirement be changed.

JASON REED, Chair
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion a vote was taken and with only 107 in favor and none opposed the motion was not approved since it required 117 votes in favor. The motion will return to the Assembly in the fall.

NOT APPROVED

19. UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

**Ex Officio Membership Status
Action by the University Senate**

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the Constitution, this motion requires a 2/3 majority of all voting members (144) at this meeting for approval, or a majority (109) of all members at two successive meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

MOTION:

To amend the University Senate Constitution, Article III, Section 4, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~; language to be added is underlined).

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE

4. Election of University Senate Members

- ~~Academic officers with class titles 9302-9329~~ Deans, vice presidents, chancellors, provosts, the University Librarian, and the General Counsel shall not be eligible for election to the Senate as members of the faculties under "a" hereof.

COMMENT:

At its February 24 meeting, the University Senate approved an amendment to the constitution that redefined ex officio membership status. The proposed amendment listed above should have been included with that motion but was inadvertently omitted. It is now presented for action.

FRED MORRISON, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion a vote was taken and with only 124 in favor and none opposed the motion was not approved since it required 144 votes in favor. The motion will return to the Senate in the fall.

NOT APPROVED

**20. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENTS
Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity
Action by the University Senate**

COMMENT:

There are two motions listed under this item. Part A is an amendment to the bylaws. The motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Senate (100) at one regular or special meeting, or by a majority of all members of the Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented. Part B is an amendment to the rules. It requires a simple majority for approval. However, since Part A and Part B are tied, Part B, even if approved, will not be implemented unless Part A is also approved.

MOTION (Part A):

To amend Article III of the University Senate bylaws, creating a new Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity, and abolishing two existing committees (Equal Opportunity for Women and Disabilities Issues) (language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~; language to be added is underlined). Note: existing sections within Article III will be renumbered appropriately if this amendment is approved.

6. EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Membership

The Equity, Access & Diversity Committee shall be composed of at least 7 faculty members, 2 professional and academic staff members, 2 civil service staff members, 6 students, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Each coordinate campus shall have at least 2 representatives. Members should reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of the campus, women, people with disabilities, and differing sexual orientations, as well as other protected classes under the University's equal opportunity policy. Campuses are encouraged to maintain or develop campus committees on related issues. The committee may form standing or temporary subcommittees or task forces on specific issues as appropriate.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To advise the president and administrative offices on the impact of University policies, programs and services on equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity from a system perspective.
- b. To promote compliance among the University community with equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity laws and policies relating to students and staff.
- c. To review policies, programs and services related to equal opportunity for and the diversity of students and employees, and recommend any changes.
- d. To bring concerns to the Senate, as appropriate.
- e. To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- f. To submit an annual report to the Senate.
- g. The role and performance of the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee will be reviewed during the 2002-2003 academic year, with a special emphasis on the extent to which the work of the two existing committees (Equal Employment Opportunity for Women and Disabilities Issues) has been carried forward.

4. DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE

~~The Disabilities Issues Committee recommends University policies, procedures, and services concerning faculty/academic professionals, students, and staff with disabilities.~~

Membership

~~The Disabilities Issues Committee shall be composed of at least 7 faculty/academic professional members, 2 students (at least one graduate and one undergraduate), 2 civil service staff members, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. Faculty, academic professional,~~

~~and student members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. Civil service members shall be appointed by the president in consultation with the Civil Service Committee.~~

~~Duties and Responsibilities~~

- ~~a. To advise the president and administrative offices, including the Disability Services Office and the University ADA Coordinator, on policies, programs, and services for students and employees.~~
- ~~b. To promote compliance with laws relating to students and staff with disabilities.~~
- ~~c. To review policies and practices in light of legal compliance aspects, deployment of resources, and effectiveness in meeting the needs of the University community, and to recommend changes.~~
- ~~d. To inform the University community to the special concerns of its members with disabilities and of the available resources.~~
- ~~e. To bring concerns to the Senate, as appropriate.~~
- ~~f. To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.~~
- ~~g. To submit an annual report to the Senate.~~

~~...~~

~~6. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN COMMITTEE~~

~~The Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee was established pursuant to and for the duration of the court decree in the case of *Rajender v. University of Minnesota*. Upon expiration of the decree (January 1, 1991), the committee continues in accordance with the "Women Academic Employees Policy Statement" of the Board of Regents.~~

~~Membership~~

~~The Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee shall be composed of 7 faculty members, 2 members of the academic professional staff, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. The committee shall be selected to reflect the general interest of the University in the pursuit of excellence in teaching and research as well as the special interests of women. The faculty members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. The academic professional staff members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees in consultation with the chair of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee with the approval of the Senate.~~

~~Duties and Responsibilities~~

- ~~a. To promote compliance with the "Women Academic Employees Policy Statement" approved by the University Senate on April 19, 1990 and adopted by the Board of Regents on July 13, 1990.~~
- ~~b. To recommend policies that guarantee equal employment opportunity for all women faculty and academic staff of the University.~~

- ~~e. To propose approaches for assuring that the University has an active affirmative action program for women in all of its academic units.~~
- ~~d. To encourage active measures to expand and strengthen the diversity of the academic community in accordance with the Regents' *"Women Academic Employees Policy Statement."*~~
- ~~e. To examine policies of the University to determine whether they would have a disparate impact on women and make recommendations to the University president or senior academic officers or to the University Senate if they do.~~
- ~~f. To work with the University's Equal Opportunity Officer to implement the Regents' policy statement on women academic employees.~~
- ~~g. To advise the University president and senior academic officers.~~
- ~~h. To recommend to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.~~
- ~~i. To submit an annual report to the Senate.~~

COMMENT:

Rationale for the creation of a Senate Committee on Access, Diversity, and Equity:

The Vision

The University Senate is committed to diversity among faculty, students, and staff and sees this as a common good. We seek to build a community that actively opposes discrimination, that welcomes and celebrates differences of identity and of viewpoint, and that is fully accessible. The journey toward such goals will be greatly enhanced by a strong Senate voice which is committed to this vision and which builds lively links to the many communities touched by it. We believe it is essential to have a committee within our structure charged with furthering this vision of equity, diversity, and access. Only such a committee will allow us to fulfill our responsibilities to provide a faculty voice in support of this vision within a system of shared governance.

Numerous Senate committees and groups have come and gone over the years, each of which addressed portions of this concern. There are, moreover, numerous advocacy groups, offices, and departments within the university that speak for these groups and that are available for consultation. Two of them are Senate Committees that have created models of advocacy on which this proposal builds. The Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity for Women - created in response to the Rajender Class Action Settlement - has a long and honorable history of advancing the interests of women on campus. As a result of their efforts, women are far more numerous, more visible as leaders, and more equitably paid than they were 25 years ago. More recently the Senate Committee on Disabilities has advocated for proactive compliance with legal requirements for accessibility. In addition, temporary committees, such as the GLBT subcommittee of the Social Concerns Committee have performed specific tasks and then faded from existence. On the other hand, the Senate has no body that is charged with consultation on issues of racial discrimination, the promotion of racial and ethnic diversity, or concerns related to sexual orientation.

Therefore, we propose the creation of a Senate Committee on Access, Diversity, and Equity in order to provide for consultative participation on the full breadth of diversity and equal opportunity issues affecting faculty, students, and staff at the University of Minnesota. Our proposal would replace the two existing committees with a single committee that has a broader charge. This committee will be empowered to create subcommittees or task forces on an as needed basis to work on specific issues that may arise or in behalf of specific constituencies that might feel the need for a distinctive voice.

Why now?

1. It is simply not tolerable to have such important concerns unaddressed by any Senate committee.
2. Furthermore, neither of the administrators charged with responsibility for these issues (Rusty Barceló, Associate Vice President for Multicultural Affairs, and Julie Sweitzer, Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action) has a clearly delineated consultative body linked to the Senate. EEOW has tried valiantly to fill this role, but its charge is far narrower than the responsibilities that these administrators bear.
3. We need to coordinate our work in a way that recognizes the intersection of identities and interests, and that creates a strong voice to consult directly and clearly with the administration on the full range of issues regarding diversity, equal opportunity, and access. This effort would underscore the University-wide responsibility for these issues.
4. As we enter the 21st century we also note that conditions today are considerably different than they were 30-40 years ago and solutions must be framed in response to new realities. The proliferation of constituency based groups, departments and programs, resource centers, and the like signal new positions within the University. The committee we propose would not replicate these groups, but instead would reach out to them and provide an environment in which to find the areas of common ground and overlapping interests.
5. It would also be built on the recognition that most individuals have multiple, overlapping identities.
6. We believe that it is essential to recognize the importance of working together within a broad vision and building on the strengths that would have been unimaginable only three decades ago.

* The new committee should include members of the current committees that will be dissolved.

MOTION (Part B):

To amend Article III, Section 2, of the University Senate Rules in order to remove reference to ex officio members on the Equal Opportunity for Women Committee and on the Disabilities Issues Committee and to identify ex officio members of the new Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee (language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~; language to be added is underlined).

~~—Disabilities Issues—Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (one from the Disability Services Office and the University ADA coordinator)~~

~~—Equal Employment Opportunity for Women—Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (two representatives, including one from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action)~~

- Equity, Access, and Diversity--Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (two representatives, including one from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action and one from the Office of the Associate Vice President for Multicultural and Academic Affairs)

COMMENT:

This amendment identifies the ex officio members of the new Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee and removes the reference to the two committees that have been abolished with the bylaw amendment previously approved by the Senate.

FRED MORRISON, Chair
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Naomi Scheman, past Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee (EEOWC), said that this motion would establish a new Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity. The proposal for this committee has evolved over several years and started by people talking about there not being a Senate Committee which looks at issues of racial and ethnic diversity as well as access and equity along these lines. The first thought was to create a new committee, but this would complicate the structure. The second idea was that the issues involved with equity, access, and diversity are complex and interrelated.

From these discussions, the idea of an umbrella committee, which would attend to issues of access to the University, equity once at the University, and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act in an interrelated manner, was created. The drafting committee wanted to place the emphasis on diversity and its value at the University, since issues of access and equity are necessary to fulfill a diversity mission.

The proposed committee consists of members committed to access, equity, and diversity across a range of differences and then active subcommittees which address themselves to particular aspects. As a consequence of this motion, two standing Senate Committees, the EEOWC and the Disabilities Issues Committee, would be dissolved. The work of these committees would then be placed on two subcommittees of the umbrella committee. The rationale is that an overarching committee would bring visibility and clout to issues and that concerns from constituencies will continue to be represented through the subcommittees.

Professor Scheman noted that while the EEOWC endorsed the structure proposed in this motion, the Disabilities Issue Committee did not endorse this proposal out of concern that the loss in status from committee to subcommittee would be problematic and that their specific issues would not receive adequate attention. She noted that there is a proposal for review of this committee to make sure that the structure is working and fulfilling the function of increasing attention to issues.

Professor James Carey, Chair of the Disabilities Issues Committee, then presented the dissent from that committee regarding the effectiveness of this change. The Disabilities Issues Committee has 14 members from across the campuses, of which one-third either have disabilities themselves or have children with disabilities. Past activities include: parking and transportation in terms of the Paratransit service offered; the cultural diversity theme language which now exists yet is void of mention of physical or learning disabilities, so discussions are being held with the Council on Liberal Education to add more courses on other types of disabilities;

PeopleSoft issues; Facilities Management construction; and adequate documentation of disabilities.

While the Disabilities Issues Committee agrees with the value of forming a new body on diversity, it disagrees on how this should be accomplished. Specifically, the committee is concerned that an umbrella committee would not be as concerned with disabilities issues or be an effective advocate for all the issues it will represent, and that a subcommittee will not provide needed continuity. The Disabilities Issues Committee therefore asks that the current committees remain and a diversity council be formed to deal with these other issues.

A senator stated that he, and the Crookston disabilities committee, agreed with Professor Carey since his campus is concerned that their needs will not be met with this new structure.

Professor Scheman responded that review of the new committee has been included in the proposal so that if needs are not being met, the new committee will be dissolved and the old structure will be reinstated. Also, disabilities would be considered a standing subcommittee and not ad hoc. Subcommittees would include membership from the umbrella committee, but would then be augmented by other people from the University who have a interest and expertise in the subcommittee's specific charge. The creation of several new committees also raises the issue of staff support.

Another senator said that while she appreciates the desire to create a cultural umbrella, the Disabilities Issues Committee is specifically focused on physical issues which would be in direct contrast with the umbrella committee's much broader, social agenda. Because of the work that needs to be done, she would worry that specific concerns would not be addressed.

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, current Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee (EEOWC), stated that even though there is a risk involved in changing a structure which is working, there was consensus the change was being made for the good of the University as a whole. To guarantee this, an annual evaluation was included for the first three years. She also mentioned that it will be easier for the administration, whose charge it is to address policies and procedures of equity, access, and diversity, to consult with one committee.

With time expired, a vote was then taken and Motion A failed with 52 in favor and 57 opposed. Motion B was then withdrawn from consideration.

**MOTION A NOT APPROVED
AND MOTION B WITHDRAWN**

**21. UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS AMENDMENTS
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Action by the University Senate**

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the bylaws, this motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Senate (100) at one regular or special meeting, or by a majority of all members of the Senate present and voting at each of two meetings. This is the first meeting at which this motion is being presented.

MOTION:

To amend the University Senate bylaws, Article III, Section 8, as follows (language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~; language to be added is underlined).

8. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Faculty Affairs Committee is concerned with policies and procedures that influence the personal and professional welfare of the faculty ~~and academic professional staff~~.

Membership

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall be composed of at least 10 members of the faculty, one member of the academic professional staff, one graduate assistant and one undergraduate student, and ex officio representation as specified by vote of the Senate. The academic professional staff member shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees in consultation with the chair of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee with the approval of the Senate. All other members shall be nominated by the Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate. The chair (or his/her designee) shall serve as an ex officio nonvoting member of the Faculty Consultative Committee.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To examine all policies and procedures of the University which influence the professional and personal welfare of the faculty ~~and academic professional staff~~, and to recommend improvements in the design and implementation of faculty ~~and academic professional~~ personnel policies, including such matters as tenure and promotion, salary and benefits, faculty development, and hiring and retirement alternatives.
- b. To recommend to the Faculty Senate additions, ~~to and~~ modifications, ~~and~~ interpretations, and implementation of policies on ~~of~~ Faculty Tenure.
- c. To examine and propose University policies and programs associated with faculty ~~and academic professional staff~~ development.
- d. To examine and propose benefit options and benefit option counseling available for current and retired faculty ~~and academic professionals~~ (with the assistance of the Employee Benefits Department) ~~and suggest alternatives when appropriate.~~
- e. To review the options, performance, and reporting of the Faculty Retirement Plan, with the assistance of the University's Assets Management and Employee Benefits Offices and ~~an independent consultant retained by the Faculty Senate,~~ and recommend appropriate changes.
- f. To monitor any legislation and other policies affecting faculty ~~and academic professional~~ welfare ~~including such matters as tenure and promotion, salary and benefits, and faculty and academic professional staff development.~~
- g. Interact with the Academic Staff Advisory Committee (ASAC) on all items that jointly impact academic staff and faculty, such as benefits and retirement.
- ~~g~~ h. To recommend to the Faculty Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- ~~h~~ i. To submit an annual report to the Faculty Senate.

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 108 in favor and none opposed.

APPROVED

**22. SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To accept in principle the following report and that preparation of implementing actions be presented to the University Senate at the first meeting of fall semester, 2000, by the Senate Consultative Committee. A simple majority is required for approval.

