university of minnesota
memo

To **Penny Krosch**

From **Martha Kvanbeck, Senate**

☐ For your information
☐ For your approval
☐ Per your request
☐ For your attention
☐ Note and file
☐ Note and return
☐ Note and forward
☐ Please advise
☐ Please reply
☐ Send copy
☐ Please see me

I am fowarding you the attached materials which were distributed at the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly meetings on Tuesday, November 17.

enclosures

Date _____

MAJOR AGENDA ITEMS

1992-93 SENATE AND ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

SENATE COMMITTEES

All-University Honors Committee
Chair: Ellen Berscheid, Psychology, N309 Elliott Hall, 625-6641

- Review nominations for University honors, naming of buildings, and outstanding achievement awards
- Possibly consider the system of faculty honors and awards

Committee on Committees
Chair: Geoffrey Maruyama, Educational Psychology, 250 Burton Hall, 624-3315

- Nominate faculty, academic professional, and student members to Senate committees
- Review Senate committees and recommend changes in committee structure, charge, or membership if appropriate
- Consider greater inclusion of P&A representation in the Senate

Computing and Information Systems
Chair: Thomas Burk, Forest Resources, 140 Green Hall, 624-6741

- Participate as an overview and consultative body for the information technology planning process, including supercomputing
- Consider the legislative audit of the Minnesota Supercomputer Center
- Advise the administration on the information decentralization process and on network tool development
- Data privacy/security/computing ethics/appropriate use

Consultative Committee
Chair: Mario Bognanno, Industrial Relations, 537 Mgmt & Economics, 624-1090

- Executive Committee of the Senate

Disabilities Issues Committee
Chair: Terence Collins, General College, 240 Appleby Hall, 625-5366

- Advise the administration on issues of physical and academic access and provision of student services to the disabled
- Compliance with appropriate laws and regulations

Educational Policy Committee
Chair: James Tracy, History, 614 Social Sciences, 624-0808

- Implementation mechanisms, Senate policy on teaching contributions
- Faculty responsibility for advising
- Appointment of an honors task force (in consultation with SCC)
- Credit hour/contact hour policy
- Tuition policy
- Minnesota Transfer Curriculum
- Changes in Crookston degree programs

Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee
Chair: Ann Burkhart, Law School, 426 Law Center, 625-4522

- Pay equity issues
- Adoption of "stopping the tenure clock" for new parents
- Post-Rajender procedures
- Analysis of Diversity in the University workforce

Faculty Affairs Committee
Chair: Carl Adams, Info and Decision Sciences, 395 HHH Center, 624-5220

- Review Faculty workload document
- Revise compensation policy
- Review implementation proposals for sabbatical programs
- Discuss report on Employee Assistance Program
- Develop policy on proration of benefits for part-time employees
- Monitor faculty retirement plans performance
- Explore mechanisms for inducing higher level of retirement
- Review progress of restructuring personnel offices
- Review University's smoking policy
- Discuss marriage tax issue
- Review rules on initial eligibility for faculty retirement plan
- Review desirability of cafeteria benefits plan
- Review revised grievance procedures
- Review faculty/academic staff advocacy and grievance advisory program
- Discuss recommendations of the Health Care subcommittee
- Consider development of a gun control policy for the Twin Cities campus

Finance and Planning Committee
Chair: Irwin Rubenstein, Plant Biology, 220 Bio Sciences Center, 625-1234
[Note: Some items have been delegated to the Subcommittee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation and appear under that heading.]

- Participate in the University's planning process
- Costs of changes at the Crookston campus
- Enrollment management
- Tuition policy and the "Waldorf" plan
- The 1993-95 biennial budget
- Review of CUFS implementation
- Generation and allocation of ICR funds
- Costs and returns on University investments
- Reviews of collegiate administrative costs

Judicial Committee
Chair: David Ward, Sociology, 909 Social Sciences, 624-9085

- Hear cases from faculty claiming violations of the tenure regulations

Library Committee
Chair: Kay Cooper, Univ Film and Video, 1313 5th St SE, Rm 108, 627-4274

