

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

MAY 18, 1995

The fifth meeting of the University Senate for 1994-95 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, May 18, 1995, at 2:20 p.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 117 voting faculty/academic professional members, 22 voting student members, 4 ex officio members, and 5 nonmembers. President Nils Hasselmo presided.

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE TO UNIVERSITY SENATE ACTIONS
Information**

- A. Joint Preparation Requirements for the Minnesota State Universities and the University of Minnesota
 Approved by: the University Senate on February 16, 1995
 the Administration March 1995
 the Board of Regents on March 9, 1995 (with implementation changed from
 Fall '96 to Fall '97)

**II. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1995-96
Action**

Professor Roberta Humphreys was elected vice chair of the University Senate for 1995-96.

APPROVED

**III. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statement
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statement:

Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statement

The Regents of the University of Minnesota reaffirm the Principles of Academic Freedom and Responsibility. These are rooted in the Belief that the Mind is ennobled by the Pursuit of Understanding and the Search for Truth, and the State well served when Instruction is available to All at an Institution dedicated to the Advancement of Learning. These Principles are also refreshed by the Recollection that there is COMMUNE VINCULUM OMNIBUS ARTIBUS - a Common Bond through all the Arts.

Academic Freedom is the Freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the Classroom, to explore all Avenues of Scholarship, Research and Creative Expression and to speak or write as a public Citizen without institutional Discipline or Restraint. Academic Responsibility implies the faithful Performance of Academic Duties and Obligations, the Recognition of the Demands of the Scholarly Enterprise and the Candor to make it clear that the Individual is not speaking for the Institution in Matters of public Interest.

Questions regarding academic freedom or academic responsibility shall be resolved in accordance with the "Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure" or other applicable University procedures.

DISCUSSION:

Professor John Adams presented the motion to approve the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statement. He recalled for senators previous discussions by the Senate concerning this item. It is clear, he said, that development of the statement is one of the most important things the Senate will accomplish this year because the statement will be used as a guide and compass in the years to come. It has come to the Senate Consultative Committee's (SCC) attention, he noted, that some outside the University might look at the document as a bit arcane or precious in the way that it is worded. However, all comments made to the committee have been favorable and the SCC endorses its approval. Professor Adams did suggest, however, and the Senate approved, one modest adjustment to the document that would place the latin phrase "Commune Vinculum Omnibus Artibus" before the phrase "a Common Bond through all the arts" in order to clarify the language.

Professor Adams expressed appreciation to Regents Professor Rutherford Aris, author of the document, for his thoughtful attention to the crafting of the statement.

The Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statement, as amended, was then approved by a majority of members present and voting. [The document as it appears above is the amended version.]

APPROVED

**IV. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Merger of Student Senate Leadership Positions
Action**

MOTION 1:

To amend the Senate Constitution as follows: [deletions are ~~struck out~~; additions are underlined]

ARTICLE III, SECTION 6b

....

6. University Senate and Student Senate Officers

a.

b. The officers of the Student Senate shall be a chair and a vice chair ~~, a clerk, and a treasurer.~~

~~The chair and vice chair shall be elected by the Student Senate at its last regularly scheduled spring quarter meeting from the members of the Student Senate. The chair and vice chair shall be elected at a special spring quarter session of the Student Senate attended only by student Senators elected for the following year. The outgoing chair shall preside over the election. Non-Senators and outgoing student Senators may not be candidates for these positions.~~ The chair and vice chair shall not be from the same campus. In the event that no one is nominated for the vice chair position from a separate campus, the position will be open to all qualified members of the Student Senate. Term of office shall be July 1 to June 30, and the persons holding office ~~is~~ are eligible for re-election. The duties of the chair are (1) to be the official spokesperson of the Student Senate; (2) to set the Student Senate agenda, to be approved by the Student Consultative Committee; (3) ~~to organize and chair the~~

