

[In these minutes: Discussion with CAPA Chair, Student Conduct Code, February 20 Student Senate agenda, Student Workshops, Student Senate Chair as Ex Officio in University Senate]

STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (SSCC) MINUTES

FEBRUARY 6, 2003

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

PRESENT: Judy Berning, (chair), Nick Cecconi, Yev Garif, Kari Lindeman, Ryan Osero, Nathan Saete, Tom Walsh.

REGRETS: John Amble, Scott Ferguson, Kelsi Holland, Dan O'Connor, Eric Steinhoff.

GUESTS: Randy Croce, Amelious Whyte.

1. DISCUSSION WITH RANDY CROCE, CHAIR, COUNCIL OF ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND ADMINISTRATORS (CAPA)

Randy Croce, Chair of CAPA, thanked SSCC for inviting him to this meeting and said he hoped to have more contact with them in the future. He said that the classification of academic professionals and administrators (P&A) was created 22 years ago as a way to classify people who were not tenured but did more teaching, research, and service than other staff. This classification has grown to include coaches, advisors, student service professionals, administrators, teachers, and researchers. Currently, this classification has more employees than the faculty classification. CAPA, as well as faculty, is concerned about the trend to hire more P&A and award tenure less.

The main reason for the visit today is to discuss the Academic Unit Governance Policy that the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) created last fall and will be bringing to the Faculty Senate for approval later this month.

The early drafts of this policy were troubling to many P&A since it stated that only faculty could vote on collegiate constitutions and curricular changes. FCC has been very willing to listen to many CAPA concerns and the latest draft addresses many of these issues. The one remaining concern is that many areas already have a collaborative process, and CAPA does not want this process to be removed by faculty taking all authority within a unit. The policy, however, does state that faculty can share the responsibility within a unit, but that faculty are the recourse of last resort. This last part was changed at CAPA's request.

CAPA's Executive Committee meets next Thursday and will vote on the policy. Faculty will then vote on February 20. While the policy is not everything CAPA might have wanted, it is an agreeable compromise that will avoid conflict between FCC and CAPA, and will allow both

groups to focus on other issues.

Q: What other issues has CAPA addressed?

A: CAPA is involved in the evaluation of service units, changes to benefits and health plans, and the University's budget situation. The last area is very important since P&A are the most vulnerable classification. They are not protected by tenure and can be released without any reason.

Q: Are only faculty voting on the Academic Unit Governance Policy?

A: Yes. Judy Berning said that she talked to Dan Feeney about allowing students to vote, but since the policy came through faculty channels, only faculty will vote. Students could submit a separate statement to the administration for their consideration prior to implementation.

In closing, Randy Croce said that CAPA would help the students with any efforts that they have and would be willing to hear reports on any issues that CAPA should be aware of that impact students.

2. SSCC CHAIR REPORT

Judy Berning said that she has talked with Cheryl Meyers, Student Affairs Committee (SCSA) Chair, about SCSA reviewing the MPCC proposal and formulating a response for the Student Senate. There has been some hesitation, but she will make sure that SCSA tackles the issue this spring.

She, Ryan Osero, and Yev Garif, met with President Bruininks. A few topics included late night programming at the coordinate campuses and the University student missing in downtown. He asked that SSCC set-up a follow-up meeting to discuss the student experience on campus. Administrators to invite include the President, Executive Vice President and Provost Maziar, Vice President Jones, and Vice Provost Swan. The Student Reps to the Regents and student body presidents will also be invited.

Another topic with the President was the University budget and endowments. More private sources of funding will be sought after for third and fourth year undergraduates, as well as graduate students. In March, the Regents will be approving a set of core values to guide the budget decisions. The President and Regents are supportive of protecting students, but tuition will still increase by double digits.

3. APPROVAL OF THE STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Judy Berning said that after SSCC expressed some doubts at their last meeting, she talked with Kate Stuckert in the Chief of Staff's Office to determine why jurisdiction is defined vaguely. The response was that since there were no major problems with the current definition, the administration did not want to change it. Under the current language, jurisdiction is defined on a case by case basis, so that the vagueness gives the University more flexibility. If the students

push for definite language, the administration likely will not approve it.

Committee members made the following comments:

- Students are still concerned that the Code could be used in the wrong way
- Definition on a case-by-case basis is not justified
- Rules should be set for consistency
- Someone should be invited to talk about how jurisdiction is decided
- Vague language might create problems in the future
- Would the Code cover students responding to a University event, but off campus?
- Is it in the best interest of the University to take action against an off campus event?
- Language should be written so that students know
- There is a difference between representing the University and being part of a University event
- What is the appeals process?

Members decided that they were not comfortable approving the Code at this time. They would like to talk to someone involved in its implementation and review Codes at other schools.

4. FEBRUARY 20 STUDENT SENATE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

5. DISCUSSION OF STUDENT WORKSHOPS

Judy Berning asked members for any topics that they would like to see covered in a Student Senate workshop. Responses included: lobbying, writing resolution/statements, parliamentary procedure, and conflict resolution.

Q: How will the coordinate campuses benefits from the workshops?

A: ITV could be used to reduce travel expense and time.

A committee member suggested that some of the writing workshops could be covered through an online tutorial, and that other units on campus already offer workshops on some of the other topics.

6. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR AS EX OFFICIO OF UNIVERSITY SENATE

Judy Berning said that this constitution change was no longer necessary since it was determined that all ex officio members of the Senate Consultative Committee, including the Student Senate Chair, are voting members of the University Senate. This is a new interpretation that was discovered when reviewing the constitution to prepare the amendment.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Judy Berning said that the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) has approved a word change in the credit hour policy that would allow faculty to meet with students for less than the number of credits.

Members expressed concern with this change since many students are already frustrated with missed classes, expect course meeting times, and are being cheated out of their education and tuition when classes do not meet.

Judy Berning said that this item has been pulled from the February 20 University Senate agenda and will be discussed by the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) at its meeting next week.

With no further business, Judy Berning thanked all members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate