



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

November 15, 1984
626 Campus Club
12:30 - 3:00

AGENDA

- 12:30 1. Minutes of November 1 (SCC and FCC enclosed).
2. Reports:
- A. Student Chair
 - B. SCC Chair
 - C. Finance Committee
 - D. From Regents' meetings
3. Appointments: faculty member to Business and Rules Committee.
- 1:00 4. Faculty-student governance relationship.
- 2:00 5. Request from the UEA regarding information on and travel to Senate committee meetings. (Enclosure to SCC: UEA statement of 10/23/84.)
- 2:30 6. Policy on co-sponsorships, advertising, and promotions. (Enclosure to SCC: Letter from Business and Rules chair to SCC chair, 10/31/84, conveying interpretation and recommendations of alternatives.) Guest: Richard Purple.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

MINUTES
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

APPROVED 12/6/84

November 15, 1984
626 Coffman Memorial Union
12:40 - 2:50

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Joseph Latterell, Doug Melby, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chr.), Paul Murphy, Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, David Shope, Eric Stroschein, Deon Stuthman, and Burt Sundquist (until 1:10).

Guests: Ann Burgard, Jacque Jodl, Mary Jane Plunkett, Richard Purple, Maureen Smith.

1. Minutes of November 1 SCC and FCC meetings. No corrections were offered in the meeting. Professor Merwin asked members to report promptly any needed changes.

2. Reports.

A. Student Consultative Committee. Mr. Melby.

- SSCC has appointed a representative to the Student Legislative Advisory Committee (SLAC);
- SSCC is planning a visit to UMD;
- A number of student leaders met recently with Vice President Kegler at a retreat; he was very helpful in suggesting ways students can lobby on behalf of the University and of students. Ms. Jodl and Mr. Melby have talked with President Keller who has committed \$2000 to help the student lobbying work.

B. SCC Chair. Professor Merwin.

- He has confirmed via letter SCC's understanding from its November 1 meeting that Vice President Lilly will write SCC some response regarding the proposals from the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation.
- Development of a policy to handle allegations of fraud in research: The Senate Committee on Research will join efforts with the Graduate School which has also been developing policy; the hope is to have a policy in place soon.
- SCC will convene in the near future with a small group of deans to discuss matters regarding implementing Senate policy;

- Howard Bohlen, Professor Emeritus of Economics and Education at the Claremont Graduate School, will be on campus in May to deliver the Guy Stanton Ford lecture. The Graduate School has said SCC could have the opportunity to meet with him to discuss governance. SCC members indicated they wanted to take advantage of this opportunity;
- As SCC members requested, a copy of the Kerr Commission report and two copies of the Cleveland/Braman paper are now circulating;
- The FCC will need to meet for 10 minutes following today's SCC meeting.

C. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Stuthman.

SFC met November 1 to review the much-publicized data regarding funding for the University. The data permit FY83 comparisons between the U of M and most of the schools in the Big Ten, and internal comparisons over the last ten years.

SFC was advised central administration would recommend to the Regents that they request a supplementary appropriation of approximately \$21.6 million over the biennium. Those dollars are needed to move Minnesota up to a third-fourth place tie in the Big Ten. The administration recommends giving #2 priority to the request for the supplement, with faculty salaries remaining first.

Professor Freier and Mr. Shope inquired what would be the effect of the supplement, if granted, on cost-based tuition. Professor Stuthman said the supplement would have the effect of revising the instructional cost formula. SFC has not yet raised the specific question of the effect on tuition, but should get at that explicitly in its next meeting, he said.

D. Regents meetings.

SCC observers briefly summarized the major agenda items. Professor Clark noted that some regents in the Faculty, Staff & Student Affairs Committee raised questions about the size of certain salary adjustments awarded for market responsiveness, particularly in the School of Management. She reported that President Keller told the regents that the administration is monitoring those raises carefully to be sure they are equitable as well as market-responsive.