- Interlibrary lending provided by University libraries
- Effects of copyright guidelines
- Performance appraisal methods within the libraries
- Review of Libraries' mission and vision statement drafts
- Resources available on Internet
- Software to facilitate retrieval of archival material
- Library efforts to deal with biotechnology information

- Space issues
- Funding for archives facility

Physical Plant and Space Allocation Subcommittee
Chair: Mary Sue Simmons, University College, 107 Armory, 624-4020

- Changes in Facilities Management
- Charges for space
- Deferred maintenance
- Revision of the Minnesota Facilities Model
- Review of building operating costs and sources of funding
- Steam plant issues

Research Committee
Chair: Paul Sackett, Industrial Relations, 537 Mgmt & Economics, 624-9842

- Academic misconduct policy changes
- ICR rates and distribution
- Policy on data ownership

Social Concerns Committee
Chair: Frank Wood, Educational Psychology, 226 Burton Hall, 624-4178

- Select Committee on Gays, Lesbians, and Bisexuals
- Shareholder resolutions
- Biotechnology research
- ROTC on campus
- Tobacco advertising and use
- Diversity on campus

Student Affairs Committee
Chair: Thomas Soulen, Plant Biology, 220 Bio Sciences Ctr, 625-2761

[Chair just named; committee has not met yet]

- Committee in general is concerned with all issues dealing with the social welfare of students

University College Assembly
Chair: To be named

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

Committee on Committees   (see above)

Council on Liberal Education
Chair: Richard Skaggs, Geography, 414 Social Sciences, 625-6643

- Continued development of plans to implement the Report of the Task Force on Liberal Education

Educational Policy Committee
Chair: James Tracy, History, 614 Social Sciences, 624-0808

- Twin Cities campus calendar options

Intercollegiate Athletics
Chair: Norman Chervany, Info and Decision Sciences, 395 HHH Center, 624-1520

- Gender equity
- NCAA legislation
- Academic audits of teams
- Search for new Faculty Representative for Women's Athletics
- Policy on discrimination at competition sites
- Policy on financial aid
- Scheduling of events
- Review policy on conducting investigations

Steering Committee
Chair: Mario Bognanno, Industrial Relations, 537 Mgmt & Economics, 624-1090

- Executive Committee of the Assembly

Student Behavior Committee
Chair: James Holte, Electrical Engineering, 4-178 EE/CSci, 5-0811

- The Student Behavior Committee is an authorized part of the University student disciplinary system. It hears original complaints against individual students and student organizations involving alleged violations of the conduct code or student organizational policy, hears appeals from non-collegiate judiciary agents or bodies, and makes appropriate dispositions of complaints and appeals based on its findings.

Support Services Committee
Chair: Deon Stuthman, Agron & Plant Genetics, 411 Borlaug Hall, 625-3709

- Campus safety
- Child care
- Building access control

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

Department of Philosophy
College of Liberal Arts

355 Ford Hall
224 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

612-625-6563
Fax: 612-626-8380

Nov. 3, 1992

To: M. Kvanbeck, Clerk
    University Senate

From: Michael Kac (Senator)

Re: Question for the President (for Nov. 17 meeting)

Please address the following question to President Hasselmo:

We are beginning to hear talk of a significant reduction over
the next twenty years in the number of research universities.
Given the competition for increasingly scarce resources that is
likely to intensify during this period combined with increasing
pressure to deliver only results that have applicability in the
short term, we can anticipate that early casualties of this
situation will be: (a) basic scientific research; (b)
humanistic scholarship; and (c) artistic and other imaginative
endeavor. What is being done now to protect these parts of the
University's mission and what will be done in the future to
ensure that they survive and prosper?