April 6, 2000

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
385 Law Center

Dear Fred:

I attach Part II of the report of the Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity. This part of the report responds to the first and second charge in your letter of appointment of 15 July 1999:

1. *To review the policies and standards regarding student academic integrity and make recommendations for improvement of University policies.* The task force should examine the standards in the Code of Student Conduct and in the various college policies. Should a uniform University-wide policy be adopted? Should a uniform policy apply to undergraduates, graduate, and professional students equally, or are there circumstances requiring special policies for some of these groups? Should more explicit standards be adopted regarding plagiarism, use of materials obtained from other sources and services, such as the Internet, etc.? How should these policies be communicated to students?
2. *To review the procedures for enforcement of the student academic integrity standards.* How should these policies be enforced and what penalties should be applied? Should the faculty member who believes that misconduct has occurred be responsible for enforcement or should that function be turned over to a college or central office? Do faculty members have a duty to report and pursue perceived violations of academic conduct standards? How should a faculty member treat material that the faculty member believes was submitted in violation of the standards? What sort of processes are appropriate for decisions of these cases? What kinds of penalties should be applied?

The Committee met over several months, talked with a number of individuals, and read a voluminous amount of material. This report is our view of how the University of Minnesota can best address questions of academic integrity.

I will join the Senate Consultative Committee on April 6 to discuss the report.

Cordially,
Tom Clayton, Chair
Special Senate Committee on
Student Academic Integrity

cc: President Mark Yudof

**Report of the Special Senate Committee
on Student Academic Integrity
(Part II: Academic Integrity)**

April 6, 2000

STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

The primary purposes of a research university, whether private, public, or of public land-grant status like the University of Minnesota, are the discovery, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge by all apt and available means. This compound effort includes the teaching of students enrolled for the purposes of learning and of taking degrees that certify the fields and quality of their academic achievements. As one of the nation's leading research universities, the University has an obligation to communities not only local but national and international to ensure the integrity of its research and scholarship, and of its instruction and certification by degree. The integrity of a university depends especially upon the integrity of its faculty members, but necessarily also on that of its regents or trustees, administrators, and civil-service staff, and emphatically of its students.

I. CHARGES TO THE COMMITTEE

The Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity was appointed by letter dated 15 July 1999 from the Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, Fred Morrison. It was given three charges, two concerned with all students in the University, the third charge with the athletic programs of the Twin Cities Campus. We addressed the third charge first because it seemed most pressing and most readily addressed, and submitted our report on 1 November 1999. This is the second and final report, addressing the first two charges.

On these two charges we met fourteen times and consulted extensively by e-mail between meetings. We are gratefully indebted to the persons we interviewed for sharing their expertise and experience with us: Associate Dean Jean Cameron, College of Liberal Arts; Professor Virginia Gray, Political Science; Dr. Darwin Hendel, Institutional Research and Reporting; Associate Dean Peter Hudleston, Institute of Technology; Associate Dean Meredith McQuaid, Law School; Ms. LeeAnn Melin, New Student Programs; Ms. Jan Morse, Student Dispute Resolution Center; Associate Dean Gerald Rinehart, Carlson School of Management; Associate Dean Wendy St. Peter, College of Pharmacy; Ms. Barbara Shiels, Office of the General Counsel; and Professor George Spangler, College of Natural Resources.

Under charge 1 we were asked specifically to "review the policies and standards regarding student academic integrity and make recommendations for improvement of University policies. The task force should examine the standards in the Code of Student Conduct and in the various

college policies.” We have reviewed, examined, and recommended in response, not point by point according to the charges, but in the report as a whole. Under charge 1 we were also asked the following questions—to which we give (italicized) answers in brief here; we address them in effect in various parts of the report, not always directly in these terms.

[1] Should a uniform University-wide policy be adopted? *Yes, with scope for unit variation in keeping with the spirit of the University policy and with the letter as appropriate.*

[2a] Should a uniform policy apply to undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, equally, or [2b] are there circumstances requiring special policies for some of these groups? *A uniform policy, expectation, and standard of justice should apply to all students, accommodating special circumstances and different levels as necessary and appropriate.*

[3] Should more explicit standards be adopted regarding plagiarism, use of materials obtained from other sources and services, such as the Internet, etc.? *Yes and no. The standards we recommend apply to any kind of cheating. To attempt to spell out the legion possible ways of cheating by technological means, which come into being and mutate almost by the hour, would seem to be to court a costly cadre of sorcerer’s apprentices to identify, sort, list, and count the proliferating methods as Norton does computer viruses. But we fully recognize the need to help students understand that plagiarism may include non-print sources.*

[4] How should these policies be communicated to students? *By all available and expedient means, from notice given in application materials through annual or semestral reminders made by e-mail to statements made on every syllabus, assignment, and examination.*

The second charge, to “review the procedures for enforcement of the student academic integrity standards,” asked six representative questions that are too complex to be answered in brief (except for no. 3, *Yes*) but are given here for the record and because all are addressed in effect in this report.

[1] How should these policies be enforced and what penalties should be applied?

[2] Should the faculty member who believes that misconduct has occurred be responsible for enforcement or should that function be turned over to a college or central office? (“Faculty” is to be understood in some contexts as referring to “all instructional staff”)

[3] Do faculty members have a duty to report and pursue perceived violations of academic conduct standards?

[4] How should a faculty member treat material that the faculty member believes was submitted in violation of the standards?

[5] What sort of processes are appropriate for decisions of these cases?

[6] What kinds of penalties should be applied?

II. PRINCIPLES AND OBSERVATIONS

This report is intended to be the response of the University of Minnesota to a problem perceived as nationwide and very serious if not epidemic in American institutions of higher learning. It is concerned first and foremost with promoting academic integrity as the rule and only secondarily with detecting and punishing academic dishonesty as the exception, which is serious enough, however, to require addressing.

Integrity has become a buzzword more often conjured with than understood. Its essential meaning is “something undivided; an integral whole,” wholeness, soundness. It has a special application in relation to humans that is succinctly expressed by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “soundness of moral principle; the character of uncorrupted virtue, esp. in relation to truth and fair dealing; uprightness, honesty, sincerity” (*OED2* 3b). Integrity is more than what is left when cheating has been eliminated, and it is not passive. It is perhaps easiest recognized by its manifest distance from self-interest, and at its best it is ethical excellence in action. Not every institution, program, person, or act can be instantly assessed as having or lacking integrity; but these qualities constituting it are widely, not to say universally, recognized as of inestimable value in human relations and essential for a civil and orderly society. Without such qualities and corresponding actions, there is no “integrity.”

Academic integrity is integrity in academia, and like integrity (or the lack of it) everywhere else, it is recognizable not as a passive state or attitude but by actions characterized by it. *Student* academic integrity is vital to the integrity of both the research and the instructional and degree-granting missions of the University. And it is essential if honest students are to have the benefit of due recognition of their own work uncompromised by the dishonest practices of students who cheat. Cheating undoubtedly hurts the cheater, because “he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much”; but cheaters most hurt *other students*, first in their individual courses, and on their projects and written work from freshman composition to doctoral dissertations; and again by devaluing and discrediting a university’s degrees. That society as a whole is affected for the worse by such practices is obvious.

All acts of academic dishonesty are forms of *cheating*, which means essentially “to deal fraudulently, practice deceit” (*OED2* 4a). For students in the University that means to gain unfair advantage over other students—most often by plagiarism or by copying or sharing answers on examinations. Other ways to cheat include depriving others’ work of credit by preventing its reaching the instructor, for example, or falsely claiming a personal hardship to gain extra time on examinations. The present resources of the World Wide Web are only the beginning of sophisticated means of cheating that will continue to increase, multiply, and become more subtle with the advances of technology. But cheating is cheating, whatever the means, and it should be well understood by anyone capable of functioning in society, not to mention qualified to be a member of the University community. Anyone who has the slightest doubt about what cheating is should at once make the effort to find out, as by consulting the Office of Academic Integrity (OAI; see III.A). Instances of cheating will not be condoned when detected, whatever the explanation; and ignorance of what constitutes cheating is no excuse for cheating.

We have no compelling reason to think that cheating is epidemic at the University of Minnesota, but students have reported in surveys that they “saw another student cheat on a quiz or test in a University course” and “knew a student who handed in someone else’s work as their own (on a take-home test or assignment).” From a survey of freshmen we know also that for nearly 70% it was *important* or *very important* for “the University to take firm action to protect academic integrity and hold those who cheat responsible” (Cooperative Institutional Research Program Freshmen Survey, conducted 1999). And for only 3% was it “not at all important.” Most cheating tends to be of two kinds: impulsive or “opportunistic” cheating; and calculated and deliberate, sometimes habitual, cheating. Neither kind can be tolerated, but the former is plainly less grave than the latter; it can probably be reduced or even eliminated by instructors’ taking reasonable precautions to limit the opportunity, and by the President’s and the University Senate’s regularly reminding all students to refrain from cheating in any form, for the sake of their fellow students, their university, and their own integrity. Deliberate and persistent cheating is an antisocial and destructive practice much more serious, and the University must make every effort to detect instances and their perpetrators, penalize them appropriately, and, if they offend egregiously or repeatedly, expel them.

The University assumes integrity as the norm of its students' behavior. But even where there is thought to be no cheating, prudence argues for the precautionary benefit of an integrity code and a declaration of academic integrity to be signed by all students. This declaration should be signed during the academic part of their initial orientation to the University, as freshmen, transfer students, or entering graduate or professional students, or on an appropriate equivalent occasion in units where there is no formal orientation. Making such a declaration will alert students to their personal responsibility to their fellow students and the University as a whole, and to the penalties imposed for cheating when detected and proved. Ideally, this would confer lifelong immunity from cheating upon the signer; but because there are and will be exceptions, efforts to inform and prevent must be supplemented by those to detect and to punish as necessary.

In accordance with the foregoing discussion, we recommend that all students of the University sign this declaration upon their admission:

I recognize academic integrity as essential to the University of Minnesota's and its students' equitable and uncompromised pursuit of their joint endeavors. As a student I promise to practice it to the best of my ability and to do nothing that would give me unfair advantage at the expense of my fellow students. If I cheat in spite of making this declaration, I expect to be penalized according to the offense, up to and including notation of cheating recorded on my transcript and permanent expulsion from the University of Minnesota.

We also recommend that as a reminder and reaffirmation students sign and date the following statement to be printed on blue books and other examination forms:

I have not cheated while taking this examination and anyone. Anyone who sees cheating during an exam is encouraged to tell the instructor or the Office of Academic Integrity.

Finally, we recommend that students sign the following statement for out-of-class written papers or projects:

The work on this paper or project is entirely my own except as documented otherwise, and I have given no undocumented assistance on the assignment to others.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CREATING A CULTURE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The Committee firmly believes that civility and mutual respect, and the practice of academic integrity, are reciprocal. Although the University cannot strictly legislate and enforce civility and respect as such, it has a primary obligation to profess, practice, and promote academic integrity; to actively discourage violations; and to ensure that proven violations are suitably penalized. In some smaller and less complex institutions, these ends are accomplished by an honor system, which we considered but rejected as inappropriate in an institution as large, diverse, and complex as the University of Minnesota, where long experience has assured us all that there will be some cheating irrespective of steps taken to prevent it (on honor codes and systems, see further in Appendix B). We therefore give, in the Penalties section of the report (V), recommendations related to specific principles, policies, procedures, and infrastructures that we think need to be instituted (or reinforced where already existing) to facilitate investigation and take punitive measures as appropriate.

A. OFFICE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The Committee strongly recommends the creation of an Office of Academic Integrity (OAI). OAI should (1) be a central repository of resources to aid members of the University community in promoting academic integrity, (2) sponsor discussion across the University of reasons and

ways and means to promote and defend academic integrity, and (3) develop and disseminate resource materials that promote academic integrity and condemn cheating. A primary purpose of this office should be to help the faculty by easing the burden of pursuing cases of suspected cheating, which in the past has been sufficiently onerous, time-consuming, thankless, and counterproductive that it has been less and less often undertaken. We assume that the office will not be involved in a case unless the faculty member chooses to involve it, but that it will be ready, willing, and able to help when consulted.

OAI should be headed by an Academic Integrity officer reporting to the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (with the Academic Health Center reporting to OAI on these issues). The Committee does not believe that the title and responsibilities of the office should be added to those of an existing position because there would be too much for anyone to do who already has a full-time position, and the responsibilities would not receive adequate attention as a consequence. We envision that the responsibilities of the academic integrity officer, if carried out fully and well, may consume more time than one person can give them. It will be essential to provide adequate staffing and resources for OAI; otherwise the effort will appear a mere façade and induce further skepticism about the University's commitment to academic integrity. The responsibilities of the Office of Academic Integrity should include at least the following:

- a. promoting academic integrity in all appropriate ways, including preparation and dissemination of materials suggested in the following paragraphs
- b. investigating claims of cheating submitted to the office by faculty members and, where cheating has been found to have occurred, imposing a penalty (or recommending a penalty to the faculty member if he or she wishes to deal with a matter that is not required to be addressed by OAI, such as the grade for an assignment or the course)
- c. advising students of their rights and responsibilities when an allegation of cheating is made
- d. receiving and investigating as appropriate allegations of cheating made by any member of the University community

The Committee also recommends the creation of an advisory committee for the Office of Academic Integrity that would be composed of faculty, P&A staff, and students, the Academic Integrity officer as an ex-officio member, and at least one undergraduate adviser from one of the larger colleges. The specific bylaw recommendation we propose for submission to the University Senate is Appendix A of this report.

OAI materials might include but should not be limited to the following on an OAI Web site and otherwise (with OAI logo and telephone number wherever appropriate):

- a. A brief reminder of what academic integrity is and why it matters, who loses by violations, and what they lose
- b. An even more brief statement for use in syllabi, on exam forms, and at other useful sites
- c. A page specifying best classroom practices to prevent cheating
- d. A page of guidance on how to deal with cases of cheating addressing human interaction as well as University procedures and resources
- e. A page of examples of what constitutes cheating (side 1) and what doesn't (side 2)

- f. A striking symbol or logo for OAI (it was suggested that a design contest for this might be a good way to launch the initiative)

Our initial recommendation is that OAI serve the Twin cities campuses, because we did not have representatives from the other campuses on our Committee or have time to consult with those campuses. We believe, however, that they should be actively involved in the discussions and invited to advise the Senate, perhaps through the Committee on Educational Policy, on how they might best be integrated into the office and practices we have recommended. We believe that a revised set of recommendations, intended to embrace the coordinate campuses in whatever way they believe would work best for them, should be brought back to the Senate in Spring 2001.

B. OTHER STEPS TO PROMOTE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND PREVENT ACADEMIC FRAUD

The Committee recognizes that the entire University community has a role to play in preventing cheating. We can publicly, explicitly, and frequently assert that academic integrity is important. Discuss it at every opportunity. Say WHY it is important. And we can carry these efforts into our every activity. For example, the President should discuss academic integrity in his annual address and at least briefly at Convocation. The University should mandate printing the affirmation-of-honesty statement (end of II, above) on all blue books and other examination forms. Other ways to communicate this message include the following.

A. Admissions

Each application packet should include a brief discussion of the integrity code and the declaration to be signed early in the first year.

B. Orientation

Orientation sessions should devote time to explicit discussion and examples not only of cheating but of academic integrity. What does academic integrity look like? Why is it important? These sessions should be interactive, so that students start to internalize the meaning and value of integrity. They should talk about it with each other.

1. Freshman orientation

Introduce the idea of a university, of the discovery and production of knowledge, of educating for the future

2. College-level orientation

Tailor the presentation to local cultures

3. Transfer students

It cannot be safely assumed that they have been sufficiently prepared for the University's demands for academic integrity, and they should be oriented accordingly

4. Graduate and professional student orientation

There is a rich variety of cases to draw upon for the discussion, from both a student's and a teacher's and adviser's perspective. Graduate and professional students are especially well positioned to understand the value of integrity in the dissemination of knowledge.

As teaching assistants and prospective faculty members, they will appreciate as professional development any instruction on how to prevent cheating and promote academic integrity among their own students.

IV. RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND REASONABLE EXPECTATIONS OF ALL PARTIES

After its detailed and ranging investigation, the Committee concluded that the most effective way ultimately to promote academic integrity is to cultivate an environment, or culture, of civility in which acts of mutual respect and responsibility are the daily routine of University life and academic integrity is a natural corollary. To that end we provide here a series of recommendations aimed at promoting rights, responsibilities, and reasonable expectations among all those who make up the University community—faculty, staff, students, administrators, and Regents. In the following sections we have delineated these rights, responsibilities, and expectations for each of the three major groups who are directly responsible for maintaining the academic integrity of the University.