She told SCC that Messrs. Preus and Misenko reported to the regents optimism about changes in financial aid award procedures that could greatly speed up the delivery of aid.

Professor Merwin reported that a regent raised a question in the Committee of the Whole regarding the University's mode of participation this year in the United Fund because the results were very poor.

3. Committee appointment. Professor Giese has resigned from the Committee on Business and Rules due to illness. The SCC agreed that Professor Merwin should ask Professor Altholz to serve in an interim capacity.

4. Conflict between the regular meeting times of the SCC and of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee.

Professor Sundquist called SCC's attention to this repeated conflict. He reported that the work of the advisory committee is moving along well.

He then excused himself to join the other meeting.

5. Faculty-student governance.

Professor Merwin reminded the SCC that it had committed itself, via a vote last spring, to studying the question of the relationship of the governance structures with a view toward taking some proposal to the Senate. The background materials include the Senate minutes from 1969 which incorporate the report of the task force that successfully proposed adding students to the Senate.

Senator Swan has submitted a motion for the November 15 Senate meeting to remove students from the Senate, with the exception of the five campus student body presidents. Professor Merwin quoted for SCC the relevant portion of Senate Rules, Article II,4. (Agenda and Procedures):

"...An item of new business presented at a meeting of the Senate by an individual member shall be referred to the Senate Consultative Committee for consideration and presentation at the next regular meeting of the Senate; but such an item of business may be considered and voted on at the meeting at which it is introduced by a two-thirds majority vote of the members of the Senate present and voting on a motion for immediate consideration (not debatable)..."

The Senate parliamentarian has ruled that the motion may have discussion with no vote, and Business and Rules has said the motion should be moved on the docket to "New Business."

Professor Sorauf argued against hasty discussion in today's Senate meeting and Mr. Melby distributed copies of, and read, a Student SCC statement which took the same position.

SCC members discussed at some length the pros and cons of allowing discussion of the motion in this day's Senate meeting. Arguments made against discussion:

- Discussion of the motion without a floor vote to do so was contrary to Senate rules and long practice;
- Discussion would set a precedent for evasion of orderly procedures and diminish the SCC's initiative as the Senate's steering committee;
- Discussion would not be carefully deliberative, because it would be unprepared on the part of those opposing the motion; supporters, however, have had considerable preparation time;
- The time allotted (30 minutes) was insufficient for a first hearing.

Arguments in favor of discussion today:

- Entering the motion has put the most extreme governance change proposal out in the open;
- People are really interested in the question;
- The speakers' remarks might enhance SCC's future discussions.

Other points:

- The SCC should hold one or more open forums on the question;
- While many alternative governance modifications are imaginable, none will develop without considerable work;
- It may be time to create a faculty-student task force to consider possible better governance arrangements.

Professor Sorauf said that he did not know from the Swan motion and rationale what the problem is because the alleged problems don't seem to relate to the proposed solutions. He suggested that if the problem is one of time, students are not a major cause. While there may be a need for a stronger faculty voice within the Senate or a direct faculty voice to the Regents, those possible needs do not relate to student participation. If the problem is that of cumbersomeness and inefficiency, the very size of the Senate is an obvious problem, he said. A Senate of between 50 and 80 members would be preferable.

Mr. Shope advanced the thesis that the Senate's power had waned during the ten years of fiscal stringency when the Senate structure was inadequate to participate in decisions that had to be made quickly. The power of central administration and of the regents increased to deal with the fiscal problems, at the expense of the Senate. But while power is the real problem, he said, the Swan motion addresses structure.

Mr. Farrell asked that SCC make an effort over the rest of the year to find out how people in the University at large really think and feel about this issue and bring a proposed solution to the Senate in Spring 1985.

Professor Clark suggested the Faculty Senate might want to put on its agenda the issue of faculty power.