UNIVERSITY SENATE

elected faculty/academic
professional and student
representatives from the
TC, UMC, UMD, and UMM campuses

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

TC representatives of the University
Senate serve as the Twin Cities
Campus Assembly

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (SCC)

executive committee of the Senate

ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE (ASC)

executive committee of the Assembly--
TC members of SCC serve as the ASC

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
faculty members of SCC

STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
student members of SCC

FACULTY ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE
faculty members of ASC

STUDENT ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE
student members of ASC

All committees report to the Senate
through the Consultative Committee

- ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE
- COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
- COMPUTING & INFORMATION SYSTEMS
  COMMITTEE
- DISABILITIES ISSUES COMMITTEE
- EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
- EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
  FOR WOMEN COMMITTEE
- FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
- FINANCE & PLANNING COMMITTEE
  - PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE
    ALLOCATION SUBCOMMITTEE
- JUDICIAL COMMITTEE
- LIBRARY COMMITTEE
- RESEARCH COMMITTEE
- SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
- STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
- UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

All committees report to the Assembly
through the Steering Committee

- COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
  (TC members of Senate Committee on
  Committees)
- COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION
- EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
  (TC members of Senate Educational
  Policy Committee)
- INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE
- STUDENT BEHAVIOR COMMITTEE
- SUPPORT SERVICES COMMITTEE

'U' already succeeding in quest for accountability
Star Tribune, November 14, 1992
Opinion/Editorial Column, President Nils Hasselmo

Basing the verdict on two, quite different, examples of university "business ventures," the *Star Tribune's* November 7 editorial pronounces "A failure of university accountability."

One such venture is the Minnesota ALG program. The *Star Tribune* editorial ignores the fact that allegations of wrong-doing and mismanagement are based on an investigation by the University of Minnesota's own Department of Audits. That thorough audit of the entire program—both financial and legal—is still in process, but management changes have been made, and further changes will occur.

That's not a failure of accountability; that's what accountability is. Accountability means recognizing something is wrong and taking action to change it. The tests of accountability—the willingness and ability to find the facts, and the willingness and ability to take action have been demonstrated. The results of the audit will be made public when the audit is complete.

Put my name at the very top of the list of the "some" who "may think it unfortunate that these long-festering problems surfaced on the three-year-old watch of university President Nils Hasselmo." But please don't doubt the sincerity of my promise that "accountability is rule number one in my administration."

What accountability is, is the university's own audit of the Mineral Resources Research Center, where the evidence found led the university to release the news, to file suit to retrieve public funds, and to inform the Hennepin County Attorney of possible criminal violations.

What accountability is, is the Facilities Management Quarterly Report that Associate Vice President Sue Markham presented to the Board of Regents this week. That report continues a detailed, comprehensive review of university actions taken to address the problems in facilities management that were identified by the Legislative Auditor in 1988 and 1991.

What accountability is, is a computer print-out made public at every quarterly meeting of the Board of Regents Audit Committee, part of the regular report of the Director of Audits to the Board. It's a report on 108 internal, external, and legislative audits done before July 1, 1992. It reports that 1,665 recommendations were made by those audits, and that 96% of those recommendations have been or are being implemented.

What accountability is, is the November 19 national conference we are sponsoring on university-industry research. Neither the University nor the *Star Tribune* has all the answers to the questions that must arise from the entirely new partnerships among universities, governments, and private enterprises that are certain to increase in the 1990s. It is part of accountability to lay those questions on the table for an open—and open-minded—discussion of the pluses and minuses of public-private partnerships.

The other business venture referred to in the editorial is the Minnesota Supercomputer Center, a unique public-private partnership that gives the University of Minnesota one of the most powerful computing centers in the country—at only a fraction of the total cost to the taxpayer. Accountability hasn't failed in this case. Nobody, including the Legislative Auditor, has suggested or discovered any malfeasance. The whole debate has been among people in government, the media, the university, and private industry having good faith differences over what information should or should not be made public.

We're breaking new ground with this venture. The university administration is on record favoring the release of all information necessary to assure public accountability, and the Board of Directors of the Minnesota Supercomputer Center, Inc. has publicly committed to disclose financial data regarding that private corporation, as requested in the Board of Regents' resolution of October 9, 1992.

The current agreement clarifies the contract between the university and the center, defining clearly what the university pays and what it gets for its money. The university administration has reported on the distribution of supercomputing resources. We are implementing a restructured peer review process for allocating supercomputing resources. We are organizing an external review of all educational and research activities associated with supercomputing. And, we are appointing two highly respected scientists as members of the Board of Directors of the Minnesota Supercomputer Center, Inc.*

These steps will not satisfy everybody, once and for all. They should, however, produce a better working understanding of what information must be public, what must be private. That's accountability, too.