~~Student Lobbying Advisory Committee; to serve on the board of the Coalition/UMCHE, the University's student lobbying organization; (4) to serve as the University's representative on the Student Advisory Committee; (5) to serve on one central University advisory committee and to delegate student members for other advisory committees; (6) to serve as the chair of the Student Consultative Committee.~~

The duties of the vice chair are (1) to assume the duties of the chair in the event of an absence or incapacity of the chair; ~~and~~ (2) to assume responsibilities delegated by the chair; ~~(3) to submit to the Senate office an annual budget request for the Student Senate and Student Consultative Committee, to be approved by the Student Senate during its fall quarter meeting; (4) to organize an annual orientation for members of the Student Senate; (5) to monitor Student Senate attendance and ensure that the Student Senate handbook is updated and distributed; (6) to serve on a central advisory committee that is not attended by the Student Senate chair if there is more than one such committee active; (7) to serve as the vice chair of the Student Consultative Committee.~~

~~The clerk and treasurer shall be appointed by the chair subject to the approval of the Student Senate. The duties of the clerk and treasurer shall be prescribed in the Senate Bylaws. The Student Consultative Committee shall periodically review these officer positions.~~

c.

MOTION 2:

To amend the Senate Bylaws as follows: [deletions are ~~struck out~~; additions are underlined]

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8

Article I. University Senate Membership, Elections, and Officers

....

~~8. Treasurer of the Student Senate: The treasurer of the Student Senate shall be the chief budget officer of the Student Senate. The treasurer shall chair the budget subcommittee of the Student Senate.~~

ARTICLE III, SECTION 4

4. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

The Senate Consultative Committee shall be composed of 10 elected members of the faculty, 9 elected students, and the vice chair of the University Senate. The faculty representatives shall serve as the Faculty Consultative Committee; the 8 elected student representatives and the chair and vice chair of the Student Senate shall serve as the Student Consultative Committee; the 8 elected student representatives and the ~~vice~~ chair of the Student Senate shall ~~comprise~~ constitute the 9 voting student members of the Senate Consultative Committee.

....

Student Consultative Committee

Membership

The Student Consultative Committee shall be composed of:

- one student from the Crookston campus
- one student from the Duluth campus
- one student from the Morris campus
- five students from the Twin Cities campus, as follows:
 - 1993-94 4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional
 - 1994-95 3 undergraduates, 2 graduate/professional
 - 1995-96 4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional
 - 1996-97 3 undergraduates, 2 graduate/professional
 - 1997-98 4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional
- the chair and vice chair of the Student Senate

Student members except for the chair and vice chair shall be elected in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses' student constituencies, subject to the following provisions:

- At the time of their election, students shall be members of the University Senate (except for Crookston).
- Students shall serve a one-year term, and are eligible for re-election. No student member is eligible to serve more than three consecutive terms.

Student vacancies shall be filled in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses for the balance of any unexpired term until the next regular election.

The chair of the Student Senate shall also serve as the chair of the Student Consultative Committee. The vice chair of the Student Senate shall also serve as the vice chair of the Student Consultative Committee. If either the chair or vice chair has already been elected to the Student Consultative Committee as a regular member, he or she must concede his or her prior position to another student, to be chosen as soon as possible by the appropriate student constituency. The chair and vice chair shall serve no more than two consecutive terms. The vice chair of the Student Senate shall serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Senate Consultative Committee ~~if not otherwise elected in his or her own right~~. The ~~vice~~ chair of the Student Senate shall serve as a voting member of the Senate Consultative Committee.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To meet separately, when necessary, to discuss with the president, or others, matters of concern to the student body.
- b. To serve as ~~the nucleus of an~~ the executive and steering committee of the Student Senate.
- e. ~~To provide for a budget subcommittee of the Student Senate. The budget subcommittee shall be chaired by the treasurer of the Student Senate. Three members shall be appointed by the chair of the Student Senate with one member from each of the following committees: Student Senate Consultative Committee, Student Committee on Committees, Student Lobbying Advisory Committee. These appointments are subject to the approval of the Student Senate.~~

Chairs: The chair s of the Faculty Consultative Committee ~~and of the Student Consultative Committee~~ shall be elected by ~~their respective~~ its members from among their number for a one-year term of office. ~~Chairs~~ The chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall be eligible for re-election to that position. The chair and vice chair of the Student Consultative Committee shall be elected by the Student Senate in accordance with Article III, Section 6b, of the Senate Constitution. The chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall serve as chair of the Senate Consultative Committee.