A. THE FACULTY AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

Faculty vigilance is the most important defense against cheating. Faculty members can create an environment that promotes academic integrity in the classroom, the seminar room, the laboratory, and every other place in the University. And it is they who must take the lead, who can best model academic integrity, and who can best articulate what academic integrity is designed to protect and achieve. The faculty should aim not just for the absence of cheating, but to get students to value integrity and practice it beyond the merely academic because it is an important moral and social value of worth to all.

If faculty members are to be the line of defense against cheating, they need somewhere to turn for help in dealing with students who cheat. They also need support from department heads and deans in making decisions about dealing with cheating. There should also be the help and support from the Office of Academic Integrity that we have recommended above.

The Committee recommends that faculty members report all incidents of cheating to OAI, and that they consult with OAI on penalties. If a faculty member chooses not to consult with OAI and a student later grieves the process, the faculty member bears the burden of proving in any subsequent grievance process that the penalty is appropriate. The concern here is to ensure consistency in decisions and penalties, allowing for appropriate variations for different kinds of offense (e.g., first-time plagiarism by a freshman should not be treated the same as plagiarism by a doctoral student).

Classroom practices that discourage or prevent cheating are the faculty member's

- a. including in every syllabus a statement about academic integrity, and about cheating and its consequences
- b. designing assignments that are unique to the class: personalize class assignments, particular fieldwork projects, and essay topics to the point where it is difficult to plagiarize for them. Assignments should not be general enough to be taken from the Web or an encyclopedia
- c. proctoring all exams, even if teaching assistants are present. Research shows that the presence of the faculty member reduces cheating
- d. using alternate or other special seating at exams

- e. having students sign in or checking IDs for large-class exams
- f. reminding students to sign the affirmation-of-honesty statement printed on their blue books
- g. limiting the use of multiple-choice exams and using means to prevent easy answer-copying when they are used; for example, reordering questions in several variant forms
- h. making each student write something in class to a minimum length of about 300 words at least once or, better, more than once a term as a sample of his or her characteristic way of reasoning and writing
- i. defining cheating, especially plagiarism. Give examples
- j. making time to discuss what can legitimately be drawn from the Web, how it is to be cited, and where the documentation format is to be found; and providing examples of appropriate and inappropriate use and citation

B. STUDENTS

Students have a responsibility not to cheat and to act with integrity generally. They have the right to expect that instructors will provide guidance on academic integrity and cheating, and will use classroom measures that protect students who do not cheat from those who do or might.

Students have the due-process right to be informed in writing when they are accused and of what as soon as the accusation is taken beyond professor-student interaction. And they are entitled to information about the process.

Students must be responsible in particular for academic integrity within their own realm. They should protect their own work from being drawn on without acknowledgment by others. When in doubt, they should take responsibility for asking what constitutes cheating or inappropriate sharing. They should also report others if they are cheating. This is public citizenship. Students can encourage others to maintain academic integrity, and not to cheat. Peer pressure is powerful.

C. ADMINISTRATORS

The administration has a significant stake in the integrity of the institution, and thus has the right to require preventive classroom practices. It can also expect faculty and student cooperation with guidelines and processes to promote academic integrity. The Committee strongly recommends that the administration support funding for OAI staff and associated resources and activities.

The administration's contribution to promoting academic integrity might include most if not all of the following:

- a. establishing procedures for enforcement and compliance (as appropriate through OAI, General Counsel's office, etc.) which ensure that the rights of both faculty and students are protected
- b. preparing materials for admissions and orientation (including web-site materials), for all students new to the University at any level, and for courses such as English Composition and Writing-Intensive courses (which are required of all undergraduate students)

- c. providing resources to the faculty (e.g., Web search-engines)
- d. providing funding for OAI and support for the advisory committee so it has the resources to assume responsibility for the investigative and prosecutorial function when allegations of cheating are made, so the faculty—who are often unsuited to doing so and do not have the time to do so—are not obliged to carry out this function, and so that OAI has resources to undertake prevention and education efforts with both faculty and students
- e. encouraging colleges to work with and support OAI
- f. being firm, and standing behind the faculty and OAI
- g. reinforcing faculty and student efforts to promote academic integrity

The administration can and should set expectations for all, repeat these publicly and often, and establish rules and procedures for meeting them. It should develop guidelines, processes, and procedures for enforcement that are not onerous. It can support, praise, and reward faculty members who are vigilant, responsible, and proactive about academic integrity. It must also defend publicly and explicitly the due-process rights of students.

V. PENALTIES

A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In order to minimize cheating at the University, everyone—students, faculty, staff, and administrators—must contribute to creating a culture in which academic fraud is neither committed nor tolerated. The most important step in doing this is to make cheating difficult and thus prevent it in the first place. But, both as part of the prevention effort and in order to maintain publicly our norms of integrity, there must be a system for exacting penalties when cheating does occur. The three major desiderata are:

- a. Penalties should be substantial enough to serve as a deterrent to cheating, and the investigative and punitive processes must be broadly known and understood. Full understanding both of due-process rights and of the dispute-resolution mechanism should ideally reassure the students who do not cheat that their own work is being protected, while putting the fraudulent on notice that the University takes cheating seriously. Students cheat because they think they can get away with it, and the University must chip away at this private fiction in every way that it can.
- b. Penalties should be fair. This is always difficult to achieve. The basic principle of fairness is “Treat like cases alike, different cases differently.” That is, two like students who have cheated in the same way, under the same circumstances, should receive the same penalty. If one student has cheated and another has not, only the one who cheated should be penalized. This principle helps to define what will be fair, but in fact there is an infinite variety of different kinds of cheating and of different personal circumstances under which cheating occurs. What we recommend is a system in which, in broad outline, the basic principle of fairness is followed but in which individual judgment of each case determines the penalty within those bounds. And above all, we recommend a system in which both the maintenance of the broad penalties, and individual judgments within them, are done consistently across cases.
- c. Penalties should allow students in all but the most egregious cases—and certainly undergraduate first offenders—to recover after the penalty, be rehabilitated, and go on to

pursue their studies in a constructive way. The University recognizes that while all cheating is an affront to its principles, there is little to be gained by permanently tattooing the guilty: lesser offenses ought to be dealt with in a thorough and methodical manner, but should not necessarily leave a permanent record. Major or repeated infractions, however, must necessarily require a more substantial response.

B. SPECIFIC PENALTIES

We believe that the nature and range of penalties should be developed by the new OAI in consultation with the Senate committee that will be advisory to it. But we lay out here a few specific principles and suggestions that we think should guide OAI in doing this.

a. Extenuating circumstances should consist only of aspects of the academic situation, not other things that are going on in a student's life. This is *academic* fraud; only *academic* circumstances should be considered as extenuating. For instance, it would seem to us advisable to penalize plagiarism more severely for a graduate student (who should know better) than for a first-semester undergraduate who might have been confused about the nature of plagiarism. Similarly, second offenses should be penalized more strictly than first offenses. But students should not be penalized differently because of their personal circumstances; for example, working while going to school, participating in extracurricular activities, having responsibilities as a parent, etc., no matter how much we may sympathize with those circumstances. This cannot be overemphasized. Basing the penalties on the relative misfortunes of individuals is tantamount to endorsing academic dishonesty in degrees.

b. We recommend that on a minor first offense students not only incur an appropriate penalty but be put on notice that they are on some sort of "probationary status." A reasonable policy might state, for instance, that if at the time of graduation no further instances of cheating have been discovered, the record of having cheated once would be removed from the student's permanent transcript.

c. Implied above is a particular kind of penalty that we wish to recommend to OAI and its advisory committee. For some level of egregious behavior, we believe it would be appropriate to note permanently on the student's transcript that he or she had been penalized for cheating while at the University, for example by noting that an F in a course was given for cheating or that the student was expelled for cheating. In cases where a graduate or professional degree is denied because of cheating, the fact should likewise be noted on the transcript. This would surely act as a strong deterrent, and it would also be an act of responsibility to the community. The transcript is supposed to show what a student has done at the University, the good and the bad. If a student has failed a course, we note that on the transcript; if a student has cheated egregiously or repeatedly, should we keep that knowledge to ourselves? At present, if a student who has been failed in a course for academic fraud should be asked later as to why that particular class resulted in an F, he or she is able to compound the dishonesty by lying about the reason for grade.

C. PROCEDURES

In order to ensure that the basic principle of fairness is maintained (like cases treated alike, different cases treated differently), the assignment of penalties should be done exclusively by OAI. Individual professors cannot know what penalties are being imposed elsewhere in the University, so if they try to assign penalties for offenses they have discovered, the overall result will inevitably be unfair—at least in the sense that a student might receive a penalty very different from that given a roommate for the same offense. The only way we see to achieve consistency is to have this done at one place, in one office.

The general procedure for dealing with an instance of cheating, then, should be:

- a. An instructor suspects that cheating has occurred.
- b. The instructor first meets with the student. If the instructor is satisfied that cheating definitely did not occur, the matter is dropped. If the instructor determines that cheating occurred, and the student agrees, an appropriate penalty is imposed by the instructor (who should consult with OAI about the penalty before imposing it). In all cases when a penalty is imposed, OAI is notified so that a consistent record may be maintained. If the student does not admit to the offense, but the instructor remains suspicious, the requisite material is forwarded to OAI and the student is notified. OAI will provide standardized forms for these communications.
- c. The instructor may send a report to OAI at any point in the process from suspicion on through a thoroughly investigated case, without necessarily meeting with the student before reporting. Instructors and departments will vary in how much of the investigation they wish to conduct themselves; it should be their option to have the Office of Academic Integrity conduct a good deal of the investigation of fact, if that is what they prefer.
- d. OAI is required to notify the student in writing within reasonable time, and certainly within the semester, that it has received a report of alleged cheating by the student. If the faculty member chooses not to pursue the matter alone, OAI will investigate and resolve any dispute about whether or not this was an instance of cheating. If, after consulting with the student and the instructor about the circumstances of the case, OAI determines that cheating has in fact occurred, it consults with the faculty member about the penalty or, if the faculty member wishes, OAI sets the penalty. If the penalty involves a grade change, OAI can obviously only advise the instructor.
- e. The instructor's cooperation in this process, by reporting instances of cheating and abiding by the recommendations of the Office of Academic Integrity, is required. But we do not believe that strong sanctions on instructors who do not cooperate would be helpful or appropriate. In order to add a positive incentive for instructors to cooperate, we recommend that the University add to its procedures that when an instructor has reported cheating to OAI and has abided by its recommendations, he or she does not bear a burden of proof in showing that the penalty was appropriate. When this has not been done, however, the instructor would bear such burden of proof.
- f. OAI must be scrupulous in its procedures and also provide a clear and comprehensive hierarchy for due process consistent with existing Regents' policy and campus procedures. This does not preclude operations of the colleges' own boards. There must be inviolable mechanisms to prevent students from skipping steps of the process and attempting to "venue-shop" for a more lenient or more friendly board. There should also be mechanisms to prevent spurious or unjustified appeals to non-jurisdictional bodies as either an alternate venue of appeal or as retribution, but students retain the right to use regular grievance channels as jurisdiction may be appropriate.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Committee does not wish to dictate all of the particulars and is only making general recommendations to set in place implementation machinery. We are not recommending an honor code per se (see Appendix B). Moreover, while there are honor codes in place within the University that appear quite effective, they are in small colleges or professional schools. We also recognize that there are different categories of severity of cheating; they need to be linked to the

reasons why academic integrity is important and why some are more of an offense against it than others. We recognize that, if the system proposed here functions well, even if there are more reports of cheating, there need not be more hearings; perhaps the existing Campus Committee on Student Behavior (and corresponding bodies on the coordinate campuses) should handle any that are required.

APPENDIX A

DRAFT MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following amendment to Article III of the bylaws (create a new committee, Academic Integrity). All language is new; existing sections of the bylaws would be renumbered accordingly.

1. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The Academic Integrity Committee is an advisory body to the Executive Vice President and Provost and to the administrative officers responsible for education, outreach, and sanctions related to issues of academic integrity.

Membership

The Academic Integrity Committee shall be composed of 6 faculty/academic professional members (including at least one from a coordinate campus and at least 4 of whom must be members of the tenured or tenure-track faculty) and 3 students (at least one of whom shall be a graduate or professional student and at least one of whom shall be an undergraduate student). The chair of the committee shall be a member of the tenured faculty. The academic integrity officer shall be an ex officio member. The chair and committee members will be appointed by the Executive Vice President and Provost with the advice and consent of the Committee on Educational Policy.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To advise the academic integrity officer on all matters the committee deems appropriate, including but not limited to (1) ways to make academic integrity an abiding concern of the University, (2) the development and dissemination of best practices to ensure academic integrity, (3) processes and procedures for considering allegations of student or faculty academic misconduct, and (4) the nature of sanctions that should be imposed on those who are found to have violated University rules concerning academic integrity.
- b. To advise the academic integrity officer on the disposition of specific cases of allegations of academic misconduct, at the discretion of the academic integrity officer.
- c. To recommend to the Senate such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- d. To submit an annual report to the Committee on Educational Policy and to the Senate.

[Note: this bylaw and references to academic misconduct are not to be construed as conflicting with, or superseding, other bylaws or University policies related to research misconduct, conflict of interest, or the ethical conduct of research and scholarship.]

COMMENT:

The Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity recommended the creation of an Office of Academic Integrity and an advisory committee to work with the proposed office. This proposal implements that recommendation.

APPENDIX B

HONOR CODES AND SYSTEMS, AND OTHERS

The Committee began its work by defining its ends—above all to promote academic integrity across the University but also to provide for detecting and penalizing violations—and then considering means to achieve them. Prominent among them was an honor system, which we carefully considered at great length for the University as a whole but rejected in favor of a system combining students' signing declarations of integrity with a streamlined system of administration centering on the recommended new Office of Academic Integrity and fortified by the active participation and leadership of the faculty. Such a system seems optimal for the University of Minnesota. This will no doubt disappoint those who cherish the idea of an *honor code*, some of whom also have fond recollections of their experience of it. But the venerable term often elicits more nostalgia than understanding, because it may refer to anything from the bare signing of a declaration to “a system (as at a college or prison) whereby persons are trusted to abide by the regulations (as for a code of conduct) without supervision or surveillance” (**honor system** *n.*, 1904, in *Merriam Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, 10th ed., 1994). The Committee was not deterred by the slightly disconcerting association here, and it is in fact noteworthy that one who escapes from prison does not necessarily affect the lot of other trustees (though emulation might be stimulated), whereas a cheating student in a college or university inevitably does, even if he or she is caught.

A true honor system of *this* sort is nowhere to be found, so far as we know, except perhaps at a prison, especially a country-club prison. In fact, the distinguishing characteristic of the contemporary honor *system* is less its lack of “supervision or surveillance” than its being legislated, administered, and executed by students elected for the purpose by their peers. We were told by representatives of intra-University units having an honor system that it works well, and we were given good reasons to believe that. But these units—Law, Natural Resources, Pharmacy, and the like—are all relatively small and the student body constituted of majors or professional students unified by their discipline and by close identification with their unit and association with each other. Furthermore, even in these the honor system applies only to courses for majors, not to service courses for non-majors; and we might add (with tongue in cheek) that a law school has a natural affinity for any kind of legal form, apparatus, and activity.

Beyond the University it may be seen that at Caltech, for example, all students are expected to conform to a uniquely brief and binding code (pre-1920): “No member of the Caltech community shall take unfair advantage of any other member of the Caltech community”; but Caltech is an elite and specialized university—and it has a student Board of Control. The University of Maryland's Code of Academic Integrity (1990) is complemented by a student Honor Council of *appointed* members; “Faculty members remain responsible for the diligent proctoring of examinations, the security of exam questions, grade books, answer sheets, and the like” (*Faculty Handbook*). Cal Tech has a true honor system, Maryland has not, as the name of its code acknowledges (this observation is of course not meant to fault it).

