



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
210G Burton Hall  
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

April 26, 1985

327 Coffman Memorial Union

1:15 - 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA

Enhancing the governance effectiveness of the  
Faculty Senate and the University Senate and  
of their committees.

MINUTES  
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
April 26, 1985  
1:15 - 3:00 p.m.  
327 Coffman Union

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Beth Emanuelson, Phyllis Freier, Sue Gruenes, Douglas Melby, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chr.), Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, Frank Sorauf, Wesley B. Sundquist.

Guests: Jacqueline Jodl, Jim Pearson, Maureen Smith.

Professor Merwin announced that the meeting with SCC and Howard Bowen, this year's Graduate School Guy Stanton Ford Lecturer, had been confirmed for Wednesday, May 22, 9:30 - 11:00 a.m. Notification of location will be forthcoming.

1. Improvement of governing system.

Professor Merwin reminded members that the special meeting of SCC had been called to discuss ways of improving the University's governing system. Copies of various handouts (which Committee members had previously received) were available for those who didn't have them. It was decided that at this meeting the discussion would be open to all subjects and ideas related to the matter.

Professor Freier first brought up Professor Warren Ibele's recommendation that Senate and Assembly votes be recorded separately for students and faculty. The Committee agreed that in some instances it would be valuable to have this information which could clearly have an effect on an item. At times it would be important to have a clear faculty or student opinion on a matter and on those occasions SCC could introduce a motion to that effect. SCC would be able to identify those items prior to the meetings. The Committee was concerned, however, that this could be considered as a form of discrimination, that it emphasized division even though in the long run it would produce cohesion; that it would be time consuming causing some Senators to become discouraged; and that it might lead to requests to further record votes by college, sex, age, etc. Professor Clark pointed out that the Swan/Turner motion submitted to the Senate on February 14, 1985, intended to simplify the system and suggested that recording votes would be in direct opposition to that intent.

At this point the discussion on recording votes was ended in order to proceed to other subjects.

The students voiced their opinion that SCC should be looking closer at the Senate and Assembly agendas in order to prevent poor legislation from getting on the dockets. They said this sort of thing discourages Senators, especially students, from attending meetings.

Professor Merwin said that<sup>at</sup> present motions are sent directly to the Business and Rules Committee for placement on the docket and that B & R's role was primarily one of allocating time and location to items rather than one of screening. He said that with the present time frame for which docket items are due, SCC often doesn't have time to review all items before the docket goes to print. He agreed that SCC should spend more time reviewing the agenda and suggested that a change might be needed in the timetable for which items must be submitted.

Next, Professor Sorauf brought up the size of the Senate and said that it is larger than most legislative bodies and that with divisions by students, faculty, academic professionals, colleges, etc., it has become a very cumbersome system. He felt that in order to make the current system work well it would draw too heavily on student and faculty skills and time. It was also his concern that Senators are not adequately informed about many items they vote on. He cited CLA's newly structured Assembly where the overall size has been reduced and members assigned to serve on its major committees. The result is a more knowledgeable Assembly, but one that still draws heavily on people's time.

Professor Rubenstein asked if any studies had been done on university and college governance systems. Professor Clark mentioned Kenneth Mortimer's book entitled Shared Participation but said there isn't any real consensus on which way is most efficient because each university and college has unique situations and traditions. Professor Sorauf added that an example would be the University of Wisconsin which is considered most like the University of Minnesota in terms of overall structure and programming, but has a very different governing system.

Discussion then shifted to the idea of eliminating the University Senate and having only a Faculty Senate and a Student Senate or to eliminating the University Senate and having campus Assemblies only. Ms. Emanuelson said that she felt the students would be the ones to suffer the most without a University Senate in terms of how matters affect them. Professor Rubenstein pointed out that most of the items that

had come before the Senate and had been effectively debated were clearly faculty or student matters such as the tenure code and salary and retirement issues. Professor Merwin asked what would be done when something came up that affected both faculty and students or all campuses.

Professor Melsa was asked if he thought that the coordinate campuses saw their participation on the Senate as being important. He responded that he felt it was very important monetarily to keep contact with the Twin Cities campus since central administration allocates the funds for all campuses. In keeping with this idea he would like to see participation on the Senate and some of its committees continue, especially SCC, Finance, and Planning. He added that he feels being a Senator from a coordinate campus allows one the opportunity to keep abreast of issues and to discuss them with colleagues and that certain items, such as the financial aid recommendations approved by the Assembly, can greatly affect the coordinate campuses. Professor Melsa also pointed out that if President Keller's Commitment to Focus program is implemented, the Waseca and Crookston campuses will come under the umbrella of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics.

Professor Sundquist said it was his opinion that the governing system should be reduced in size proportionately and structured in a pyramid shape with a broad base and streamlined at the top to allow for such things as closed session discussions.

Professor Melsa and Ms. Emanuelson proposed that more time be spent on follow-up of Senate and Assembly motions that have been approved and forwarded to either Central Administration or the Regents. They felt the Senate's credibility in part depended on this follow-up.

At this point Professor Merwin asked the Committee to decide how it would like to proceed. It was agreed that Professor Clark's and Ms. Birk's Subcommittees would bring back to the SCC on May 16 two to four models of governing structures -- one of those models should be a Senate of approximately one-half the current size and another should eliminate the University Senate and include campus Assemblies only and a merged Consultative Committee (it was not specified whether the Assemblies and Consultative Committee would be joint faculty and student bodies).

Professor Merwin adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Kvanbeck  
Executive Assistant  
University Senate



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Student Senate  
240 Coffman Memorial Union  
300 Washington Avenue S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(612) 373-2414

TO: SCC  
FROM: SSSC  
RE: Governance  
DATE: April 26, 1985

Students hope that discussion on improving governance will not center on any particular constituency represented in the Senate. We would like to list the actions students have taken to improve their part of the governance structure:

- hired clerical help to assist in keeping committee positions filled and checking attendance,
- developing a data base to give future students background information on the issues,
- proposed amendments to the University Senate Constitution and bylaws to legitimize the Student Senate.
- hired a researcher to give student leaders better information,
- publishing a "Voter's Guide" in hopes of having a larger and more informed voter turnout in student elections,
- holding on-going discussions of the "Task Force on Student Participation" to further improve student governance.

In discussion at Waseca the SSSC decided to support Ms. Emanuelson's proposal to allow the Student Body President on the Twin Cities campus to be a member of the University Senate. Further changes in MSA's Constitution will be needed to allow the Student Body President to sit on the Consultative Committee.

Also, out of these discussions, the members present agreed that the responsibility for an effective Senate sat with the SCC as the steering and executive committee. Although there was no agreement on specifics we felt that the SCC should be more active by taking on issues and after initial discussion assigning them to appropriate committees. Second, SCC should ensure that legislation passed by the Senate is of high quality so that it can be implemented. Third, after passage the SCC should continue to lobby for implementation of Senate policy.

Our conclusion was that if Senate policy was implemented the perception problem on an ineffective Senate would vanish. Overcoming the problems will not be easy but students are willing to help.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Student Body President  
240 Coffman Memorial Union  
300 Washington Avenue S.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
(612) 373-2414

To: Jack Merwin  
From: Jacqueline Jodl  
Re: Task Force on Student Participation  
Date: April 25, 1985

During the past several months the MSA Forum members and student senators have given a great deal of thought to student performance in the governance structure. In light of the Swan motion and numerous informal conversations with faculty, administrators, and regents, we realized the importance of following through on our statements at the February Senate meeting; we recognized that there are flaws in the student governance structure and have committed ourselves to correcting these problems.

In order to address the problem of student participation, it is first necessary to identify the scope and nature of the problem more specifically than has hitherto been attempted. Second, it will be necessary to develop approaches for correcting each of the identified problem areas. Rather than rely on the recollections of a small number of students familiar with the concerns raised during the debate on the Swan motion, it has been suggested that a Task Force consisting of students, faculty, and staff members be formed to collect and organize information and suggestions from all interested members of the University community and to then develop recommendations for the consideration of the appropriate student governance organization.

In line with this proposal we have requested that the following people serve on the Task Force on The Quality of Student Participation in University Governance:

Bob Barnett, Assistant to Vice President of Student Affairs  
Julie Bates, former SSCC member and Chair of Research & Planning, MSA  
Laura Cavallo, Administrative Officer, MSA  
Shirley Clark, member, FCC  
Tom Daniels, Student Representative to the Board of Regents  
Pat Durbin, Student Concerns Committee, MSA  
Steve Florman, member SCC, 1985-6  
Dan Griffith, member SCC, 1985-6  
Linda Hanson, member SCC, 1985-6  
Doug Melby, member SCC, 1984-5  
Liz Kranz, Chair, Student Representatives to Board of Regents  
Jim Pearson, Researcher, MSA

Jack Merwin  
April 25, 1985  
Page Two

Ann Pflaum, Assistant to Vice President of Administration & Planning  
Mary Jane Plunkett, Consultant, Student Organization Development Center  
Tim Pratt, member SCC, 1985-6  
Roy St. Laurent, member SCC, 1985-6  
Ed Krenick, Chair, Committee on Committees  
Andy Seitel, Legislative Director, MSA  
David Shope, member SCC, 1984-5; Speaker, MSA

I have attached our schedule of meetings and tentative time line. The first meeting will be organizational: we will discuss possible persons to testify before the task force and begin preliminary discussions on the scope and nature of our problems in governance. At the second meeting, we will further define questions to be raised at the following week's testimony. With any luck at all, recommendations will be compiled by early June. If you or any members of FCC are interested in testifying or have suggestions for the task force, please contact me at the MSA office (373-2414). Your comments will be greatly appreciated.

See you in class on Monday!

Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jacques". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the "Regards," text.

Task Force On Student Participation

<u>Date</u>	<u>Room</u>	<u>Time</u>
April 30	309 CMU	2:00 - 3:00 p.m.
May 7	354 CMU	2:00 - 3:00 p.m.
May 14	To Be Announced	2:00 - 4:00 p.m.
May 21	354 CMU	2:00 - 3:00 p.m.
May 28	354 CMU	2:00 - 3:00 p.m.
June 4	354 CMU	2:00 - 3:00 p.m.