~~The Student Consultative Committee shall have a chair and a vice chair who shall be from separate campuses. The vice~~

~~chair shall assume the duties of the chair in the event of an absence or incapacity of the chair and shall assume responsibilities delegated by the chair.~~

MOTION 3:

To amend the Senate Rules as follows [deletions are ~~struck out~~; additions are underlined]

ARTICLE III, SECTION 2

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.

....

Senate Consultative--Vice chair of the University Senate (voting); Chairs of the Finance and Planning and Educational Policy Committees; elected representative from the Duluth faculty eligible to vote in Senate elections; Vice chair of the Student Senate

COMMENT:

The above amendments were approved by the Student Senate on February 16, 1995, and if approved by the University Senate will merge the chair and vice chair positions of the Student Senate and the Student Senate Consultative Committee. The Student Senate believes these changes will result in more effective leadership and communication within student governance. The Senate Consultative Committee endorsed the amendments at its April 6 meeting.

JOHN ADAMS, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

DISCUSSION:

The amendments failed to receive the required number of votes necessary for approval and will be brought back to the first meeting fall quarter for reconsideration.

NOT APPROVED

**V. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Sexual Assault Policy
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the following Sexual Assault Policy:

Sexual Assault Policy

The University of Minnesota is committed to creating a community which is free from violence in all forms, including, but not limited to physical assaults, and bias motivated actions based on gender, race, sexual orientation, or disability. Sexual violence, including sexual assault and sexual harassment, will not be tolerated at this University.

To flourish as a University and as a community, we must strive to ensure the safety of every individual and respect for the dignity of every individual whether they are students, faculty or staff.

The University commits itself to creating a community which is not only free from sexual assault and other forms of sexual violence, but supportive of its survivors.

We define sexual assault as sexual contact (not limited to sexual intercourse) when such contact is achieved:

- **without consent, or**
- **with the use of physical force, coercion, deception, threat, or**

the victim is:

- **mentally incapacitated or impaired**
- **physically impaired (due to alcohol or drug consumption)**
- **asleep or unconscious**

A sexual assault is an attack not only on a person's body, but on their dignity; an attack not only on an individual, but on the community.

The decision to report the sexual assault of a member of the University community by another member of the University community rests solely with the survivor. However, the University strongly encourages the reporting of sexual assaults to the proper University officials. Reporting is the only way that action can be taken against the alleged attacker.

The University will strive to provide a judicial process for students that is sensitive, supportive, fair, expedient and respectful of the individual needs and rights of all involved. This process will allow for interim measures to be taken when they are necessary to ensure the well-being of the survivor, the accused, or the witnesses. This process will not be prejudiced by any actions that may be taken in the criminal or civil courts at the county, state or federal level.

Our responsibility in relation to sexual assault is not limited to the adjudication process. The survivor, the accused and the community itself have needs that must be addressed.

The University offers an array of services to support both the survivors and offenders of sexual assault.

The University commits itself to the provision of a variety of educational programs and services to all members of the University community. As an educational institution we must not neglect the importance of education as it pertains to sexual assault and sexual violence.

The commitment of all members of the University community to this policy will contribute to our goal of creating a community free from sexual violence.