Many institutions that pride themselves on their honor codes are small and located in the South, like Washington and Lee, whose honor code goes back to Confederate Army General Robert E. Lee's presidency in 1865-70; and whose student body is substantially homogeneous, as is true of most institutions with student-administered honor systems. If not all student bodies in such institutions are economically, socially, ideologically, intellectually, and professionally homogeneous, it seems likely that all are at least one of these and that most are more than one.

By contrast, the University of Minnesota is very large, spread across five campuses, ethnically and otherwise diverse, multicultural at every degree level, and the more complicated for the variety of degrees and levels in themselves. To this already high order of complexity might be added the special problem said to be posed by fraternities and sororities with their alleged files of recyclable papers. Since there is no proof of this process readily available, such allegations must be taken with a grain of salt—but cannot be dismissed out of hand. Nor can the implications be ignored of such a communication as this from a professor in one of the military academies (11-15-99):

“Ethics” has become a hot topic and there are endless panels and conferences. There is also a new “ethics” course and special “character development training,” all of which seems to have no effect. Between the training these students are getting in the classroom and the actual lives they are leading day to day there is a “great gulf fixed.” They are very clever and play the game well; they then go about their usual routine.

In such circumstances, achieving true representation and full responsibility and effectiveness by students elected by and electing their peers would be not just difficult but virtually impossible. *Perhaps* far more students could be rallied to vote in favor of an honor system and volunteer to participate in it than run for student office or even turn out to vote in the annual elections—on the Minneapolis campus, anyway—but we doubt it. Not running for office or voting for officers in student government, or declining to participate in the designing and administering of an honor system, is not necessarily a sign of apathy; in most cases it may be due to students’ concentrating on their studies, which is primarily what they are or should be at the University for. But even if lack of participation were due to alienation, work-schedule conflicts, or for that matter the weather, indifference, or downright sloth, the effect would be the same: too few willing or able to “represent” all too many, and elected by all too few to do so. *Appointing* student representatives may serve a purpose in lieu, but it is plainly not democratic, while serving no better the demanding and complex purposes that must be served if a university is to discharge its responsibilities fully and equitably. We know of no research university approaching the size of Minnesota that has or has even tried a student-administered honor system for the whole.

We concluded unanimously that in order to promote and protect academic integrity, and to do so with justice, equitability, and efficiency, the University needed a system more comprehensive, sure, and circumspect than a student-administered honor system could possibly be; and we think we found something like the optimal one. We are convinced that with effort and good will—and with modification based on experience over time—this system will work well for everyone, and in due course may indeed transform the ethical environment and our students. If it does, student academic integrity, and with it civility and mutual respect, will have a whole new lease on life at the University of Minnesota.

Tom Clayton, Chair
Betty Hackett
Mary Jo Kane
Judith Martin
W. Phillips Shively
Michael Sweeney
Barbara VanDrasek

DISCUSSION:

Regents Professor Tom Clayton, Chair of the Special Senate Committee on Student Academic Integrity (SAIC), started by listing the committee members and crediting them for their work

throughout the process. This report is aimed at cultivating a culture of academic integrity on the campus and encouraging academic integrity in practice and theory.

The committee was encouraged at the start of the process by the fact that 70% of last year's entering freshmen thought that it was either important or very important to do something to prevent cheating and penalize those which are caught.

The two central points in the report deal with administration in this matter. The SAIC recommends that there be a new Office and Officer of Academic Integrity, which would be charged with the dissemination of information to incoming freshmen that the University takes this issue seriously and they will be required to sign a declaration of academic integrity. The Office would also deal with cases of suspected cheating.

Advice has also been included for faculty as to how they can make cheating more difficult, if not impossible, and how they can deal with suspected cases. Punishments will also need to be developed that are appropriate to the severity of the offense and so that similar cases receive equal and equitable penalties. The hope is also that faculty will gather information on cheating and provide it to the Office so that it can be collected centrally to track cheaters across colleges.

Student will need to sign a declaration of academic integrity as soon as they come to the University. The purpose is not a guarantee, but it will make clear that this issue is central to the University and infractions will be punished. It has also been recommended that reminders be placed on all blue books regarding cheating. A phrase was also considered asking students to inform the instructor if they saw any cheating. This phrase has been reworded to encourage students to report cheating, but not mandating that this be done. The purpose of this statement is to ensure that students who do their own work get the benefit without being compromised by the successful cheating of other students.

A senator expressed concern regarding the implication of the oath that students would need to take at various times during their collegiate career. The University should assume that a student is honest unless there is evidence to the contrary. Since the majority are honest, why should the University imply that there is some suspicion about their integrity? While the establishment of a central office is needed, the senator is opposed to the implications behind this oath.

Another senator responded that there are procedures currently in place which can be construed by students as saying that the University expects that they cheat. He would rather sign a statement than comply with assigned seating and checked bags during examinations.

Q: The report recognized that there are many different situations at the University. Was it contemplated to what extent there might be faculty discretion as opposed to a completely uniform policy?

A: This report does not recommend rigid enforcement of anything except the detection and penalization of cheating. If students refuse to sign this form or the blue book, there is no penalty attached. The University is hoping that the students who sign them, do so in the spirit of academic integrity. Faculty should not be penalized or feel obligated to have classes, especially small classes, sign the blue book statements although these students might not mind signing either. The most danger lies in large courses in which the same examination is given each year.

A senator urged that input from a large number of students be utilized to decide how the policy be implemented since students are the ones affected by the policy and know how students cheat.

Professor Clayton said that he would welcome input from any interested student.

A senator said that he attended a college where this same type of signed statement was required. There was not a problem with the statement because it was signed by everyone and therefore not considered personal.

Another senator stated that many examinations that he gives are not taken in a blue book so he would need to distribute an additional statement to sign, which he felt would not be as impersonal as when it appears on the blue book.

A senator agreed that a central office is needed since he has seen students cheat in multiple classes because each different professor treats that cheating as a first offense. He did disagree with the proposed statement for two reasons. First, incoming students should already know that cheating is wrong and therefore should not need to be reminded. If students do not know, then the admissions procedures should be revised. Second, to assume that a student who was going to cheat will now not do so because they have signed a statement is ludicrous.

Another senator said that the statement is simply a reminder that the University takes academic integrity seriously. These procedures are not being put in place to set the students against the faculty or administration. Instead this is a collective effort so all groups work together for the good of the University.

A senator agreed that the purpose of the statement is to establish a culture of academic integrity. While the statement might not stop persistent cheaters, it is good practice to reinforce this view.

Q: International students have a different definition of what constitutes cheating and individual work. For this reason, graduate students in a particular program have been signing this type of statement for almost 20 years. Are all students now going to be required to add this statement to all their papers?

A: Yes they will.

Q: In terms of a new office being formed, how will this be implemented on the coordinate campuses in terms of personnel and funding?

A: The motion is to approve the report in principle, subject to implementing regulations that would be drafted over the summer. These questions would be answered at that time and then be brought back to the University Senate for approval. Funding will need to come from University resources and the office will be located on the Twin Cities campus. Arrangements will need to be made to provide representatives from that office to each of the coordinate campuses.

With no further questions, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**23. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Resolution on Tuition Benefits for Children of University Employees
Information for the Faculty Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

Background

In Spring 1999 the SCFA Benefits Subcommittee, representatives of ASAC, and the Civil Service Committee met to request a new employee benefit: a 50% tuition reduction for

dependents of employees enrolled in undergraduate degree programs at the University of Minnesota. The Employee Benefits Department conducted an informal survey of other universities, including all Big Ten members, to determine what level of tuition remission benefits were offered.

A majority of the universities that were surveyed offered tuition benefits. Many remitted 50% with a few (mostly privates) offering 100%. In the Big Ten, 7 of 14 offered tuition remissions with Northwestern offering 85%; Penn State, 75%, and all others at 50%. Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin do not offer a tuition benefit for dependents of employees.

The analysis performed by Employee Benefits (appended to this report) suggests that the cost of a 50% tuition remission, when fully implemented with students in all four years, would be between \$1.2 and \$1.7 million. (See appended report.) Assuming that dependents are equally distributed across employment categories, this would mean that 44% of eligible dependents are associated with Civil Service/Bargaining Unit staff while 56% are associated with Faculty and Professional Administrative Staff. Using \$1.45 million as the full cost (halfway between \$1.2 and \$1.7 million estimates), the added percentage fringe benefit increase would be .25% for CS/BU and .21% for Faculty/PA.

New Analysis

Employers design benefit plans to influence employee behavior—particularly with relation to attraction and retention to the organization. A benefit program that has certain features is more attractive to some segments of the labor force than others. For example, health care subsidies for dependents increases the attractiveness for applicants and employees with dependents. A retirement program with a service requirement for vesting of benefits encourages retention.

An employee's total compensation consists of cash payments and economic benefits designed to reduce risk (insurance), pay in kind (recreation subsidies), pay during nonworking periods (vacations and holidays), and provide for retirement (pensions). The mix of cash payments and benefits reflects the joint interests of employers and employees. In turn, public policy has favored employers providing benefits for employees rather than the employees purchasing benefits themselves due to the nontaxability of benefits, but not cash payments.

A tuition remission program for dependents of employees that includes a service requirement would be expected to increase attractiveness of employment for those who have dependents who will likely be admissible to the university. It would also reduce turnover because sustained service would be necessary to make use of the benefit.

If cost savings from reduced turnover exceed increased costs of a tuition reduction benefit, then the benefit would be costless—actually improving the efficiency of the university.

Assumptions

We begin with the following enrollment assumptions which are largely similar to those used in last year's proposal:

50% of employees have children/dependents,

Of those with dependents, each has 1.8 children/dependents between 0-23 years of age.

50% of children will be qualified to attend the university,

50% of those qualified will choose to take advantage of university enrollment,

Thus, the "risk" of an employee having a child/dependent attend the university is about .225.

The current proposal requires some additional assumptions:

Assume that the transition probabilities from freshman to sophomore, sophomore to junior, and junior to senior are .90 for each year,

The real (after inflation) rate of tuition increases will be a constant 2% into the foreseeable future,

The real (after inflation) discount rate will be a constant 3% into the foreseeable future.

Implementing the tuition benefit will be associated with a turnover reduction of 10% in the current rate of turnover during each year of an employee's employment with the university.

The cost of replacing an employee who quits is equal to 150% of annual salary for faculty, 67% for PA, 50% for civil service, and 33% for bargaining unit employees.

Analysis

With these assumptions in place, the present value of the 100% tuition remission for four years to an employee with 10 years of service is \$5,568 (at 50%, \$2,784). If we were to calculate the present cost of providing this benefit to the proportion of employees (by classification) who would be expected to accrue 10 years of service (under reduced turnover expectations), the cost would be \$2,968 for P/A, \$4,043 for faculty \$2,537 for civil service, \$2,443 for Teamster members, and \$2,014 for AFSCME members. (Keep in mind that these figures are approximate.) However, if turnover were reduced by 10%, the net (cost) saving for the university from providing this benefit, after turnover cost reductions, for a 10 year service employee would be (\$137) for PA, \$929 for faculty, (\$577) for civil service, (\$1,594) for Teamsters, and (\$1,077) for AFSCME. The overall weighted cost would be \$23.73 per year for each 10 year employee. If a 50% remission is applied, the savings would be \$112.13 per employer per year.

If the university were to implement a 100% tuition remission program, with vesting starting at 50% in year 5 and increasing by 10% per year until full vesting at year 10, and if turnover declined by 10% in each employee group as a result, the following conservative estimate would apply. Assuming that all employees work for up to 20 years, and that there are about 5% of employees in each year of service between 1 and 20, then the annual cost savings, net of tuition costs, per employee is about \$89 and the annual savings across the employee population would be in excess of \$1,200,000.

Spreadsheets on which this analysis is based are available upon request from the Senate office.

Resolution

Whereas: The University of Minnesota, as a land grant institution, has as one of its central missions the education of highly qualified undergraduate students, and

Whereas: The University of Minnesota benefits from the efforts and commitment of all of its employees, and

Whereas: University of Minnesota employees, especially as employees of an institution of higher learning, understand the benefits of higher education and seek to make them available to their children/dependents, and

Whereas: The University of Minnesota desires to improve the effectiveness of its workforce and reduce employment costs by reducing employee turnover, and

Whereas: The faculty of the University of Minnesota seeks a stronger sense of community among all employee groups, each of which contributes to the mission of the university, and

Whereas: It can be demonstrated that the inclusion of a partial tuition remission benefit would reduce employment costs under relatively conservative assumptions, therefore

Be it resolved: That the Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the children/dependents of all university employees having accrued 5 or more years of uninterrupted university service be granted a 50% tuition reduction upon being regularly admitted to an approved undergraduate program leading to a bachelor's degree, that the tuition reduction will be applied to half of the tuition for the first four year's of a child/dependent's enrollment, during periods in which the child/dependent student is in good academic standing; and that the percentage of tuition reduced be increased by 10% for each additional year of uninterrupted service through year 10.

COMMENT:

The SCFA Benefits Subcommittee, under the direction of its chair, Professor John Fossum, has developed the above-mentioned resolution and supporting information. It has been presented to and approved by both the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC).

RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard Goldstein, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), said that this subject has been considered for a long time, but was finally worked on by the SCFA Benefits Subcommittee. There are a number of reasons that this policy is being considered. First, it will provide an important benefit in hiring at all levels in the University. Second, it will play a role in retention. Third is the impact on employee morale. Lastly, it will increase interest in undergraduate education by all employees.

An analysis was done by Professor John Fossum which found that there are savings to the University by retention of employees since new employee training is not needed. The reason that this policy is not being presented for action now is that the administration wants to conduct its own study of costs versus savings with this proposal. Currently, seven of the Big Ten universities offer tuition benefits, as does MnSCU.

Q: Will this benefit be rolled into fringe benefits so that employees will end up paying for it anyway?

A: If the gross tuition cost for this benefit is considered, the analysis indicates that it would be a fringe benefit of .2%, which does not take into account any savings to the University.

**24. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Faculty Emeriti Policy and Administrative Procedures
Action by the Faculty Senate**

MOTION:

To approve the Faculty Emeriti Policy and Administrative Procedures. A simple majority is required for approval.

COMMENT:

The proposed policy is available in the Senate Office and the proposed administrative procedures are as follows:

DRAFT

Administrative Procedures for the Regents Policy on Faculty Emeriti

1. Purpose. In recognition of years of valued service and contributions to the University of Minnesota, the Board of Regents has established the title of “emeritus” to be awarded to those who meet the standard of a faculty emeritus defined in section I, subdivision 1 of the policy *Faculty Emeriti*. The objective of this policy is to honor the past affiliation and encourage and maximize the inclusion of emeritus faculty as participating members of the University of Minnesota community. The principle guiding this policy is that faculty emeriti shall have the opportunity and are encouraged to continue as active members of the University community to the extent they are willing and able. The policy, *Faculty Emeriti*, and the procedures for administering it supersede those concerning “Emeritus Title for Faculty”(adopted January 9,1969). Furthermore, the policy and these administrative guidelines specify the expectations of the University and its academic and service units in implementing this policy and the privileges and services that are expected to be provided to faculty emeriti. These administrative guidelines and procedures should be read and interpreted in conjunction with the policy, not as a substitute for it.

2. Conferment of the Emeritus Title and Notification. The emeritus title is automatically conferred to a faculty member (regardless of gender) upon retirement from the University under honorable circumstances as specified in Sections I, III, and IV. It may also be granted by the Board of Regents, on recommendation of the president, under special circumstances when the above conditions are not met as described below and in Section III, subd. 2. The conferment of the faculty emeritus title shall be at the faculty member’s rank at the time of retirement; however, it does not confer any employment status, rights, or associated entitlements.

Formal notification of emeritus status. Each college shall issue a letter to the eligible retiring faculty member within one month of their retirement, conferring the emeritus title.