Professor Sorauf moved it is the sense of the student and faculty members of this committee that both the traditional understanding of the rules of the Senate and good legislative practice would dictate that the Swan motion not be taken up at today's Senate meeting save by a vote for immediate consideration, and that we would respectfully ask the President to refer the matter to the Senate Consultative Committee; further that the SCC would assure him that the motion would receive the fullest possible consideration and that SCC would return it to the Winter Quarter Senate meeting for full discussion and action.

Professor Murphy seconded the motion.

The motion carried with one negative vote.

SCC agreed it would seek the concurrence of Business and Rules in this request to the president.

If the Senate should take up the motion for discussion, Professor Clark asked that SCC try to direct discussion to what drives the proposal, and so get at the various underlying impetuses for recommending this particular change.

6. Request from the University Education Association (UEA) of UMD and UMW to receive copies of the agendas and minutes of certain Senate committees (Senate Consultative, Faculty Consultative, Faculty Affairs, Finance, Planning); and to have the Senate provide travel expenses for up to three people to travel to meetings when agenda items appear relevant to UMD and UMW concerns.

Professor Clark, who chairs the SCC's Senate Budget Subcommittee, pointed out that under our current rules people who are not members of a committee are not eligible for travel expenses from the Senate budget. She reported on a related situation, as follows: The Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women submitted travel expenses to the Clerk of the Senate last June for reimbursement for travel of a non-member observer from UMD to EEOWC meetings. Marilee Ward made partial reimbursement while requesting the committee to look for alternative funding.

Other information: Professor Merwin reported on other opinions he had sought. William Thomas, Director of Personnel, thought neither providing travel funds or not providing travel funds would affect negotiations. University attorney Karen Schanfield saw no legal reason not to provide funds, but noted that since the Senate pays for only one committee member to come to the Twin Cities from any one coordinate campus, we might not want to pay for more than one from UMD or UMW.

Professor Merwin called for drawing a distinction between duly-elected or appointed committee members and observers. Professor Latterell noted it was hypothetically possible that a group of people at the Morris Campus (e.g., the AAUP chapter) might decide he was not representing their interests; he asked if they could then, on the same basis, request funding to send an observer.

Some members pointed out that the UEA could seek support for this travel through their collective bargaining if they believe it important.

The Consultative Committee arrived at the following consensus:

It is the SCC's position that observers will be welcomed as colleagues. The Senate, however, pays for travel only of duly elected or appointed members of the Senate committees. SCC suggests the UEA request travel funding from their respective provosts' budgets. The SCC will send its agendas and minutes to the presidents on the two campuses in the same manner and schedule as it distributes them to the rest of its mailing list. (The SCC chairman will write President Keller stating this position.)

7. Policy and review committee on co-sponsorships, promotions, and advertising.
Guest: Richard Purple, Chairman, Business and Rules Committee.

(Note: Following the SCC's September 20 discussion of the question with representatives of other committees and related administrative offices, Professor Merwin formally requested the advice of the Business and Rules Committee on the implications of the motion approved last spring by the Campus Assembly and on its implementation. SCC members had for the 11/15 meeting copies of Business and Rules' response which offered an interpretation of the legislation and three alternative recommendations.)

Professor Sorauf inquired as to whether the Student Affairs Committee's recent agreement to hear and act on one appeal regarding implementation of the policy indicates their willingness to serve as the appeals body whenever need for such a body arises. MSA president Jacque Jodl reported that ACSA agreed to decide on this one issue because no other board was in place. It did not mean to imply it should be the normal appeals body. MSA took to ACSA the question of whether or not an advertiser's logo could appear on campus because students didn't think they could attract advertisers/sponsors under SODC director Tom Fiutak's ruling prohibiting the use of logos. There is still no official policy in place, she said.

Professors Purple and Stuthman emphasized that co-sponsorships are not limited to student organizations but occur frequently also in academic units. The regents apparently have at some time spoken to the issue. Professor Stuthman asked whether it's desirable to have a policy that attempts to cover all eventualities, or one which covers the obvious situations only.