JOHN ADAMS, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee

EVELYN FRANKLIN, Chair
Student Affairs Committee

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Joel Bergstrom, senator and member of the Student Affairs Committee, introduced the motion. Two questions arose concerning the language: 1) Is the phrase "rests solely with the survivor" appropriate? and 2) Is the document intended only for students since the term "students" is used throughout it? While the senator posing the first question understood the concept behind the phrase, he wondered if more appropriate language, such as "the person who was assaulted," should be substituted. A member of the Student Affairs Committee explained that the word "survivor" was used because it has become the term of choice in recent years for those who have been sexually assaulted. With regard to the second question, it was not clear to members of the Student Affairs Committee who were present whether the policy was intended to apply only to students. The Senate, however, believed that it should apply to all members of the

University community and approved a motion to replace the word "student" with "members of the University community" where appropriate.

Another question was raised concerning the judiciary process referred to in the document. Again, committee members in attendance were not able to explain the intent behind the language. At this time, the Senate voted to recommit the document to the Student Affairs Committee for further clarification and review.

REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE

**VI. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
ROTC
Action**

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following Resolution with respect to the continuing conflict between the University's equal opportunity and ROTC policies:

ROTC Resolution

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs and facilities without regard to sexual orientation;

WHEREAS, federal military regulations governing ROTC place the University's ROTC program in conflict with this policy;

WHEREAS, the Senate acknowledges various important benefits of ROTC programs; but

WHEREAS, the Senate is also committed to defending the University's equal opportunity policy in its entirety,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate request the President and the administration to continue their efforts to place the issue of federal military regulations discriminating against current and future members of the armed services in the matter of their sexual orientation on the national agendas of the appropriate educational associations and the Minnesota congressional delegation, with the objective of resolving the conflict on our campus, as well as at other universities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that those efforts be communicated to the University community for the purpose of illuminating the nature and importance of the equal opportunity policy.

BE IF FURTHER RESOLVED that if the conflict has not been settled by June 30, 1996, then the University, at the time of renewal, will renegotiate its contracts with all ROTC programs on campus in accordance with the following resolution; at the same time, the administration will establish an oversight committee to oversee the fulfillment of the following resolution.

BE IF FURTHER RESOLVED that if the conflict has not been settled by one year after the beginning date for renegotiation of the contract, then the University will begin the process of severing relations with the ROTC, specifically by disallowing the admission of any new students into any ROTC program on campus. ROTC representatives may maintain a presence on campus as long as that presence is maintained in such a way that the equal opportunity policy is not violated.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, pending approval by the Board of Regents, the University formally notify all ROTC programs on campus of this motion by June 30, 1995.

COMMENT:

The equal opportunity policy of the University of Minnesota, as required by federal statute, states, "The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation." The University of Minnesota Reserve Officers Training Corps program (ROTC) has consistently discriminated against applicants and members on the basis of sexual orientation. On February 14, 1991, the University Senate adopted a resolution calling on the University to end its relationship with the ROTC program if the discrimination continued after June 30, 1993.

On May 8, 1992, the Board of Regents affirmed its support of the principles put forward in the Senate resolution but declined "to endorse at this time, the recommendation of the University Senate that a timetable be established at this time for effecting the desired changes." The President was directed "to continue to pursue changes in the Department of Defense policies through administrative and legislative channels and in cooperation with other national higher educational organizations." This action was similar to one called for in a prior resolution passed by the University Senate at its Fall 1989 meeting, which also included no deadline for ROTC compliance with University equal opportunity policy.

President-elect Clinton committed himself to eliminating Department of Defense discrimination based on sexual orientation prior to taking office in January 1993, but the action he eventually took, the so-called "don't ask, don't tell" policy, fell short of providing equal treatment for people of all sexual orientations. Their right to open affirmation of their sexual orientation continues to be denied by the current policy, and they remain subject to harassment and punitive action if their sexual orientation becomes known to others. Fitness to carry out job-related activities is not the issue. This discrimination is based solely on the thoughts and feelings of the individuals concerned.

Much of the text of the comment presented with the 1991 Senate resolution remains germane in 1995. The remainder of this statement is taken directly from that document, beginning in the third paragraph.

....there has been increased interest (in recent years) in the promotion and celebration of diversity within our own University community. And yet, at the heart of the University's commitment to diversity are our equal opportunity and affirmative action policies, the former of which is so clearly violated by ROTC practice.