Special circumstances. As provided in the policy, Section III, subdivision 2, the emeritus title can be awarded or promotion in rank made for a faculty member not meeting the definition of faculty to emeritus as set forth in the policy, Section I, subdivision 1.

In such case, the recommendation must be initiated at the departmental level and the following is required: a statement of the rationale and other documentation (i.e., letter of support) providing justification for the action proposed, approval by a 2/3 majority of the tenured faculty in the unit, and subsequent approval of the department head/chair as well as the dean of the college.

The awarding of the emeritus title or promotion within the emeritus rank is granted upon approval of the Board of Regents after recommendation by the Executive Vice President Provost and the President.

3. University Services and Privileges. In order to facilitate the maintenance of a significant connection with faculty emeriti, the University shall provide faculty emeriti, who desire them, with the following privileges and services equal to those provided to regular faculty:

1. e-mail accounts (including internet access);
2. library privileges;

3. listing in the University directory and mailservice;
4. faculty discounts for computer software, recreational facilities, athletic events, and other performances and exhibitions;
5. continuation of parking privileges at faculty rates—subject to space limitations (in such case, the next best alternative space should be offered);
6. auditing of graduate or undergraduate level courses, subject to the instructor’s approval and relevant University policies and procedures;
7. access to University and state policies governing the continuation of health insurance, but at their own expense;
8. participation in academic processions (graduations, convocations, etc.) in a position of honor; and
9. represent the University (upon appointment by the president) at academic ceremonies of other institutions.

4. Academic Unit Services and Privileges. Subject to cost and availability, academic unit administrators are encouraged to provide active emeritus faculty the following privileges, services, and facilities as are warranted by the nature of the continuing relationship with the university but not to exceed those provided to regular faculty:

1. office space;
2. access to laboratories, computers, or comparable facilities requisite to the continued engagement in scholarly work or mutually agreed upon task whether on a contractual or volunteer basis;
3. access to mail, telephone, and other routine office services (e.g. copying, secretarial); and
4. the privilege to submit proposals for sponsored research and to advise graduate students_or postdoctoral research associates, subject to University rules and policies.

5. Continued Relationship with the University. An academic department, service, or other administrative unit may enter into a volunteer or contractual agreement with a faculty emeritus to provide services subject to terms of the contract and applicable laws and rules as referenced in Section VI of the policy *Faculty Emeriti*.

6. Informal Dispute Resolution. Disputes by faculty emeriti that arise from the policy *Faculty Emeriti* and these administrative procedures shall be resolved via an informal process. If a dispute arises from a decision under the policy *Faculty Emeriti* and these administrative procedures, the faculty emeritus can request review by the administrative level above the administrator making the decision (e.g. at the college level when the dispute concerns a decision by a department chair/head). Requests for reviews and reviews should be made in a timely manner.

RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard Goldstein, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), recalled that two years ago the Faculty Senate passed a Retiree's Bill of Rights. Since that time, SCFA and its Retirement Benefits Subcommittee have been working with the administration to develop a Regents' policy and administrative procedures.

The point of the policy is that emeritus faculty can be of great benefit to the University and their presence on campus is positive. Currently, many departments give many of the rights and privileges that are listed here to their emeritus faculty, but this should not be left to the whim of

an administrator. Instead, it should be a uniform minimum across the University. The cost is small and will be outweighed by the benefits.

Q: The policy mentions promotion of faculty in terms of emeritus status. What does this mean?

A: If an associate professor were to retire, his or her title would be Associate Professor Emeritus. If a department wishes to make a promotion in emeritus title for these individuals, which costs no money, the policy provides for the way to do this.

With no further questions, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

25. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Yudof said that the grand jury investigation into athletic matters on the Twin Cities Campus is pending and the University will cooperate in any way that it can with the federal prosecutory authorities.

In terms of the legislative session, the biggest concern is that there will not be a bonding bill at all since the University cannot tell if this is a tough bargaining strategy or whether a bonding bill will not be produced. The most recent versions have included funding for the new Studio Arts Building, the Genomics Building, the second half of the Molecular and Cellular Biology Building, the Morris Science and Math Building, the Duluth Performing Arts Building, and Kiehle Hall renovations at Crookston.

The Faculty Consultative Committee has been working with him to implement the two newly-approved athletics' committees. The Faculty Academic Oversight Committee has been charged with reviewing the academic records of student athletes, making determinations on athletes' degree progress, and focusing on individuals who are not making significant academic progress or are having other problems. The second committee, the Athletic Advisory Committee, has responsibility for oversight of athletics. If anyone would like to volunteer for either committee, please submit a nomination.

He then discussed the economic development initiative being chaired by Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks and Vice President Muscoplat. The idea is to focus on certain metrics of the Minnesota economy, determine how well the state is doing in terms of such things as workforce and venture capital, and to bring into the process leaders from the private and public sector to look at potential problems for the state in the future and look at a range of solutions for a long-range economic development plan for the state. As a public land-grant university, it is appropriate for the University to convene these leaders and get the discussion started. Funding for the University would need to be part of any package for economic development in the state.

26. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Q: What are the minimum conditions the Worker's Rights Consortium (WRC) will need to meet if the University is to remain affiliated with the WRC and what amount of time will be provided to achieve these conditions?

A: After consideration of this issue for quite some time, the Social Concerns Committee and a Task Force on Sweatshop Labor both recommended joining the WRC instead of the Fair Labor Association (FLA). As stated in the conditional approval, the 12-member board has only three

seats designated for universities, yet since the WRC only represents collegiate apparel, universities should have a more active role in board participation. Second, while there is a conflict of interest in having industry representatives as board members, the WRC needs to have a mechanism to engage industries in their activities. Third, the WRC does not have a monitoring plan in place, and fourth, appropriate financial provisions need to be established. There is no specific timeline since it is a new organization and these are complicated issues to be resolved.

Q: Has anything been done to look into the long-term threat to the University from distance learning?

A: There has been discussion of this topic in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. There is disagreement among people since some see distance learning as a threat and others feel that the University is a residential college. At this time, the technology is ahead of the thinking so discussions should be held in governance on this topic. Applications have increased at the campuses so there is no immediate threat at the undergraduate level. Some professional degrees are being offered electronically to accommodate people who cannot move to attend classes and to reach remote areas.

Q: What is the media now saying regarding the basketball situation in terms of Coach Haskin's contract?

A: There were two Star Tribune editorials which appeared today and are accurate. In the judgement of the University attorneys, the information provided did not amount to grounds for dismissal.

Q: With the completion of the Enterprise project, why is the 1.25% PeopleSoft tax being continued?

A: The University has overhead to cover, but the legislature does not allocate much, so central administration pays as much as it can before it also runs out of funds. This has been a problem with IMG now that the legislative appropriations have decreased and tuition revenue goes directly back to the colleges. In terms of the Enterprise Project, the cost will be the original amount that was first proposed, but not approved. A report was issued by the Dean Rosenstone Task Force which stated that the University needs to pay for overhead and the faculty, staff, and students need to look closely at all expense items to make sure that they are not extravagant.

27. OLD BUSINESS

Professor Judith Martin, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), said that she needed to clarify a few issues regarding the use of the grading report, which was presented for information earlier in the meeting. The grade information is offered in the context of the grade inflation report from last year, which asked that this information be provided to the Senate each year. Second, the intention is that these data will begin to elicit discussions at the departmental and collegiate level about what grades actually mean. Lastly, these data cannot be compared to previous years because of the switch to semesters.

28. NEW BUSINESS

TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE Tenure Code Interpretation Information for the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

Interpretation of Subsections 7.11 and 7.12: General Criteria and Departmental Statement

The faculty of an academic unit are expected to periodically review their criteria for awarding indefinite tenure and reflect any new criteria in a revision of their Subsection 7.12 Statement. The new criteria and Subsection 7.12 Statement must be adopted in accordance with the established procedures of the University, after consultation as required by those procedures. Current probationary faculty in the unit may elect to be evaluated on the criteria in the previous Subsection 7.12 Statement or on the new criteria. This option is also available to current tenured faculty in their evaluation for promotion to the next level. Probationary or tenured faculty must make this decision within one year of the date of administrative approval of the new criteria.

Comment:

This interpretation will replace the second paragraph of existing Interpretation 6. This paragraph now states, "If changes in the program of a unit affect the prospects of probationary faculty members to achieve tenure, these faculty members should be given the earliest possible notice of the potential impact of such changes." The new interpretation will allow probationary faculty members to choose to be evaluated using the previous criteria of the unit for tenure or the new criteria. This option is also available to tenured faculty of the unit who are seeking promotion to the next level, e.g. Associate Professors seeking promotion to full Professors. Although the latter group will be involved in the development and acceptance of the new criteria by the tenured faculty of the unit, they may represent a minority opinion. This interpretation does not change the requirement for review of the new criteria by the dean or other appropriate academic administrator and by the senior academic administrator. Faculty members must make their decision within one year of the approval of the new Subsection 7.12 Statement by the senior academic administrator.

Required Action:

Pursuant to Section 16.2 of Faculty Tenure, an interpretation of the Code must be approved by the Tenure Subcommittee and Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks.* Once approved, it is forwarded to the Faculty Senate for information and to the Board of Regents for action. The Board must adopt the interpretation before it takes effect.

MARY DEMPSEY, Chair
TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Mary Dempsey, Chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, presented for information an interpretation of the tenure code. She noted that interpretations only need to be approved by the Tenure Subcommittee and the Executive Vice President and Provost, which is why it is being presented for information only. Consultation on this interpretation was done with the Judicial, Faculty Affairs, and Faculty Consultative Committees and it was discussed by the Council of Deans.

UNIVERSITY SENATE RULES AMENDMENT Ex Officio Membership

* The interpretation was approved by the Tenure Subcommittee on Friday, April 14, 2000, and Executive Vice President and Provost Robert Bruininks on Monday, April 17, 2000.

Action by All Bodies

COMMENT:

As an amendment to the University Senate Rules, this motion requires a majority of voting members at this meeting for approval.

MOTION:

To amend the University Senate Rules, Article III, Section 2, as follows (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~):

University Senate Rules - Article III. University Senate.

2. Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees

Ex officio members shall be appointed from each of the offices listed below and are non-voting positions unless otherwise noted.

...

- Student Consultative—Chair of the Student Affairs Committee

...

COMMENT:

The Student Senate Consultative Committee wishes to add the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee as an ex officio, non-voting, member. We feel that it would be extremely valuable to have the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee as an ex officio member so that our two committees can better work together in the future. This is a change that has been long overdue.

JASON M. REED, Chair
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

29. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

APRIL 20, 2000

The fourth meeting of the Faculty Senate for 1999-00 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 20, 2000, at 2:05 p.m., as a joint meeting of the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 116 voting faculty/academic professional members, 1 ex officio member, and 4 nonmembers. President Mark Yudof presided.

1. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 24, 2000
Action by All Bodies
(Senate Agenda Item 2)

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URLs. A simple majority is required for approval.

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/u_senate/000224sen.html
http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/faculty_senate/000224fac.html
<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/tcca/000224tcca.html>

VIRGINIA GRAY, Clerk
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

2. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS
Information
(Senate Agenda Item 4)

Faculty SenateAmendments to Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration December 3, 1999
Board of Regents PENDING

Interpretation of Faculty Tenure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration December 3, 1999
Board of Regents PENDING

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate April 22, 1999
Administration December 3, 1999
Board of Regents PENDING

Amendment to the Judicial Committee Rules of Procedure

Approved by the: Faculty Senate May 20, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents PENDING

Resolution Concerning Retention of Faculty Lines

Approved by the: Faculty Senate September 30, 1999
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents - no action required

**3. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
(Senate Agenda Item 8)**

Professor Fred Morrison, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), and the Assembly Steering Committee (ASC), said that these three committees have been busy during the past few months. The ASC is currently working on establishing a task force on University Bookstores, for the Twin Cities, regarding concerns being raised about the availability of non-course books and is addressing remaining issues relating to athletics. The appointment process will also begin soon for the new Faculty Academic Oversight Committee and, in consultation with the President, for the Advisory Committee on Athletics. The committees are also concerned with next year's budget and the following year's biennial budget development regarding the issue of compensation and salaries.

Professor Morrison said that there will be a heavy University Senate agenda next year so three University Senate meetings per semester are being planned. In the fall, there will be the President's State of the University address in September, an October meeting devoted to the final report of the Health Plan Task Force, and then a November meeting. In the spring, meetings will be set for February, March, and April.

Finally, Professor Morrison extended thanks to Professor Virginia Gray for two years of service as Clerk of the Senate and her guidance as Chair of the SCC/FCC during the tenure debates, since she is leaving the University at the end of the semester. The University Senate extended a round of applause.

**4. ELECTION OF SENATE/ASSEMBLY VICE CHAIR(S) FOR 2000-01
Action by the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly
(Senate Agenda Item 12)**

Professor Marti Hope Gonzales was elected Vice Chair of the University and Faculty Senates and Khaled Dajani was elected Vice Chair of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

**5. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Resolution on Tuition Benefits for Children of University Employees
Information for the Faculty Senate
(Senate Agenda Item 23)**

FOR INFORMATION:

Background

In Spring 1999 the SCFA Benefits Subcommittee, representatives of ASAC, and the Civil Service Committee met to request a new employee benefit: a 50% tuition reduction for dependents of employees enrolled in undergraduate degree programs at the University of Minnesota. The Employee Benefits Department conducted an informal survey of other universities, including all Big Ten members, to determine what level of tuition remission benefits were offered.

A majority of the universities that were surveyed offered tuition benefits. Many remitted 50% with a few (mostly privates) offering 100%. In the Big Ten, 7 of 14 offered tuition remissions with Northwestern offering 85%; Penn State, 75%, and all others at 50%. Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin do not offer a tuition benefit for dependents of employees.

The analysis performed by Employee Benefits (appended to this report) suggests that the cost of a 50% tuition remission, when fully implemented with students in all four years, would be between \$1.2 and \$1.7 million. (See appended report.) Assuming that dependents are equally distributed across employment categories, this would mean that 44% of eligible dependents are associated with Civil Service/Bargaining Unit staff while 56% are associated with Faculty and Professional Administrative Staff. Using \$1.45 million as the full cost (halfway between \$1.2 and \$1.7 million estimates), the added percentage fringe benefit increase would be .25% for CS/BU and .21% for Faculty/PA.

New Analysis

Employers design benefit plans to influence employee behavior—particularly with relation to attraction and retention to the organization. A benefit program that has certain features is more attractive to some segments of the labor force than others. For example, health care subsidies for dependents increases the attractiveness for applicants and employees with dependents. A retirement program with a service requirement for vesting of benefits encourages retention.

An employee's total compensation consists of cash payments and economic benefits designed to reduce risk (insurance), pay in kind (recreation subsidies), pay during nonworking periods (vacations and holidays), and provide for retirement (pensions). The mix of cash payments and benefits reflects the joint interests of employers and employees. In turn, public policy has favored employers providing benefits for employees rather than the employees purchasing benefits themselves due to the nontaxability of benefits, but not cash payments.

A tuition remission program for dependents of employees that includes a service requirement would be expected to increase attractiveness of employment for those who have dependents who will likely be admissible to the university. It would also reduce turnover because sustained service would be necessary to make use of the benefit.

If cost savings from reduced turnover exceed increased costs of a tuition reduction benefit, then the benefit would be costless—actually improving the efficiency of the university.

Assumptions

We begin with the following enrollment assumptions which are largely similar to those used in last year's proposal:

50% of employees have children/dependents,

Of those with dependents, each has 1.8 children/dependents between 0-23 years of age.

50% of children will be qualified to attend the university,

50% of those qualified will choose to take advantage of university enrollment,

Thus, the “risk” of an employee having a child/dependent attend the university is about .225.

The current proposal requires some additional assumptions:

Assume that the transition probabilities from freshman to sophomore, sophomore to junior, and junior to senior are .90 for each year,

The real (after inflation) rate of tuition increases will be a constant 2% into the foreseeable future,

The real (after inflation) discount rate will be a constant 3% into the foreseeable future.