Ms. Emanuelson reported for background that the controversy which gave rise to last spring's ACSA policy motion started about two years ago when SODC ruled that no tobacco or alcohol advertising would be allowed. That was what students saw as the crucial problem and the one from which they sought relief. Hence, it was Ms. Emanuelson's opinion that there would not be a lot of other cases.

Since the Assembly has adopted a policy, the Steering Committee cannot ignore the question of implementation, Professor Merwin noted.

Professor Sorauf remarked that the Vice President for Student Affairs must have numerous policies, some of which students disagree with; he asked why this one should have an independent appeal system.

The Assembly Steering Committee reached agreement favoring the third option offered in the Business and Rules letter: "Simply repeal the entire Assembly policy statement on the grounds that the matter is not of significant importance for the time and effort required." The Steering Committee would take responsibility for making the case to the Assembly for repeal. A possible intermediate solution would be to redesign the policy to apply to students only. However, members note, regents policy does exist.

The Steering Committee agreed to put the question of repeal on the Assembly agenda for the Winter Quarter meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Clerk of the Senate
424 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2125

November 20, 1984

Jack Merwin, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
College of Education
210E Burton Hall

As you know, the attached proposal and amendment were referred by the Chair of the University Senate to the Consultative Committee at the University Senate meeting on November 15, 1984.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marilee Ward".

Marilee Ward
Clerk

enclosure

Plaster
11-15-84

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION OFFERED BY PAT SWAN

IN THE FORM OF A SUBSTITUTE

In order to further the objectives outlined in the Swan motion, be it hereby resolved that the University Senate endorse the following general principles on University governance.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- I. The University Senate shall henceforth be composed of two separate chambers: the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate.
- II. These separate chambers shall operate much as the US Congress does; i.e. any proposal that passes one chamber does not become University policy, unless passed in an exactly similar form by the other chamber.
- III. The Faculty Senate shall be composed of the same members as is the current Faculty Senate. The allotment/election procedures shall remain the same as in the current University Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules. The same shall be true for the Student Senate.
- IV. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall be elected from amongst its membership for a term of one-year. The Chair of the Student Senate shall be elected from amongst its membership for a term of one-year. Either Chair shall be eligible for reelection.
- V. The Senates shall not meet jointly, except as a joint session for a ceremonial purpose, i.e. Presidential/Regential/Gubernatorial Address, etc.
- VI. The Senates shall have exactly parallel committee structures, in order to facilitate the conduct of business. For the initial two-years, the currently-existing membership of University Senate Committees shall be used. Each respective Senate may in future determine the exact number of faculty/students that should serve on its committees.
- VII. The Tenure, the Judicial, and the EEOW Committees currently in operation shall remain exclusively under the Faculty Senate's domain.
- VIII. The Committees of the Senates can meet jointly, in order to facilitate the conduct of business.
- IX. Any proposal passed by either Senate shall be referred for consideration to an appropriate committee of the other Senate by the Chair of the Senate in question.
- X. If the two Senates pass out similar proposals that differ from one another, the proposals must be referred to a conference committee for agreement. The Chairs of the respective Senates shall appoint the members of the conference committee. If the issue originated in the Faculty Senate, a Faculty Senator shall chair the conference committee. If the issue originated in the Student Senate, a Student Senator shall chair the conference committee.
- XI. No proposal shall be considered final University policy until the two Senates have passed identical proposals.
- XII. There shall be created a Student Affairs Committee to

(OVER)

be in scope similar to the Faculty Affairs (SCFA) Committee. This Committee shall consist of 11 students, 7 from the Twin Cities campus and one each from the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Waseca campuses.

Be it further resolved that the University Senate Committee on and Rules be instructed to bring the Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules in line with this proposal at the next Senate meeting.

Be it further resolved that these changes shall go into effect on July 1, 1985.

COMMENT

If the University Senate is desirous both of modifying and strengthening the governance structure and of having strong, separate voices for each of its components, the Faculty and the Students, instead of having a unified voice as is extant, this substitute motion seems the logical extension of the Swan motion.

Paul Schulte
Student Consultative Member

STATEMENT OF STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Student members of the Senate Consultative Committee do not wish to have the Swan amendment addressed on the floor of the Senate today. The sentiment expressed by Diane Magrath at their farewell party as she quoted John Mansfield are shared by students. We are satisfied with the role we play in student/faculty governance, but if faculty have concerns that need to be addressed, we feel today, as other student consultative committee members did last Spring, they should be discussed, but not as proposed by Professor Swan on the floor of the Senate. We are concerned because in phone calls to faculty we found the following:

SUBSTANTIVELY (Against the Motion)

For Students	Against Students	Undecided
12	10	27

PROCEDURALLY (Against the Debate)

For Students	Against Students	Undecided
18	8	21

As of noon today, Professor Gillmor will speak on our behalf; Bales, Gore, Connelly, Shapiro, and Campbell will speak if they believe the discussion would result in a skewed perspective toward students. In three days, students on this campus have signed approximately 5,000 petitions stating they do not want their vote eliminated from the Senate. We believe this expression of concern is shared by the majority of students on the five campuses.

From a historical perspective, it is interesting to note how constituencies-- faculty and students--react in differing time spans. In the late 60's and early 70's, students employed confrontive tactics, retained lawyers, sued the University, employed "sit-ins", fought for open access, for increased funding for women athletes. During the past five years, students have worked "within the system" and supported the collegial consultative process. Conversely, faculty women, dissatisfied with the internal mechanisms of the University, have utilized the judicial system to address what they believed to be long standing grievances.

As members of the Student Senate Consultative Committee, we have made an effort to address Professor Swan's comments. We reviewed Senate records and could not find "evidence" that students vote as a block, nor could we find "evidence" that our presumed voting pattern had affected Senate business. As for the contention we have difficulty filling the 180 positions of Senate and Assembly committees, the answer is - it is very time consuming to interview more than 200 applicants, but in 1982, 1983, and 1984 we have filled more than 90% of the designated positions and we have records to substantiate our efforts.

We have not had time to reserach, nor could we address all of professor Swan's comments in thirty minutes on the Senate floor. Included in this memorandum, is the packet of materials we will submit to the Senators this afternoon, including the rationale for including students in the Senate in 1969, the Jodl-Shope-Melby Opinion piece in the November 11th Daily, and a brief response to the statement ~~of~~ our contributions have been modest at best. For your information, we have also included a letter from the Honors Senate of CLA expressing their apprehensions. We need to have this motion addressed by the Consultative, not on the floor this afternoon.

Hot

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
THE SENATE
MINUTES

February 6, 1969

X. OLD BUSINESS
REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON STUDENT REPRESENTATION

Reported for Action

I. Introduction

The Task Force on Student Representation calls upon the University of Minnesota to commit itself to the principle of the widest possible participation of faculty, students, and administrators in University decision making.

In an institution which considers "the search for truth" its mission and exists within a society based on democratic principles, no one segment, or group of segments, should determine the institution's full potential for the attainment of truth.

The conception, shaping, and realization of an idea or an ideal must be the joint effort of the total community rather than isolated or separate elements of that community. We reject the concept that innovation, research, and creative thought are the exclusive domain of the instructor, the student, or the administrator.

The University must take as its model a partnership, a sharing of responsibility, rather than the fragmented power struggle represented by separatist walls protecting student power, faculty power, and administrative power.

A "community of scholars" cannot exist with groups claiming separate and absolute control over matters of mutual concern to the members of that community. Although the State of Minnesota through the University Charter has placed the ultimate authority for the University of Minnesota in the Board of Regents, the Regents themselves appropriately and necessarily have chosen to delegate many responsibilities to the President and the University Senate. The President and the Senate have been committed to wide participation in the decision-making processes of the University through many administrative and Senate committees. Faculty, administrators, and students have shared membership on Senate or administrative committees for over a half century. As the institution has developed, the range of committees and the number of persons involved in the deliberations of these committees have increased. Student representatives now number over 170 on various Senate and administrative committees on the various campuses. At least one Senate committee presently has a majority of student members.

While a responsible student voice is heard on these committees, the Senate has remained a faculty legislative body. Administrators are seated without vote. Students may enter the Senate for discussions only when their Senate subcommittee has an issue before the Senate. They cannot vote on the policy matters that their efforts have brought before the Senate.

The exclusion of some elements of the academic community from greater involvement in the establishment of policy governing that community is unnecessary and undesirable in the future of that institution. A blend of modern insights and ideas as well as continuity and stability of proven traditions is necessary for the continued dynamic development of the University.

Our institution must offer the opportunity to those capable men and women who are willing to accept responsible roles in the governance of modern higher education whether these persons are administrators, faculty, or students. The emphasis in the future should be upon shared functions and joint responsibility for the total enterprise.

If we have educated our young people, if we assume that they are now and are to continue to be responsible citizens in our democratic society, and if we believe that the principles of a democratic society extend to the academic community, we must recognize students as full partners, and not just consultants in that community.

The Task Force on Student Representation recommends that the next step in the steady progression toward a true University Senate, rather than a faculty Senate, be the incorporation of students as full participants in the Senate and Assemblies, as well as increased student membership in Senate and Assembly committees.

A Response to the Motion

The suggestion that the primary purpose of the students' participation in University governance is to "provide them with experience in leadership" indicates a fundamental misconception of the relationship between the parties involved. Students have a right to participate in policy decisions which shape their educational experiences. The suggestion that students can only contribute to policy debates "in those areas in which they have had experience" establishes standards for participation in representative government which are impossible to attain. Indeed, the latter suggestion obviates representative government, for which Senator can be expert in all areas? The work of informing the representatives on particular issues is the duty of committees and subcommittees and the responsibility of the representatives is to assess the arguments and information which result from the work of the committee members and the appropriate experts. (The representative, then, must be expert at using experts).

The suggestion that students concern themselves with "curriculum development, student fees, the calendar, and similar issues" is patronizing and implies that students' concerns are confined to these and "similar issues" (whatever those would be). Rather, the University is a community, and all areas of concern are of importance to all of its members. True, some areas deal with the special interests of some of its members, but there is no issue which does not affect each member. To imply that tuition policy, sexual harrassment policy, and planning are not student concerns is *prima facie* absurd.

MSA

An attempt to disenfranchise students

By Douglas Melby,
Jacqueline Jodl
and David Shope

The University Senate this Thursday will consider a motion by Professor Patricia Swan "to eliminate student representation from the senate." This action appears to circumvent the usual procedures followed by the senate. According to Swan's comments accompanying the motion, the idea is "to get the modified and strengthened governance structure in place before the new president of the University takes office."

It is interesting to note the unseemly haste, with which this motion is being presented. A May 15, 1980, report by a subcommittee on senate reorganization cautioned that "if any revision of the present system is to work, it must be developed through discussion and consensus of faculty and students, so as to command their subsequent active support." Three years of careful discussion and deliberation preceded the implementation of the revisions referred to in that report. That reorganization "to improve consultation, coordination, and communication among those involved in the governance system" followed a significantly different time line than the Swan motion, which provides for 30 minutes of discussion to determine whether students should be disenfranchised.

Some faculty members contend that students do not make enough valuable contributions

at meetings to justify their presence. But before Swan's motion becomes the rule, alternatives to disenfranchising students must be studied: such as better orientations for incoming student leaders and clear definitions of the expectations and responsibilities that accompany the right to senate participation. Students need more than 30 minutes to address Swan's comments and to re-examine the principles involved in decision-making shared by students and faculty members.

A governance system shared by students and faculty members is relatively new on our campus, but it is not an isolated phenomenon. According to J. Victor Baldrige in his book *Policy Making and Effective Management*, published in 1978, "In the late 1960s and 1970s students joined academic senates at hundreds of institutions. Such participation is common in academic institutions today." Students on our campus were granted "voting" rights in the senate in 1969. The activists of that era viewed it as a redress of a longstanding grievance; an acknowledgment that students are an integral part of this institution. At that time, and now, the senate provides students with a means to voice concerns.

The dreams of the 1970s are unraveling. Perhaps it is inevitable, with declining enrollments and decreasing public support, that tensions will build between faculty members, students and administrators. Students, as well as faculty members, are frustrated with their eroding influence as the need for aggressive fiscal management puts more power and discretion into the hands of the central administrators and the regents. But should students be the victims of faculty frustration? Today as never before, students need Universitywide support to contain tuition in-

creases. Legislators have increased the proportion students pay of their educational costs from 24 percent in 1975 to 32 percent in 1984. The legislative assumption that students can pay more, along with the very real possibility that federal and state funding of financial aid will be substantially cut, needs to be addressed by the senate. It is an issue of major concern for students, but we need faculty support to receive proper consideration.

Conversely, the faculty needs students. During the past decade, this institution has been obsessed with fiscal matters. Faculty members, with anxiety levels running high over cut programs and dismantled departments, spent countless hours discussing tenure proposals to protect their jobs. They need student support for their positions. If a 7 percent salary increase is included in the biennial request, faculty members will need student lobbyists to support them at the state Capitol. Faculty members need the continued enthusiastic support of students to maintain enrollment levels to ensure present University funding—and their jobs. If Swan's objective is to establish a clear, undiluted faculty voice, then let the question be "How can the students work with the faculty to further faculty influence with the administration and the Board of Regents?"

Formalized student input, which we have in the senate and the senate committees, helps in the planning, development and evaluation of programs and services and must be ongoing. Students may not contribute substantially to the deliberations, but they do absorb and relay faculty concerns to their fellow students. Eliminating students from the senate may be expedient, but not prudent. This issue should be referred to a committee on which differences can be discussed in an

unhurried and collegial atmosphere based on trust and shared commitment to quality education.

At the meeting this Thursday at 3 p.m. in Room 25 of the Law School, the senate will consider the Swan motion along with sexual-harrassment procedures, academic-progress standards for financial-aid recipients, the recreational sports Board of Governors' constitution, housing, convocation and arts grants to student organizations and persons seeking support, health-service fees and student needs for non-classroom space. Would the removal of students from the senate affect the way these issues are viewed?

Students fought hard for the right to vote. Before disenfranchising us, let the entire University community share in these deliberations.

Apology

In an opinions piece that appeared Oct. 11 dealing with the libel suit brought by Gen. William Westmoreland, several paragraphs were repeated verbatim without attribution of their source, U.S. News and World Report. The Daily regrets the omission.

Douglas Melby is the student chairman of the Senate Consultative Committee, Jacqueline Jodl is the student body president of the Twin Cities campus and David Shope is speaker of the Minnesota Student Association.

Tuesday, November 13, 1984

Page 5

November 14, 1984

Fellow members of the University Senate:

As the date of this meeting drew near, many of us looked forward to our deliberations with uncertainty. No one is quite sure of the motivational factors behind Professor Swan's proposal to split the University Senate or how far-reaching the consequences of this action will be. All of us have some thoughts on the subject of University governance, but many of us feel that the 30 minutes allotted for consideration of the Swan motion is far too small a time period for such a major philosophical change as is proposed.