To present the ROTC equal opportunity conflict merely as a "policy" conflict, as we have done so often, suggests a symmetry: each policy conflicts with the other. But in fact, we have hesitated to practice equal opportunity in such a way as to challenge our ROTC policy. Why is this asymmetry tolerated?

To be sure, the ROTC-University affiliation is valuable; for instance, there are considerable benefits to the Nation and to the State from offering military action in conjunction with civilian education; moreover, the University and many students benefit from ROTC scholarships. To that extent, the ROTC equal opportunity conflict is not just a policy conflict but also a conflict of values. Again, there may appear to be a symmetry -- unmistakable values on both sides. But the question arises whether the values in question are equally fundamental to the role of the University as an educational institution.

To establish a deadline for resolution of this matter, rather than simply to require immediate conformity with the equal opportunity policy, is to acknowledge that there are indeed some important benefits of ROTC programs -- benefits worth preserving. But to establish a deadline with the consequences stated above is to acknowledge that our equal opportunity policy is much more valuable to our educational mission than our ROTC policy. It is in addition a very clear message to members of the community that the University is strongly committed to equal opportunity. The deadline also represents a special urgency that the President and administration can hopefully communicate to leaders of other educational institutions, and to our congressional representatives, on behalf of continued efforts to get an appropriate response at the federal level. (Emphasis as in the original statement.)

JOHN ADAMS, Chair

DISCUSSION:

Professor Barbara Walden, Chair of the Social Concerns Committee, presented the motion concerning the ROTC Resolution. Referring to the committee as the "conscience" of the Senate, she said the resolution was being brought forward in that vein. Professor Walden reviewed with senators the commentary portion which details the history of and rationale for the resolution. She then introduced Professor Frank Wood, chair of the Subcommittee on Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues.

The Resolution, Professor Wood said, addresses a matter of violation of the University of Minnesota's mandated affirmation of equal opportunity for all persons. Essentially, it calls on the University to reaffirm a position taken in February of 1991. For clarification, he told senators the issue of having an ROTC program on campus is NOT at issue. It is also important to note that the Resolution is in no way a reflection on the qualifications of the present ROTC staff or the quality of the program. The Resolution addresses a civil rights issue. Current federal policy requires that the ROTC, which is a significant source of student financial support as well as providing access to a career in the military, violates the equal opportunity policy by requiring that some students conceal and/or deny their sexual orientation to be eligible for admission to the ROTC program and to remain in the program. The Resolution is a recommendation to the Board of Regents to again review the matter.

In response to a question to the President concerning what actions he took in response to the 1991 Senate Resolution, he said he and others engaged in active lobbying both directly and through the national educational associations and that he visited the Department of Defense to present the University's case. During the Clinton campaign there appeared to be some movement, but the kind of action that was hoped for was compromised in the political process. The result was an ambiguous and unsatisfactory situation. The University has continued to monitor the political situation and to evaluate court cases related to this issue, which, he said, have gone in both directions.

"When does the ROTC contract next come up for renegotiation?" inquired one senator. Neither the President nor the Social Concerns Committee had that information at hand, although the Social Concerns Committee has inquired into that matter.

Another senator reported that a document entitled "A Pledge To Students," which supports the current ROTC program, was recently approved by MSA and he encouraged the Senate not to vote in favor of the Resolution.

Other senators spoke in favor of the Resolution and some even suggested the language wasn't strong enough. "We wouldn't tolerate this in any of our departments or among any of our colleagues," said one person.

In response to a question concerning whether local ROTC representatives had been contacted, Professor Walden said the committee did speak with ROTC representatives. As the Senate may suspect, they are not supportive of the Resolution and believe they are mandated by the Federal policy.

The Social Concerns Committee carefully crafted the Resolution, said one of its members, in order to provide the University some time to continue its work on the matter and hopefully come to a successful resolution of the issue. While some would like to see the language stated more strongly, the Committee understands the importance of ROTC and the role it plays at the University, but it also recognizes the importance of the University's commitment to equal opportunity for all students and employees.

At this time the Resolution was overwhelmingly approved on a voice vote by a majority of those members present and voting.

APPROVED

VII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

The President opened his remarks by thanking his colleagues at the Morris campus for a very pleasant visit the previous week--a visit in which he had an opportunity to meet and exchange ideas with faculty, staff and students. He said he has also had the opportunity to attend other events which brought home what the University is about, where important contributions of the institution, faculty, staff, and students have been recognized.

The president then reported on a number of topics:

Partnership proposal: It is expected that the University will receive approximately \$61 million from the State during the next biennium, which represents a \$45 million increase. Unfortunately, most of that money is a one-time allocation. The signal from the legislature, however, is that it heard the University's requests and it believes that the University is taking steps to be more cost effective in the way it continues to provide research, teaching and outreach to the State. The University must continue with its reform agenda and continue to set priorities, said the President.

The legislature endorsed five of the critical measures which the University recently developed and adopted. It was important that the University took the initiative in this area, President Hasselmo said. \$5 million of the appropriation for the next biennium is tied to meeting objectives which fall under those five measures. However, the implications are somewhat problematic because the University received \$26 million less than it had calculated in the Partnership Proposal. As a result, there will probably be a tuition increase greater than what was suggested under the Partnership Proposal, which was 4.8%

Compensation: The administration is carefully looking at the Report of the Compensation Working Group (CWG) and is trying to find ways to put as much as possible into the compensation pool because it realizes that the future of the University depends on its ability to remain competitive. The only way to accomplish this, said the President, is by not providing "across the board" increases because different components of the University find themselves in very different market, competitive, and equity situations. Flexibility must be allowed in the compensation plan in order to place compensation strategically in those areas where it is needed to deal with compensation issues. The Report of the CWG is being used as a guide by the administration, noted the President. It presents a very aggressive compensation report in the context of what 30 major universities in the country do. It has been very difficult to implement policies in compensation with State funding the way it has been in recent years and the CWG report points to the necessity of looking at other ways to generate revenues in order to meet the compensation needs of the University. This is an area that the administration, faculty and staff will have to work together in order to maximize those opportunities, which includes aggressive marketing of learning opportunities through various mechanisms directly by colleges and also through University College, whose purpose is to provide that type of marketing assistance.

Strategic Investments: Strategic investments are being made, said the President, and the institution will go forward according to priorities established under U2000. Investments in the undergraduate initiative are being continued to make sure that the best possible undergraduate education can be provided. Continuing investments are being made in the diversity effort as well as in the technology that is necessary for quality teaching and research. Administrative efficiencies are also under review. Other areas are also being identified for strategic investment, such as academic areas where there is national and international leadership; the arts, sciences and professional fields; and re-engineering, which is the process of changing the entire overhead structure in such a way that not nearly as much is spent on overhead operations.

Restructuring and Reallocation: The University is entering its fifth year of major restructuring and reallocation. The \$21 million that was distributed among colleges within the University is going into the last phase of that restructuring. Reform and reorganization has been and will continue at many levels, including central administration, human resources, and facilities management.

Responsibility Center Management (RCM): President Hasselmo briefly reviewed the concept of Responsibility Center Management. RCM provides a framework for decision-making based on knowledge of the true

resource streams through the institution. It enhances shared governance by transferring the decision-making and resource allocation processes closer to the academic departments and support units allowing significantly larger number of students and faculty to participate. The University's current system of allocating resources from central to provost to dean to department, through multiple revenue streams is simply too complex. RCM creates:

- incentives to enhance revenues and control costs
- recognition for the importance of tuition revenue and hence for students and the courses and professors that attract them
- recognition of the importance of the state subsidy and a clear sense of how, and where, the state subsidy is used
- explicit charges for space related costs
- explicit portrayal of indirect costs helps reinforce that indirect cost recoveries are to help cover real costs and hence are not discretionary revenues
- portrayal of revenues and expenses at the school/department level involves the faculty substantively at a level where they can make a difference
- the explicit identification of the sources and uses of overhead funds creates pressures to provide services more efficiently.