Implementing the tuition benefit will be associated with a turnover reduction of 10% in the current rate of turnover during each year of an employee’s employment with the university.

The cost of replacing an employee who quits is equal to 150% of annual salary for faculty, 67% for PA, 50% for civil service, and 33% for bargaining unit employees.

Analysis

With these assumptions in place, the present value of the 100% tuition remission for four years to an employee with 10 years of service is \$5,568 (at 50%, \$2,784). If we were to calculate the present cost of providing this benefit to the proportion of employees (by classification) who would be expected to accrue 10 years of service (under reduced turnover expectations), the cost would be \$2,968 for P/A, \$4,043 for faculty \$2,537 for civil service, \$2,443 for Teamster members, and \$2,014 for AFSCME members. (Keep in mind that these figures are approximate.) However, if turnover were reduced by 10%, the net (cost) saving for the university from providing this benefit, after turnover cost reductions, for a 10 year service employee would be (\$137) for PA, \$929 for faculty, (\$577) for civil service, (\$1,594) for Teamsters, and (\$1,077) for AFSCME. The overall weighted cost would be \$23.73 per year for each 10 year employee. If a 50% remission is applied, the savings would be \$112.13 per employer per year.

If the university were to implement a 100% tuition remission program, with vesting starting at 50% in year 5 and increasing by 10% per year until full vesting at year 10, and if turnover declined by 10% in each employee group as a result, the following conservative estimate would apply. Assuming that all employees work for up to 20 years, and that there are about 5% of employees in each year of service between 1 and 20, then the annual cost savings, net of tuition costs, per employee is about \$89 and the annual savings across the employee population would be in excess of \$1,200,000.

Spreadsheets on which this analysis is based are available upon request from the Senate office.

Resolution

Whereas: The University of Minnesota, as a land grant institution, has as one of its central missions the education of highly qualified undergraduate students, and

Whereas: The University of Minnesota benefits from the efforts and commitment of all of its employees, and

Whereas: University of Minnesota employees, especially as employees of an institution of higher learning, understand the benefits of higher education and seek to make them available to their children/dependents, and

Whereas: The University of Minnesota desires to improve the effectiveness of its workforce and reduce employment costs by reducing employee turnover, and

Whereas: The faculty of the University of Minnesota seeks a stronger sense of community among all employee groups, each of which contributes to the mission of the university, and

Whereas: It can be demonstrated that the inclusion of a partial tuition remission benefit would reduce employment costs under relatively conservative assumptions, therefore

Be it resolved: That the Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the children/dependents of all university employees having accrued 5 or more years of uninterrupted university service be granted a 50% tuition reduction upon being regularly admitted to an approved undergraduate program leading to a bachelor's degree, that the tuition reduction will be applied to half of the tuition for the first four year's of a child/dependent's enrollment, during periods in which the child/dependent student is in good academic standing; and that the percentage of tuition reduced be increased by 10% for each additional year of uninterrupted service through year 10.

COMMENT:

The SCFA Benefits Subcommittee, under the direction of its chair, Professor John Fossum, has developed the above-mentioned resolution and supporting information. It has been presented to and approved by both the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) and the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC).

RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard Goldstein, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), said that this subject has been considered for a long time, but was finally worked on by the SCFA Benefits Subcommittee. There are a number of reasons that this policy is being considered. First, it will provide an important benefit in hiring at all levels in the University. Second, it will play a role in retention. Third is the impact on employee morale. Lastly, it will increase interest in undergraduate education by all employees.

An analysis was done by Professor John Fossum which found that there are savings to the University by retention of employees since new employee training is not needed. The reason that this policy is not being presented for action now is that the administration wants to conduct its own study of costs versus savings with this proposal. Currently, seven of the Big Ten universities offer tuition benefits, as does MnSCU.

Q: Will this benefit be rolled into fringe benefits so that employees will end up paying for it anyway?

A: If the gross tuition cost for this benefit is considered, the analysis indicates that it would be a fringe benefit of .2%, which does not take into account any savings to the University.

6. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

**Faculty Emeriti Policy and Administrative Procedures
Action by the Faculty Senate
(Senate Agenda Item 24)**

MOTION:

To approve the Faculty Emeriti Policy and Administrative Procedures. A simple majority is required for approval.

COMMENT:

The proposed policy is available in the Senate Office and the proposed administrative procedures are as follows:

DRAFT

Administrative Procedures for the Regents Policy on Faculty Emeriti

1. Purpose. In recognition of years of valued service and contributions to the University of Minnesota, the Board of Regents has established the title of “emeritus” to be awarded to those who meet the standard of a faculty emeritus defined in section I, subdivision 1 of the policy *Faculty Emeriti*. The objective of this policy is to honor the past affiliation and encourage and maximize the inclusion of emeritus faculty as participating members of the University of Minnesota community. The principle guiding this policy is that faculty emeriti shall have the opportunity and are encouraged to continue as active members of the University community to the extent they are willing and able. The policy, *Faculty Emeriti*, and the procedures for administering it supersede those concerning “Emeritus Title for Faculty”(adopted January 9,1969). Furthermore, the policy and these administrative guidelines specify the expectations of the University and its academic and service units in implementing this policy and the privileges and services that are expected to be provided to faculty emeriti. These administrative guidelines and procedures should be read and interpreted in conjunction with the policy, not as a substitute for it.

2. Conferment of the Emeritus Title and Notification. The emeritus title is automatically conferred to a faculty member (regardless of gender) upon retirement from the University under honorable circumstances as specified in Sections I, III, and IV. It may also be granted by the Board of Regents, on recommendation of the president, under special circumstances when the above conditions are not met as described below and in Section III, subd. 2. The conferment of the faculty emeritus title shall be at the faculty member’s rank at the time of retirement; however, it does not confer any employment status, rights, or associated entitlements.

Formal notification of emeritus status. Each college shall issue a letter to the eligible retiring faculty member within one month of their retirement, conferring the emeritus title.

Special circumstances. As provided in the policy, Section III, subdivision 2, the emeritus title can be awarded or promotion in rank made for a faculty member not meeting the definition of faculty to emeritus as set forth in the policy, Section I, subdivision 1.

In such case, the recommendation must be initiated at the departmental level and the following is required: a statement of the rationale and other documentation (i.e., letter of support) providing justification for the action proposed, approval by a 2/3 majority of the tenured faculty in the unit, and subsequent approval of the department head/chair as well as the dean of the college.

The awarding of the emeritus title or promotion within the emeritus rank is granted upon approval of the Board of Regents after recommendation by the Executive Vice President Provost and the President.

3. University Services and Privileges. In order to facilitate the maintenance of a significant connection with faculty emeriti, the University shall provide faculty emeriti, who desire them, with the following privileges and services equal to those provided to regular faculty:

1. e-mail accounts (including internet access);
2. library privileges;
3. listing in the University directory and mailservice;
4. faculty discounts for computer software, recreational facilities, athletic events, and other performances and exhibitions;
5. continuation of parking privileges at faculty rates—subject to space limitations (in such case, the next best alternative space should be offered);
6. auditing of graduate or undergraduate level courses, subject to the instructor’s approval and relevant University policies and procedures;
7. access to University and state policies governing the continuation of health insurance, but at their own expense;
8. participation in academic processions (graduations, convocations, etc.) in a position of honor; and
9. represent the University (upon appointment by the president) at academic ceremonies of other institutions.

4. Academic Unit Services and Privileges. Subject to cost and availability, academic unit administrators are encouraged to provide active emeritus faculty the following privileges, services, and facilities as are warranted by the nature of the continuing relationship with the university but not to exceed those provided to regular faculty:

1. office space;
2. access to laboratories, computers, or comparable facilities requisite to the continued engagement in scholarly work or mutually agreed upon task whether on a contractual or volunteer basis;
3. access to mail, telephone, and other routine office services (e.g. copying, secretarial); and
4. the privilege to submit proposals for sponsored research and to advise graduate students_or postdoctoral research associates, subject to University rules and policies.

5. Continued Relationship with the University. An academic department, service, or other administrative unit may enter into a volunteer or contractual agreement with a faculty emeritus to provide services subject to terms of the contract and applicable laws and rules as referenced in Section VI of the policy *Faculty Emeriti*.

6. Informal Dispute Resolution. Disputes by faculty emeriti that arise from the policy *Faculty Emeriti* and these administrative procedures shall be resolved via an informal process. If a dispute arises from a decision under the policy *Faculty Emeriti* and these administrative procedures, the faculty emeritus can request review by the administrative level above the administrator making the decision (e.g. at the college level when the dispute concerns a decision by a department chair/head). Requests for reviews and reviews should be made in a timely manner.

RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, Chair
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Richard Goldstein, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (SCFA), recalled that two years ago the Faculty Senate passed a Retiree's Bill of Rights. Since that time, SCFA and its Retirement Benefits Subcommittee have been working with the administration to develop a Regents' policy and administrative procedures.

The point of the policy is that emeritus faculty can be of great benefit to the University and their presence on campus is positive. Currently, many departments give many of the rights and privileges that are listed here to their emeritus faculty, but this should not be left to the whim of an administrator. Instead, it should be a uniform minimum across the University. The cost is small and will be outweighed by the benefits.

Q: The policy mentions promotion of faculty in terms of emeritus status. What does this mean?

A: If an associate professor were to retire, his or her title would be Associate Professor Emeritus. If a department wishes to make a promotion in emeritus title for these individuals, which costs no money, the policy provides for the way to do this.

With no further questions, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

**7. OLD BUSINESS
(Senate Agenda Item 27)**

NONE

**8. NEW BUSINESS
(Senate Agenda Item 28)**

**TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE
Tenure Code Interpretation
Information for the Faculty Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

Interpretation of Subsections 7.11 and 7.12: General Criteria and Departmental Statement

The faculty of an academic unit are expected to periodically review their criteria for awarding indefinite tenure and reflect any new criteria in a revision of their Subsection 7.12 Statement. The new criteria and Subsection 7.12 Statement must be adopted in accordance with the established procedures of the University, after consultation as required by those procedures. Current probationary faculty in the unit may elect to be evaluated on the criteria in the previous Subsection 7.12 Statement or on the new criteria. This option is also available to current tenured faculty in their evaluation for promotion to the next level. Probationary or tenured faculty must make this decision within one year of the date of administrative approval of the new criteria.

Comment:

This interpretation will replace the second paragraph of existing Interpretation 6. This paragraph now states, "If changes in the program of a unit affect the prospects of probationary

faculty members to achieve tenure, these faculty members should be given the earliest possible notice of the potential impact of such changes.” The new interpretation will allow probationary faculty members to chose to be evaluated using the previous criteria of the unit for tenure or the new criteria. This option is also available to tenured faculty of the unit who are seeking promotion to the next level, e.g. Associate Professors seeking promotion to full Professors. Although the latter group will be involved in the development and acceptance of the new criteria by the tenured faculty of the unit, they may represent a minority opinion. This interpretation does not change the requirement for review of the new criteria by the dean or other appropriate academic administrator and by the senior academic administrator. Faculty members must make their decision with in one year of the approval of the new Subsection 7.12 Statement by the senior academic administrator.

Required Action:

Pursuant to Section 16.2 of Faculty Tenure, an interpretation of the Code must be approved by the Tenure Subcommittee and Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks.* Once approved, it is forwarded to the Faculty Senate for information and to the Board of Regents for action. The Board must adopt the interpretation before it takes effect.

MARY DEMPSEY, Chair
TENURE SUBCOMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

Professor Mary Dempsey, Chair of the Tenure Subcommittee, presented for information an interpretation of the tenure code. She noted that interpretations only need to be approved by the Tenure Subcommittee and the Executive Vice President and Provost, which is why it is being presented for information only. Consultation on this interpretation was done with the Judicial, Faculty Affairs, and Faculty Consultative Committees and it was discussed by the Council of Deans.

**9. ADJOURNMENT
(Senate Agenda Item 29)**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

* The interpretation was approved by the Tenure Subcommittee on Friday, April 14, 2000, and Executive Vice President and Provost Robert Bruininks on Monday, April 17, 2000.

APRIL 20, 2000

The third meeting of the Student Senate for 1999-00 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 20, 2000, at 11:36 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 22 voting student members. Mr. Reid LeBeau, Student Senate Chair, presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

NONE

2. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 24 STUDENT SENATE MINUTES

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/student_senate/000224stu.html

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

3. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO STUDENT SENATE ACTIONS

Student Legislative Resolution

(<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/slcred.html>)

Approved by the: Student Senate February 24, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents - no action required

Resolution Regarding the Removal of the Graduation Proficiency Test for Second As a Requirement of Graduation

(<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/gptres.html>)

Approved by the: Student Senate February 24, 2000
Administration PENDING
Board of Regents - no action required

4. STUDENT LEGISLATIVE COALITION UPDATE

Meggan Ellingboe reported that the bonding bill is still in conference committee, but no work is being done since both houses are on Easter Break.

5. CAMPUS/STUDENT ORGANIZATION REPORTS

Crookston - Kevin Poppel, the SSCC representative, reported that activities are winding down since it is the end of the semester. Chris Shulstad has been elected as the 2000-01 SSCC representative for the campus.

Duluth - Mark Uszenski, the SSCC representative, stated elections are scheduled for April 25 - 27, which was a postponement to allow restructuring of UMDSA. The SSCC will be visiting UMD on April 27. Earth Day is also being celebrated on campus this week.

Morris - Reid LeBeau, Student Senate Chair, announced that three new senators have been elected and the SSCC representative will be named next Monday.

Minnesota Student Association - Jason Reid, SSCC Chair, said that Matt Clark and Rachel Boeke were elected MSA President and Vice President. All other positions were elected this past Tuesday. Work is also being done on bylaw changes.

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly - Paul Enever, 2000-01 SSCC representative, stated that, in conjunction with MSA, an ad hoc Fees Reform Committee has completed recommendations for bylaw changes. GAPSA will also be working with SLC to encourage more support for faculty and graduate assistant pay increases next year.

Council of Graduate Students - Mike Pawson, COGS President, announced that after last night's election, Michael Jacobs was elected next year's President. Barbara Van Drasek has been working on the health care bid process for graduate assistants and teaching assistants.

6. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Jason Reed, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, started by congratulating next year's newly-elected senators. He noted that the Graduation Proficiency Test (GPT) resolution is still pending with the administration. Regarding the U Pass, resolutions were presented to the SSCC and the Student Affairs Committee (SCSA). Both committees had questions and reservations about the current proposal, so a resolution was passed instead which states that the committees support an initiative for U Pass, but not any specific plan. While most students were opposed to the class notes policy, it did pass the University Senate at the February meeting. At an SSCC meeting in March, President Yudof thought that the policy might be overkill on this issue and said that he is talking to other people before he approves the policy.

Later today, the grade change policy involving repeating a course will be up for action at the University Senate meeting. The proposed policy states that a student can only repeat a course once, that both grades would appear on the transcript, but that only the second grade would count in a student's GPA. He stated that he will be nominating Senator Khaled Dajani to serve as the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Vice Chair. Also at today's meeting under new business, the SSCC is proposing to add the Student Affairs Committee Chair as an ex officio, non-voting member. Lastly, he mentioned the Academic Integrity report which will be acted upon at the University Senate meeting. He thanked Senators Mike Sweeney and Barbara Van Drasek for their hard work on this issue. The Student Senate then gave them a round of applause.

Mike Sweeney then provided a recap of the Academic Integrity report, by stating that the report is not concerned with the penalties for cheating. Instead, the report tries to create a culture of academic integrity at the University by making it known to students that cheating is unacceptable. Everyone needs to be involved in the effort because cheating affects everyone by de-valuing the University.

The report asks that a statement be placed on blue books stating that a student has not cheated and will report anyone they see cheating. An amendment was made to this statement removing the requirement to report anyone seen cheating. He noted that various colleges within the University already operate under this type of system. In closing, he asked senators to read the preamble to understand the intent of the report, since there are many misconceptions.

7. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

Reid LeBeau, Student Senate Chair, reported that the SSCC will be traveling to Duluth on April 27 and the SLC will be meeting in Duluth on April 28. The Student Advisory Council will be electing a new chair for the upcoming year.

8. DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT YUDOF

President Yudof started by expressing concern with the bonding bill. The latest news revealed that the Studio Arts Building would be included along with many other University projects, although it is not clear if there will even be a bonding bill before adjournment this year. Representatives were sent to the founding meeting of the Workers Rights' Consortium (WRC). He stated that the University will see how the WRC evolves, since it is a new organization. Lastly, he noted that the U Pass could help with the campus parking situation as well as the environment.

Q: What will the tuition increase be for next year?

A: An increase has not been approved yet, but the recommendation is for a 5.5% increase. At the end of 1999 legislative session, both MnSCU and the University each lost \$20 million from their projected budgets. This money was instead put into scholarships, but structured in a way so that most University students would not benefit from this money. Therefore, in order to give staff and faculty members raises to keep up morale, tuition would need to be raised more than 3%. He stated that it is a terrible public policy to rebate so much money, primarily to the middle and upper classes, and then to tax students who are working their way through school. This process needs to be reversed in the legislature. A final increase will be voted on at the May Board of Regents meeting, after having been discussed at two previous meetings.

Q: Are this year's faculty and staff raises a one-time only raise or will they be recurring?

A: At this point, it is too early to tell. He stated that students should not pay for these increases. Instead taxpayers should shoulder some of this cost.

Q: The House majority leader said that the Morris renovations are included on the House bonding bill. Do you know what the Morris situation is in the Senate?

A: He has been told that Morris appears in both versions, along with the Molecular and Cellular Biology Building and Crookston renovations. The Studio Arts Building is only funded for \$2 million for planning in the House, but fully funded in the Senate. The Plant Genomics Building is also fully funded by the Senate, but had not received anything from the House.

Q: What are your feelings on the Academic Integrity report and initiatives contained within it?

A: He said that he has read the report and feels that its initiatives should be implemented.

Q: Is the University planning on pushing for anymore policy changes, such as freshmen ineligibility, within the NCAA?

A: He has tried to make changes at the NCAA level. Within the Big Ten, the universities have agreed to reduce the number of basketball scholarships for students who leave the universities for academic reasons. This change is also being discussed within the NCAA. Big Ten schools are almost unanimous also on freshmen ineligibility. At this point, the University is working through the conference regarding freshmen ineligibility, but he does not think that this change will be implemented through the NCAA because the proposal is being out-voted by other conferences.

Q: In the future, will there be a push to have undergraduate students enroll at the coordinate campuses and only have graduate and professional students in the Twin Cities?

A: The Twin Cities will not become a completely graduate school since the current undergraduate population will be maintained. Growth might even occur in some specific areas that have a great demand. Growth has been programmed for the coordinate campuses and additional strengthening needs to happen between the coordinate campuses. By tying together admission procedures, it enables incoming students to choose the campus that fits them the best.

9. ELECTION OF 2000-01 STUDENT SENATE CHAIR Election by 2000-01 Senators Only

Percy Chaby, a student senator from the Carlson School of Management, was elected Student Senate Chair.

10. ELECTION OF 2000-01 STUDENT SENATE/ STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR Election by 2000-01 Senators Only

Since most coordinate campuses had not completed their 2000-01 senator elections, a motion was made to postpone the Vice Chair election until the fall. A vote was taken and the motion was approved.

11. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

12. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

13. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:19 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

APPENDIX A MEMORIAL STATEMENTS

FACULTY

Ernst C. Abbe
1905-2000

Dr. Ernst Cleveland Abbe, who made his home in St. Paul for more than sixty years, died March 15, 2000. He was born on August 21, 1905 in Washington, DC; and was married in 1930 to Lucy Elizabeth Boothroyd. He received his BS and Master's degrees in Botany from Cornell University (1928, 1930) and his Ph.D. in Biology from Harvard University in 1934. He served on the faculty of the University of Minnesota (1935-1974) in the department of Botany where he was Professor and Chairman (1944-47, 1962-67). During his tenure at the University, Professor Abbe made a lasting impact on teaching, scientific research, and administration and on the promotion of scientific activities in the State of Minnesota. He trained innumerable undergraduate and many graduate students in the botanical sciences. At the same time Dr. Abbe's wife, Lucy Boothroyd Abbe, taught at Macalester College in Saint Paul. Lucy Abbe also participated in her husband's endeavors, including several worldwide expeditions and joint research activities. Their research included detailed studies of plants native to Minnesota and subarctic North America and of oaks in Southeast Asia. These studies involved a number of expeditions such as the University of Minnesota expedition to Hudson Bay (1939) and trips to Southeast Asia (1959-60), Mt. Kinabalu on Borneo (1962) as a Fulbright Fellow, and to Malaysia (1964). In cooperation with a number of graduate students Dr. Abbe also carried out extensive studies on the morphogenesis of maize plants in relation to their genetic constitution. He was Professor Emeritus following his retirement and continued work on a number of important studies in the years that followed.

Before coming to the University of Minnesota, Dr. Abbe was a National Research Council Fellow at Columbia, Harvard, and Cornell Universities (1933-35). Later, he was a Guggenheim Fellow at Harvard University (1941-42) and a Fulbright Professor at the University of Singapore (1961-62). He was also a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and a Fellow of the Linnean Society of London. At the University of Minnesota, in addition to his teaching and administrative duties, both he and Lucy Abbe were active in the Minnesota Chapter of Sigma Xi for many years. Dr. Abbe served as the Society's president in 1947-48 and received its "Distinguished Service Award" in 1982, Lucy Abbe was recognized for her contributions to the Society at the same time. Dr. Abbe also became involved with the revitalization of the Minnesota Academy of Science, in which he served as vice-president (1951-52) and president (1952-53). As a result of his efforts with the organization over a period spanning at least thirty years, the Minnesota Academy has continued to be very active in encouraging the efforts of young scientists and in searching for scientific talents among high school students through its yearly science fairs. Dr. Abbe contributed his own preserved plant collections to and was also very active in supporting the development of the expanded Minnesota Herbarium, an important regional and international collection of preserved plant specimens now associated with the Bell Museum of Natural History.

Dr. Abbe is survived by a sister, Elfriede Abbe of Manchester Center, VT; two sons, Robert C. Abbe of Newton, MA, and David C. Abbe of San Diego, CA; six grandchildren, Dawn Gsoell, Elizabeth Abbe, Daniel Abbe, John Abbe, Theadora Abbe Lang, and Thomas Abbe; and seven great grandchildren. A memorial service celebrating Dr. Abbe's life will be held at the St. Anthony Park United Church of Christ, 2129 Commonwealth Avenue, St. Paul on April 11, 2000 at 10:00 am. Memorial gifts should be made to the Ernst C. and Lucy B. Abbe Scholarship at the University of Minnesota by contacting Jean Lindquist at (612) 624-2244.

Carl John Eide
1904-2000

Carl Eide was born in Carrington, North Dakota, on August 20, 1904. He matriculated at the University of Minnesota, on the St. Paul Campus, and earned his BS degree in 1928 with a major in biochemistry. He entered graduate school with a major in plant pathology under Professor E. C. Stakman, and earned an MS degree in 1929 and a PhD degree in 1934, both from the University of Minnesota.

His early employment was as an analyst for the Protein Laboratory of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce (1926) and as a cereal chemist for Pillsbury's A Mill in Minneapolis (1926-1927). In the summers of 1927 and 1928, he worked in the barberry eradication program in Minnesota. In 1929, he became a botany instructor in the School of Agriculture as well as a research assistant in the Department of Plant Pathology, at the University of Minnesota. During the academic year of 1929 to 1930, Carl was a botany instructor at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, then returned to the University of Minnesota where he was appointed an instructor in plant pathology (1930-1937). He continued on the faculty serving as assistant professor from 1937-1944, associate professor from 1944 to 1947, and professor from 1947 until his retirement in 1973. He served as Acting Head of the Department of Plant Pathology off and on from 1938 to 1971. He continued as professor emeritus with an office in the department for several decades, completing many assignments for the department.

Dr. Eide served in several capacities outside the university. For example, he was a Special Scientific Aid with the Rockefeller Foundation in Colombia and Mexico in 1955 and served as an Agricultural Officer for the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, in Chile, in 1960.

He was elected to organizations such as Phi Lambda Epsilon; Alpha Zeta, where he served on the Board of Trustees from 1951 to 1954; Gamma Sigma Delta, serving as president in 1951-1952; Sigma Xi, serving as secretary-treasurer from 1950 to 1952; Gamma Alpha; and Gamma Sigma Delta, where he was honored with the Award of Merit in 1972.

Carl was active in the American Phytopathological Society, serving on several committees, and as an associate editor from 1937 to 1938 and as editor from 1956 to 1958, of the journal *Phytopathology*. He was a member of the Potato Association of America and the Society of American Bacteriologists.

Professor Eide was dedicated to teaching, and taught several courses: Introductory Plant Pathology (1932-1938), Fruit and Vegetable Diseases (1935-1951), Vegetable Diseases (1952-1960), Plant Disease Control (1934-1948), Bacterial Diseases of Plants (1938-1966) Physiology of Plant Pathogens (1939-1945), Virus Diseases of Plants (1947-1949), and Principles of Plant Pathology (1954-1973).

Dr. Eide was a superb teacher and was especially skillful in the Socratic method of instruction. His lectures on principles of plant pathology were the final course taken by doctoral candidates as it was the capstone of teaching plant pathology in the department. It was a popular course and valued immensely by students in plant pathology and others from related departments because it brought together all elements of the discipline. He was asked to continue teaching this course for several years after his retirement.

Dr. Eide's early research dealt with diseases of fruit and vegetable crops; later he focused on diseases of potato, where he specialized in late blight caused by *Phytophthora infestans*. He sought to find the nature of resistance, analyzed racial populations of the fungus, and collaborated with horticulturists in developing resistant cultivars of potato. In recognition of his

work, a potato cultivar was named after him. His research was recognized nationally and internationally for his concepts on the nature of disease resistance in plants and his applications for control of diseases in potato. He was an adviser to 20 master's and 21 doctoral candidates in plant pathology. His publication record comprises about 50 papers; however, he refused to be an author of any paper that was the outcome of either an MS or a PhD thesis, for he believed that the research done was that of the student and his role as an adviser was not enough to merit authorship of that student's thesis research. Even though he played a major role in the design and planning of the research, and even in the writing of the paper, he adamantly refused authorship.

Dr. Eide was a scholar of the best type envisioned by a university and he served as a congenial, always approachable adviser to students, and ever evinced the scholarly instincts of a scientist. He was a sound thinker, an excellent writer and editor, an inspirational teacher and mentor, with a modest, friendly demeanor and a great sense of humor. He was a well-loved professor as attested by the many who came to visit with him during his tenure and in retirement. Dr. Eide died April 9, 2000 at the age of 95.

William S. Howell
1914-2000

William S. Howell, president of the association 1971-72, died February 18 at his long time home in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Howell was probably best known for his ground breaking work in intercultural communication and for his study of persuasion. His Persuasion: a Means of Social Control (1952), co-authored with Winston Brembeck, University of Wisconsin, was a long standing favorite text-book in colleges and universities.

Although they may be unsure, the multitude of his former students teaching intercultural communication throughout the world believe that he was the first person to teach university courses in the subject. It is certain that for years graduate students trooped to the University of Minnesota to study with him.

His interests in intercultural communication probably sprang from his extensive international travel. In 1958, having become a regular listener of Radio Moscow's English Language Service, he visited Western Europe and the Soviet Union with a group of Minnesota professors. Bill wound up in the studios of Radio Moscow and later published an article on its broadcasting (OJS, Oct. 1960.) Later he co-authored an article on Radio Prague (OJS, Oct. 1969.) His contacts led to several visits to Minnesota by Joe Adamov, the chief English speaking voice of Radio Moscow. These were accomplished in spite of more than a little reluctance in the State Department.

But Bill reveled in facing adversities. He also reveled in regaling his colleagues with stories of his international visits. In 1965 he made a 52-day trip to Asia, returning through Europe, and in 1966, a 57-day trip to Columbia, France, Lebanon, and several Asian countries. A third major study trip, 45 days, to Western Europe and the Soviet Union took place in 1968.

In the 1970s he became especially interested in Japan and took a number of short trips, visiting and speaking at universities there. He spoke at too many colleges and universities in the United States as well as abroad to be mentioned. He spent a semester teaching and studying at the University of Hawaii.

Howell became well known to corporate executives in the Twin Cities and was frequently invited to offer advice as well as workshops on communicating across the lines of nations and cultures. He spoke frequently in meetings of our professional associations on carrying ethical concepts across boundaries.

Late in his career, after reading the early publications on split-brain research, Howell became interested in the rapidly growing field of cognitive science and lectured repeatedly on its implications for the study of communication. One of his more notable lectures was in 1982 to 110 professional retirees at the university, a group that he was soon to join.

Howell was an instructor at the University of South Dakota, 1938-40, and at the University of Wisconsin, 1940-42. Born on a farm in near Madison, Wisconsin, he received three degrees there, completing his Ph.D. in 1945. That year he became an assistant professor at the University of Minnesota and retired as a professor in 1984. He was heavily involved in the life of his campus, serving on a multitude of committees and councils throughout his years on the faculty. From 1954-60 he served as the Chairperson of the Department of Speech and Theatre Arts. He saw many changes in his profession and oversaw some of them.

His friends and former students who feel the urge may contribute to the Old Buffalo Fund, a scholarship fund for majors in communication at Minnesota, a fund he helped establish and whose name reflects the good humored self-deprecation that marked his personality.

G. Gordon Kingsley
1914-1999

G. Gordon Kingsley was born on October 23, 1914, in Albany, New York, the youngest of three brothers. He died on November 27, 1999, after a lengthy illness. Kingsley's father was the Superintendent of Public Schools in Albany, and the family lived in nearby rural Malden Bridge, New York.

Kingsley attended Milne High School, Albany NY. He was an excellent artist and student and after finishing high school early, attended Green Mountain Junior College in Vermont where he met his wife, Elaine. They were married in 1941.

Kingsley received his Bachelor's degree from Cornell University, Master's degree from Columbia University, and his Doctorate in Educational Psychology from Rutgers University. While completing his education, Gordon utilized his artistic talents by teaching Graphic Arts in Albany, NY. Upon completing his doctorate, he served as Dean of Men and Director of Guidance at Glenville State Teachers College in West Virginia. After three years he returned to Rutgers as an Associate Professor and Assistant to the Dean of Students.

During World War II, Kingsley served in the US Navy as a Classifications Specialist.

In 1956, Dr. Kingsley accepted an appointment in the General College as Associate Professor and Head of Counseling and Student Services. He held this position until his retirement from the University in 1981. He also served as a member of the Graduate Faculty in the Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology Program, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development. Kingsley participated in numerous University and College Committees and Task Forces, and was a strong advocate for the nontraditional student population served by the General College. He also developed the General College Counseling and Student Services Office into an exceptionally strong practicum and doctoral internship site for psychology graduate students. In this capacity he served as mentor, supervisor, and research supporter for numerous graduate students.

Kingsley himself best describes the philosophy of the Counseling and Student Services Office he established "...teaching, counseling, advising and a curriculum to meet the individual needs of its students...it is the integration of these four which guarantees the student maximum opportunity for academic success and personal growth. The student Personnel office is...a student development center, with its primary mission to help students in the development of

skills and insights which are important in establishing and achieving their educational and career goals, as well as their potential as members of society." He was continually involved with on-going applied research related to student needs, academic progress, career development and outreach.

During his career, Kingsley also served as a visiting professor at New York State College, Albany NY, and summer staff for the NDEA Counseling Institute, University of Arizona and the College of William and Mary. R.M. White, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington DC, in a letter to General College Dean, H.T. Morse, stated "...in visiting the Guidance Training Institute being conducted at the College of William and Mary being conducted by Dr. Gordon Kingsley, ...I would be remiss if I did not convey to you the gratitude and respect this group developed for him in both a professional and personal way ...the impact made by Dr. Kingsley is not frequently duplicated."