Finally, what accountability also is, is the uncovering of the inevitable acts of bad judgment or downright wrong-doing that no democratic institution can prevent individuals from committing. My promise on accountability is that my administration will do everything we can to discover such acts through our management oversight, and that we will take appropriate action when wrong-doing is discovered.

My promise that "accountability is rule number one" means that we will hang our own dirty linen on the line, that we are committed to learn from mistakes, and that we are equally committed to make changes so the mistakes are not repeated. There will be painful disclosures, but I trust Minnesotans to keep the problems in perspective.

I would be delighted if every Minnesotan knew everything there is to know about what goes on every day at their university. On balance, so would they.

* [Not included in the published column] I have appointed Regents' Professor Richard J. Goldstein, James J. Ryan Professor of Mechanical Engineering, and a member of the National Academy of Engineering. Elton Kuderer, the Chair of the Board of Regents, will formally announce this week the appointment of Mr. Lester Krogh, retired senior vice president of research and development for 3M.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the President 202 *Morrill Hall*
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110

612-626-1616
Fax: 612-625-3875

August 26, 1992

To: The University of Minnesota Community

From: Nils Hasselmo, President   *Nils Hasselmo*

Subject: Accountability and Oversight

Two months after taking office in 1989, I made a progress report to the people of Minnesota, spelling out the actions that had been taken and were being taken to address the real and perceived problems of University accountability. <u>I made the public commitment then that accountability is rule number one in my administration.</u> <u>It still is</u>.

I hasten to add that my 1989 promise was expressed very deliberately as a commitment to <u>positive</u> accountability, "not just accounting for the dollars, but accounting for the teaching, research, and service—the work we do, why we do it, how we can do it better, and what difference it makes." Because of our own communications efforts—from departmental to institutional—and the extraordinary volume of external coverage about the University's work, there is, in fact, much good news about our teaching, research, and public service accomplishments.

The conflicting reality, of course, is that a negative story drowns out good news in short order. We're seeing that this summer. We'll see more.

The demands for accountability are changing, if for no other reason than the reality that public resources are more and more limited. "Restructuring"—not just here, but society-wide—has changed many interactions among universities and other organizations. These are evolving developments that change the ways we do our work. In some cases, it may be more accurate to say they <u>ought to</u> change the way we work, because it is apparent that we have not yet accomplished those changes throughout our own organization.

Three and one-half years after my first progress report, we are still engaged in the unfinished agenda of strengthening our financial and program management. Many of the specific problems of the 1980s have been long-since addressed and solved. But, one of the ironies of developing better financial management and oversight tools is that those tools inevitably bring other, new problems to light. That shouldn't be a surprise in an academic community where one of the most commonplace sayings is, "the more we know, the more we find that we don't know."

As "rule number one," accountability means relentless pursuit of principles and high standards. It means clearly defined authority and responsibility, good management tools in the hands of people who know how to use them, and performance evaluation that really tells whether standards are being met. We're getting there, but we're not there yet.

The recent litany of news media stories containing allegations of conflict-of-interest, scientific misconduct, and inadequate management are troubling to all of us, first and foremost because they do contain allegations of misconduct that must be investigated, but also because the stories and their headlines threaten the credibility of the University, its researchers, and the research enterprise in general.

That the controversies are often complex and difficult to explain to the public quickly does not, unfortunately, prevent a public reaction that "something must be wrong." When there are several controversies over a short time, their sheer number can reinforce that public reaction, regardless of the substance and the facts that emerge as the full process of investigation runs its proper course.

One newspaper's coverage of the relationships between University researchers and private support features the repeated slogan, "Money vs. Mission." As I pointed out in a guest editorial in June, I regard that title as an "either/or simplification" that does not serve the public interest well. Our mission clearly includes the responsibility to interact with both the public and private sectors in order to apply new knowledge and to serve society as a vitally important knowledge resource. That mission requires the investment of money, and Minnesota's economic future depends in major ways on substantial returns on that investment.

Here in Minnesota, across the nation, and around the world, the "information age" has featured unprecedented change—in the discovery and application of knowledge, as well as in new kinds of interactions among universities, governments, and the private sector. None of these organizations has had policies already in place to cover every new form of interaction; all of us are adapting to new circumstances, and we will all have to continue to do so.

Having said that, I also accept that accountability means dealing responsibly with investigative journalism that seeks out the bad news. When there is a wrong or slanted interpretation, we should set the record straight. When a real problem is found, we will fix it.

Following this summer's litany of such stories, it may seem the height of foolishness to publicize our own mistakes in yet another program, but that, too, is what accountability means. We will be publishing the result of an internal University audit of the Mineral Resources Research Center, a unit that has already been closed in our restructuring plan, but nonetheless a unit where serious mistakes have been indicated in our audit. We have to own up to such mistakes and correct them.

Another audit report is expected soon from the Legislative Auditor, whose office has been studying the Minnesota Supercomputer Institute and the Minnesota Supercomputer Center. The complexity of the issues and the uniqueness of the public-private partnerships involved are certain to raise questions of governance and management. We will certainly address any such questions thoroughly and promptly.

Considered altogether, these episodes do give credence to that public perception that "something must be wrong." In fact, some things are wrong. We have considerably better financial management tools today, but they're not perfect and not everyone knows yet how to make the best use of what we have. We have considerably improved policies in place or about to be put in place, but policies alone cannot prevent either honest mistakes or dishonest acts. What is wrong today is that we have not achieved the full scope or intensity of management oversight that we are determined and committed to achieve. We know that, and it is neither a deliberate avoidance nor an accidental shortcoming. It is a complex process that simply takes time, but we all have to recognize that we are faced with growing impatience.

With the improvements that we have made in financial management and the University's internal audit system, I am now determined to integrate regular budget monitoring and audit follow-up into administrative performance reviews—my own performance, my reviews of the Vice Presidents and Chancellors, and their reviews of the administrators who report to them. Performance evaluation is a key part of the management oversight process. Over the last three years, performance evaluation in central administration has concentrated primarily on the goals and objectives of University planning. I believe that has been crucial to the future health of the University.

In the areas of research policy, the need to adapt to new opportunities and their potential problems, while also protecting the integrity of the research process and the scholar's freedom of inquiry, was at the heart of the University's decision last year to combine the deanship of the Graduate School with the vice presidency for research, defining clearly the authority and responsibility for research policies governing the entire University.

An on-going part of this effort has been the careful development of the "Regents' Policy on Academic Misconduct," which was proposed to the Board of Regents last month and will be acted upon by the Board at its meeting in September. Action on this proposal will give us a clear and effective policy and process for dealing with allegations of academic misconduct, both ensuring accountability and protecting the integrity of research and scholarship. While the new policy has been the subject of extensive consultation with faculty, I know that many of you will not see the details until after the Board's action next month. It is not my purpose in this memorandum to summarize the entire policy, but I want you to know that it strikes the proper balance between meeting the new demands for accountability and reaffirming the long-standing academic traditions of individual responsibilities and peer review.

Our new policy will not add yet another layer of reports to be generated and monitored. It is based on the individual rights and responsibilities of all members of the University community—students, staff, administrators, and faculty—to report allegations of academic misconduct to appropriate University authorities. It protects against frivolous or malicious charges, as well as mistaken allegations made in good faith. It also provides clear protection against retaliation, while also providing the option to submit an anonymous allegation. In either case, it guarantees that the allegation will be investigated promptly in a clearly defined manner that fully protects the due process rights of the accused. It provides as open a process as we can conduct under state and federal laws, and it ensures full cooperation with law enforcement agencies. As we gain experience under this new policy, we will monitor it carefully and make further improvements as needed.

Most importantly, this much-improved policy to deal with the few, exceptional cases of academic misconduct will serve to protect the academic good conduct of the thousands of faculty and staff members who deliver accountability by performing the University's mission day after day.

A vital part of Minnesota's culture and quality of life is the expectation of a higher standard of public accountability. Another vital part is the excellence and productivity of the University of Minnesota, qualities that depend on the public trust that we earn by our actions. I am committed to individual and institutional actions that meet those higher standards and maintain that trust. I know you share this determination. Your good work is a vital part of Minnesota's higher standards. We will work together.