There is no one model for how one introduces or implements RCM. The objective is to design a system that makes sense for the University. The key element is to give greater responsibility to colleges and departments.

Change to Semester System: President Hasselmo noted that it is inevitable that the University convert from quarters to semesters and that it has placed that issue on its agenda. The Senate, he recalled, recently gave its preliminary endorsement for the change. The President said he believes that this move will be to the long-term benefit of the University.

In closing, President Hasselmo expressed appreciation to a number of people involved in governance this year, and especially recognized Professor John Adams for his outstanding leadership as chair of the Senate Consultative Committee.

VIII. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Question: What is the technical meaning of "fiscal emergency" and what constitutes a fiscal emergency?

Response: The term "fiscal emergency" does appear in some documents but it is formulated in such a way that it cannot possibly ever occur because it means that the entire University would have to be in such dire straits that it would have to close its doors. It is something that cannot be applied to individual units. For instance, a particular unit cannot declare fiscal emergency and abolish tenure. The entire University can only declare fiscal emergency and that is a very unlikely scenario.

Question: Where will the resources provided from the State for U2000 go and can actual dollar figures be cited?

Response: It is important to understand that over the past five years the University has lost approximately \$50 million in funding that will not be recovered. Cuts have had to be made in certain areas in order to reinvest in others. Approximately \$86 million has been carved out for investment in various areas. Almost \$10 million has been put into direct improvements and undergraduate education. Several million dollars has also been earmarked to deal with the tremendous backlog of maintenance at the University that has developed over the past several decades. The University has invested selectively in matching research grants in certain colleges in order to build them up. Funds have also been earmarked for investment in the diversity

initiative; technology; certain academic areas, such as biomedical engineering; children, youth and family programs; psychology, which was rated number "1" by U.S. News and World Report; the social sciences, including departments such as economics, sociology, and political science; the humanities to ensure that good education and opportunities are being provided in language learning and literary and cultural studies; and the Cancer Center of the Medical school, which draws on a great deal of research strength with clinical implications in an area where national leadership is also present, to name a few.

Question: Can you clarify the position of the administration with respect to the change to the semester system?

Answer: The President interpreted the recently approved Senate Resolution as being an endorsement to change to the semester system with some contingencies and provisions concerning the need to support the process of such a change. The President said in effect the decision has been made to convert to the semester system although no formal action has been taken. [Senator Adams, chair of the Consultative Committee, confirmed the President's interpretation.] The preliminary timetable for that change is Fall of 1999 because it will take time and investment to make the change. The legislature has already mandated the state colleges and universities to change over to a semester system and it seemed that the University should follow that same course.

IX. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor John Adams, chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, provided the following report:

- Professor Carl Adams was elected chair and Professor Virginia Gray vice chair of the Consultative Committee for 1995-96
- The Regents' Diversity policy, distributed to senators prior to the meeting, represents a consolidation of a series of policies that have been adopted independently over the years--no action was deemed necessary by the Senate because the consolidated policy does not represent new policy
- The task force to review University governance is expected to be named before the end of June
- The Consultative Committee and other appropriate Senate committees need to continue to actively participate in issues and policies related to compensation. In one sense it is a matter of simple arithmetic--the size of the salary and benefits pool divided by the number of personnel equals the average compensation. If the average is to be increased, the size of the pool must be increased or the number of personnel must be cut, or both. But how can this be done? It seemed to Professor Adams that after watching the debates firsthand, the roles of deans and department heads must be strengthened, possibly with new job descriptions that will enable them to assume a greater share of responsibility in the decisions regarding the financing of their units and the use of resources under their control. Responsibility Center Management might be a device which could assist in this effort of change. There are, however, many different ways of designing and installing such a system. By the end of the calendar year, a broad outline of such a system should be presented and staff and faculty should participate in figuring out what exactly should be done along these lines. Faculty and staff must enter the discussions or decisions will be made without their input.
- In the area of instruction, the question must be asked whether students are getting what they deserve and whether tuition levels are appropriate. A policy was passed regarding peer review of instruction about a year ago, said Professor Adams, but he was not aware whether anything had been done to implement the policy. Instructional quality must be considered. A move to the semester system should provide an opportunity for addressing this and other related issues. For example, a few years ago the Senate raised the question of course credits