Kingsley was a licensed psychologist and a member of the American Psychological Association, the American Counseling Association, the Minnesota and American Personnel & Guidance Associations, the National Vocational Guidance Association, and the American College Personnel Association.

In 1966, the Kingsleys moved to North Oaks, an area that reminded them so much of their New England origins. In his private life, Kingsley's greatest joys were derived from his family, church, classical jazz music, photography, gardening, sailing, reading and his love of animals. He belonged to several civic organizations and often served as a speaker for PTA and civic groups. He was known to be thoughtful and introspective, full of humor, in awe of God's beauty surrounding him, fair and dogmatic sensitive yet strong, and was truly a gentle man. He excelled as husband, father, teacher and mentor.

His wife, Elaine, preceded Gordon in death in 1996. Kingsley is survived by his daughter, Carolyn Kingsley-Hefty (John) of Edina and one step-granddaughter, Andrea Bonney Hefty of Indiana.

Richard A. Meronuck
1941 - 2000

Richard A. Meronuck was born in Minot, North Dakota, in 1941 and spent his formative years on a small-grains farm in that area. He received his BS degree in 1963 from North Dakota State University, majoring in Agricultural Education. Subsequently he taught vocational agriculture and general science for two years at a high school in Lamoure, North Dakota. He returned to North Dakota State University in 1965 and completed an MS degree in Plant Pathology two years later. He continued his graduate studies by moving to St. Paul and enrolling in the Plant Pathology Program at the University of Minnesota. He received his PhD degree in 1971, with the late Regents' Professor Clyde M. Christensen serving as his advisor. Consistent with his upbringing, his thesis research was on problems associated with food quality and storage of grain, in particular toxins (mycotoxins) produced by microorganisms (fungi) during storage.

Richard began his employment at the University of Minnesota as an assistant professor and Program Coordinator in the Office of Special Programs, with the responsibility of developing short courses in agriculture and horticulture. He became an Extension Specialist in Plant Pathology in 1973, associate professor in 1982 and a professor in 1987. During much of his career at the University of Minnesota, Richard's extension and outreach responsibilities were focused on problems related to grain storage. In this capacity he continued to collaborate with Prof. Christensen and soon became recognized for his own expertise, nationally and internationally among target audiences. During this period, Richard developed cooperative studies with his colleagues in the Departments of Biosystems & Agricultural Engineering and

Entomology. As a former member of the Plant Pathology faculty once said, this collaborative work was so successful, it essentially eradicated grain storage problems and the associated mycotoxin issues in Minnesota. Thus, in the more recent years, Richard shifted his interests to the production and processing of edible dry beans. Again, he became recognized very quickly, with participation as an expert in international agricultural programs, as in Rwanda. In addition, he served on a number of national and international advisory committees.

Richard extended his early and continued interest in education, from extension and outreach to traditional classroom instruction. He successfully taught an advanced undergraduate level course on "Introduction to Field Crop Diseases". This was paralleled by his enthusiasm and deep interest in the application of digital technology in education.

He was an avid fisherman who had many stories to tell. He was also a member of his church choir. He translated his early life on the farm to gardening. Clearly, those of us who knew him well will miss his honesty, humor and friendship.

Richard is survived by his wife Rose, two sons Keith and Christopher, brothers Donald and David and sister Kathy Kreshbach.

Theron O. Odlaug
1912-2000

Dr. Theron O. Odlaug passed away at the age of 88 years on January 31, 2000, at Lakeshore Lutheran Home in Duluth, following several years of failing health. He leaves his wife of 62 years, Lucille, a daughter Margaret of Minneapolis and a son Michael and family of Bellevue, Washington. Besides immediate family, Dr. Odlaug is also survived by a "family" of close friends, former colleagues and hundreds of students. One of his former students was influenced to the extent that he or she anonymously donated \$50,000 to endow a scholarship in Ted Odlaug's name. That gift will be a lasting memorial to a very fine teacher and scholar.

Dr. Odlaug retired from the Biology department in 1978, closing a long and dedicated career that began in 1945 as a professor of zoology at the former Duluth State Teachers College, later to become the Duluth campus of the University of Minnesota. His service to UMD included 24 years as the head of the Department of Biology, succeeding Dr. Ray Darland in that position. His doctorate was earned at New York University. Before joining the faculty here, Dr. Odlaug taught in colleges in New York, Montana and Nebraska. At UMD he spent more than three decades in the classroom, teaching courses in Animal Parasitology, Helminthology, Human Anatomy, Comparative Anatomy of Vertebrates, Oceanography, and Water Quality Investigative and Research Techniques. In 1971 he was listed in "Outstanding Educators in America" based on his civic and professional achievements.

Professor Odlaug's research on Lake Superior was a collaborative effort with the University's Twin Cities-based School of Public Health. Beginning in the mid-50's, he was the co-director of a program that provided training and research experience in aquatic biology for teachers, graduate students and public health personnel. In the 50's and 60's, his summers were spent at the UMD Limnological Research Center on London Road. In 1966, the program received funding to purchase a CPR (continuous plankton recorder), a novel (at that time) sampling device towed behind an ore carrier. The samples collected provided a baseline study of plankton components in transects of Lake Superior. In addition to his limnological research, Dr. Odlaug also published on the topic of parasite life histories, and authored a laboratory manual on the anatomy of the fetal pig, a work that is now in its eleventh edition.

The Odlaug family and the UMD Department of Biology wish to express sincere thanks for the contributions to the T. O. Odlaug Memorial Scholarship Fund, and especially to the very

generous anonymous donor. The endowment will allow two \$1000 scholarships to be awarded to biology students each year in Dr. Odlaug's name.

Caroline R. Weiss
1931-2000

Caroline R. Weiss, a retired Associate Professor in the School of Kinesiology and Leisure Studies, died February 29, 2000 after a two-year struggle with ovarian cancer. Weiss had been a member of the faculty in the Division of Recreation, Park and Leisure Studies from 1971 until her retirement in 1996.

Dr. Weiss' academic interests were in Therapeutic Recreation and Gerontology, with specific interests in reminiscence. She was the author of numerous articles related to her interests and she was a regular participant in workshops, conferences and symposia related to Therapeutic Recreation. She received the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree from Syracuse University, with a major in Art, in 1952, a Master of Nursing degree from Yale University in 1955, and an Ed.D degree in Therapeutic Recreation from Columbia University in 1971.

Caroline was an accomplished artist and chef. She obtained a cook-chef certificate from Hennepin Technical Center and was a member of the American Culinary Federation. In 1984, she won a Special Judge's award for originality at the International Culinary competition in Frankfurt, Germany. She occasionally worked as a pastry chef at Woodhill Country Club during summers and on weekends. Caroline also was a volunteer at the University Landscape Arboretum and at the Kid's Café in Minneapolis.

Dr. Weiss was preceded in death by her father, Alfred Weiss. She is survived by her mother, Katherine B. Weiss; a sister, Seena Weiss Rosenberger, two nieces and two nephews. A memorial service and internment was held at Union Cemetery in her hometown of Quakertown, Pennsylvania in March.

A memorial service was held by her friends at the First Unitarian Society on April 2, followed by a celebration of her life by colleagues, professional associates and friends. She was a joy to be around!

**APPENDIX B
ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS, 1999-2000**

The University Senate met 4 times during 1999-2000.

(fm = forfeiture of membership for nonattendance)

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
FACULTY		
Akehurst, Frank	4	0
Altholz, Josef	4	0
Anderson, James	4	0
Anderson, Melissa	4	0
Archibald, Sandra	1	1
Arndt, Roger	4	0
Augst, Thomas	1	0
Bache, Robert	1	1
Bales, Kent	4	0
Bar-Cohen, Avram	2	1
Bauer, Marvin	4	0
Befort, Stephen	2	1
Berry, Susan	2	0
Berscheid, Ellen	2	0
Bitterman, Peter	2	0
Bland, Carole	4	0
Boedicker, James	4	0
Bolstad, Paul	2	0
Brennan, Timothy	2	0
Brewer, Rose	2	1
Bromiley, Philip	4	0
Butler, Richard	4	0
Campbell, Stephen	4	0
Carter, C. Barry	4	0
Christenson, Richard (res 1/00)	2	0
Clohisy, Denis	1	0
Coggins, Jay	3	0
Conklin, Kathleen	1	2
Connett, John	3	0
Cook, R. Dennis	1	1
Cotter, James	1	0
Daniels, Barbara	0	3
Daoutidis, Prodromos	3	0
Day, John	1	1
delMas, Robert	3	1
Duke, Gary	1	0
Dunnigan, Timothy	2	2
Ebner, Timothy	3	1
Ehlke, Nancy	4	0
Elliot, Barbara	2	2
Erdman, Arthur	3	1
Feeney, Daniel	2	2

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Ferguson, David	0	0
Ferrieri, Patricia	2	2
Finzel, Bart	3	1
Galaskiewicz, Joseph	3	0
Gengenbach, Burle	4	0
Giannuli, Dimitra	4	0
Gilgun, Jane	3	0
Girshick, Steven	4	0
Goldstein, Richard	3	1
Goldstein, Stuart	4	0
Gonzales, Marti	4	0
Griffin, Edward	3	1
Grotevant, Harold	3	0
Gustafson, Kent	3	0
Haller, Edwin	2	2
Hanson, Helen	4	0
Heberlein, Joachim	4	0
Hertz, Marshall	1	1
Hicks, Dale	0	4
Jacott, William	1	3
Jara, Cynthia	4	0
Jenkins, Marc	4	0
Johnson, Carol	2	2
Johnson, Thomas	4	0
Kaas, Duane	2	1
Kaas, Merrie	3	0
Kakalios, James	2	2
Kaveh, Mostafa	3	1
Kelly, Richard	4	0
Kimpton, Jeffrey	2	1
Kinney, Larry	2	0
Kinsey, Jean	3	1
Kralewski, John	2	1
Krosch, Penny	3	0
Kruttschnitt, Candace	3	1
LaBuza, Ted	1	3
Levy, Robert	0	0
Lilley, Karen	4	0
Linck, Richard	2	0
Livingston, Dennis	4	0
Lopez, Dian	4	0
Magee, Paul	2	0
Maitland, Ian	4	0
Markhart, Bud	1	1
Martin, Judith	4	0
Maynes, Mary Jo	4	0
McCormick, Alon	1	2
McCormick, Richard	4	0
McEvoy, Mary	0	3
McIvor, R. Scott	2	0
McRoberts, Thomas	4	0

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Mescher, Matthew	1	1
Miller, Wesley	2	2
Miller, Wilmer	3	0
Myers, Ken	3	1
Neet, Sharon (appt 1/00)	2	0
Noland, Wayland	4	0
Pacala, James	2	2
Palmstrom, Christopher	3	0
Parente, James	3	1
Perentesis, John	0	1
Peterson, Kathleen	2	1
Plihal, Jane	4	0
Polla, Dennis	3	1
Polzin, Dave	2	2
Ragsdale, David	2	0
Ramsay, Norma (res 1/00)	0	1
Ranum, Laura	2	0
Reicks, Marla	4	0
Romano, John	2	1
Rosen, Carl	4	0
Sarles, Harvey	2	1
Savage, Wade	2	0
Schlievert, Patrick	2	1
Schreiner, Pamela	3	0
Schwartz, April	4	0
Schwarzenberg, Sarah (appt 1/00)	1	0
Seaquist, Elizabeth	0	3
Seavey, Robert	4	0
Stewart, Sharon	4	0
Seybold, Virginia	2	1
Sheets, George	1	3
Simmons, Michael	3	1
Sirc, Geoffrey	2	2
Snyder, Mark	2	2
Speidel, T. Michael	2	2
Stavrou, Theofanis	4	0
Tedick, Diane	4	0
Towle, Howard	3	0
Urness, Carol	4	0
Voller, Vaughan	4	0
Wagner, Carston	2	1
Wahlstrom, Kyla	3	0
Wakefield, Ray	4	0
Wallace, Larry	2	1
Walsh, Tom	3	0
Wangensteen, Douglas	2	2
Weckwerth, Vernon	4	0
Weil, Connie	4	0
Welles, Seth	3	0
White, Michael	4	0
Wick, Susan	2	2

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
York-Barr, Jennifer	3	0
Yudof, Mark	3	1
Zaheer, Aks	2	1
Ziebarth, Ann	3	1
Zipes, Jack	3	0

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Brady, Linda	0	0
Brorson, Susan	3	0
Dempsey, Mary	4	0
Hamilton, David	4	0
Kane, Mary Jo	0	0
Massey, Joseph	3	0
Morrison, Fred	4	0
Murthy, V. Rama	1	2
Rabinowitz, Paula	1	0
Ratliff-Crain, Jeff	4	0

STUDENTS

Abramowski, Louis (res 1/00)	0	1
Amiot, Travis (appt 2/00)	1	0
Anwer, Shumaila (res 1/00)	0	0
Barnhart, Wayne	1	0
Benning, Amber (appt 11/99)	1	0
Brauer, Matthew (appt 10/99, res. 1/00)	1	0
Carrier, Jenny	4	0
Chaby, Percy	3	0
Cochran, Ryan (appt 1/00, res 2/00)	0	0
Crouse, Abigail (appt 10/99)	0	3
Curtis, Michelle (appt 11/99)	0	0
Davich, Peter (appt 1/00)	1	1
Donaldson, Bryan (appt 1/00)	2	0
Dressen, Jeremy	3	0
Dvorak, Noah	1	0
Falkner, Matt (appt 1/00)	2	0
Fanslow, Bentley (res 1/00)	0	0
Heino, Chris	3	0
Helou, Leslie	0	2
Irwin, Emily	3	0
Jenkins, Anne	3	0
Johnson, Page (appt 1/00)	2	0
Johnson, Wyatt (appt 11/99)	0	0
Jones, Michael	2	1
Kass, Benjamin (appt 11/99)	1	0
Katz, Richard (res 1/00)	1	0
Kunkel, Nathan (appt 1/00)	1	0
LaPlant, Stephen	1	2
Lee, Gina (appt 11/99)	0	0
Lowing, Craig	1	2

	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Lyche, Adam (appt 1/00)	2	0
Lydell, Lesley	2	0
Mak, Carrie	1	1
Miller, Michael	3	0
Mitchell, A J	0	0
Mojiri-Azad, Nina (res 10/99)	0	1
Moore, Reuben (appt 10/99)	1	0
Musolf, Joseph	2	0
Nagle, Ryan (res 12/99)	2	0
Naslund, Shon (res 1/00)	0	0
Ney, Vici (appt 10/99)	0	2
Owens, Dan	3	0
Pawson, Michael	4	0
Pearson, Deborah	0	0
Pestorious, Kelly (appt 2/00)	0	1
Peterson, Patrick	2	0
Raju, Srihari	0	2
Ransom, Lakeesha (appt 10/99)	0	0
Redco, Karina (appt 10/99)	0	1
Rodriguez, Ben (appt 2/00)	0	1
Roers, Shane (appt 2/00)	1	0
Rusch, Kelli	1	0
Seifert, Jason (appt 2/00)	1	0
St. Amant, Kirk (res 2/00)	0	0
Sweeney, Mike (appt 2/99)	4	0
Tarbox, Will (appt 1/00)	2	0
Van Drasek, Barbara	3	1
Vettrus, Jessica (appt 11/99)	2	0

STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Altaf, Sabeen	4	0
Ellingboe, Meggan	2	1
Ipsen, Jed	1	1
LeBeau, Reid	2	2
Lucken, Lori (appt 1/00, res 2/00)	0	0
Poppel, Kevin (appt 2/00)	2	0
Reed, Jason	4	0
Rice, Chaz	3	0
Stedman, Tiffany	3	0
Street, Aaron	3	1
Trimble, Kerstin (res. 1/00)	0	0
Uszenski, Mark	0	1