and classroom hours of instruction and decided the two should match unless there were compelling reasons why they should not. But, by looking at the day school class schedule and the CEE schedule, the summer class schedule illustrates divergence from this policy. Faculty may see good reason why a four credit lecture in one college meets twice as many hours as another course in the same college, but students and faculty must question if what has become standard practice is appropriate for educational purposes and honest for the students.

- Quite aside from instructional quality, said Professor Adams, students need to inquire whether they are receiving all of the instruction they are paying for and everyone should ask if there is appropriate leadership and management at the department level in order to ensure that University policies are actually being carried out. In the last few months he has come to the understanding that even though many people like the present quarter system, if the University is going to engage in distance learning as an aggressive approach to maintaining the market share, then the switch to a semester system must occur.
- The Faculty Senate will be addressing the issue of tenure during 1995-96. A number of proposed interpretations to the Tenure Code will be discussed at the Faculty Senate meeting later in the day and, if approved in June, amendments to the Tenure Code will need to be prepared for consideration next year. The Faculty Affairs Committee and its Tenure Subcommittee will also be addressing other issues relating to tenure.
- An issue that has been brought to the Consultative Committee's attention this year is that of maintaining the vitality and productivity of some mid-career faculty who, on occasion, drift into productivity slumps from which they never recover. Looking the other way when a research program loses its edge or when grant proposals no longer compete, does not excuse a colleague from that part of his/her job. A better response would be for the institution to make a greater investment in mid-career training through improved sabbatical policies, through short courses, by providing funding for regular attendance at professional meetings, or by reassigning certain duties.
- In order to become a more effective fulltime year-round urban land-grant University, the University must devise ways to be more imaginative and flexible. This may include flexibility in hiring practices. Flexibility has been recently introduced by permitting probationary faculty to take time out for child bearing and caregiving responsibilities. This is a positive step forward, thought Professor Adams. There are also rules that permit spousal hires in certain cases, but opportunities for couples to share positions has not been offered. At certain times in a person's professional life, it might be appropriate for him or her to work on a significantly less than fulltime basis yet retain his/her position, tenure and benefits. At the present time, however, appointments cannot fall below 75 percent time. It is possible that in some situations it would be in the best interest of the University and the individual faculty member if there was more flexibility in the system. The phased retirement program offers some of this flexibility, but why should these options be only available to certain age groups?

Professor Adams concluded his remarks by thanking the President, other administrators, senators, committee members and chairs, student leaders, and the Senate staff for their service and support this year.

X. OLD BUSINESS

A senator inquired about the status of the establishment of the Governance Task Force and Professor Adams responded that it was the Consultative Committee's intent to have it established before the end of spring quarter.

XI. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

XII. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY

Rodney A. Briggs
1923-1995

Harold C. Deutsch
1904-1995

ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS

Patrick R. Lavin
1927-1995

Patrick Lavin, Director of the Student-Athletes' Employment Program, died suddenly on May 16, 1995. His career at the University began in 1988 soon after he retired from First Banks.

Pat quickly built the Student-Athletes' Employment Program to be one of the finest in the country; he worked tirelessly in coordinating a wide variety of job opportunities, in helping students understand employers' expectations, and in matching the students' interests and abilities with the responsibilities of the job assignment.

His leadership, enthusiasm, and good humor will be greatly missed by colleagues and students alike.

STUDENTS

Thomas M. Erickson
School of Management

Kelly Sellman Parenteau
Graduate School

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Martha Kvanbeck
Abstractor