The students I have consulted on the subject all agree that the issue of Senate effectiveness should be addressed. But are there additional areas that can be considered that would strengthen the institution without denying one constituency the support of another. As a student I feel that a strong, representative, legislative body is a necessity in a system as large as this University. The University of Minnesota reaches out to the state and to the entire world with our teaching, research, service, and our finished products - including our students. Because this is an institution in the quest for truth, it can not and should not have policy direction from only one constituency.

If this Democratic institution can review itself, find areas to improve, and implement those changes, we will strengthen this body. The Senate needs to consider its effectiveness in a deliberate, rational setting, away from the emotions of a 30 minute floor fight. Let's engage in what this Senate does best - deliberation in committees, allowing for all possible input, and make recommendations based on consensus. As Senators, we should all support this!!!

Michael D. Olinstead
CUA Senator
member, Presidential Search Advisory Committee
Former Student Chair, Senate Consultative Committee

wsn



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Director

Honors Division
College of Liberal Arts
115 Johnston Hall
101 Pleasant Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-5116

November 12, 1984

Dear Friend of the Honors Program:

It has come to the attention of the Honors Student Senate that a proposal has been made to remove students from participation in University governance. The Honors Student Senate is deeply disturbed that students may be disallowed a representative voice in the making of policies that vitally affect their education.

We need your help. We ask that you support the following resolution which was passed unanimously by the Honors Student Senate:

Whereas students at the University of Minnesota are greatly affected by the actions of the central administration, and
Whereas it is the students' right to be represented in the decision-making process on issues that concern students, and
Whereas the student body has participated responsibly and effectively in the University Senate since 1969, and
Whereas the College of Liberal Arts Honors Student ^{Senate} stands as an example of positive student involvement, and
Whereas the University Senate should represent the various constituencies in the University community,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Honors Student Senate supports the concept of student participation in the University Senate. The Honors Student Senate disagrees with any effort to separate faculty from students in University governance. The Honors Senate believes that such a division would result in divisive struggles and the impairment of constructive dialogue. The Honors Senate urges all faculty and student senators to speak against and to vote against this division when the question is brought to the floor of the University Senate.

We hope that we will have your support on this issue.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Tod R. Eggenberger
President of the Honors
Student Senate

TRE/tjs

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION *Conf # 90 1/1*

Exclusive Representative for the University of Minnesota, Duluth Faculty and the University of Minnesota Technical College, Waseca Faculty

437 ARROWHEAD PLACE
205 WEST SECOND STREET
DULUTH, MN 55802
218-723-2306

10/23/84

President,
Duluth

Virginia T.
Katz

UEA ACCESS TO INFORMATION PROVIDED TO AND DELIBERATIONS OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AND THE SENATE PLANNING COMMITTEE

President-
Elect, Duluth

George M.
O'Brien

President,
Waseca

Peter A.
Fog

Vice-
President,
Waseca

Howard
Olien

Chief
Negotiator

Vincent R.
Magnuson

1. UEA Presidents in Duluth and Waseca receive in advance all agendas of SCC, FCC, SCFA, and Senate Finance and Budget Committees
2. UEA Presidents in Duluth and Waseca receive promptly ^{*from notes*} minutes of all the above mentioned committees
3. As meetings of above mentioned committees are open, UEA Presidents in Duluth and Waseca (or their designees) will attend these meetings when items appear on the agenda(s) which appear to be relevant to UMD and UMW concerns. Travel expenses of up to three people for these meetings to come out of Senate Travel Budget. *-generally*
4. Regular (minimum of one per quarter) "meet and confer" sessions with the President and/or appropriate Vice President(s) to discuss items of concern which have come up in the meetings of the above mentioned committees, in addition to other items of concern. These meet and confer sessions are to alternate between the Duluth and Waseca campuses.
5. One meet and confer session per year between UEA and their employers, the Board of Regents (if not the full Board, a delegation from the Board).

UEA



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

November 16, 1984

President Kenneth H. Keller
201 Morrill Hall

Dear President Keller:

The Senate Consultative Committee discussed the first three items of the UEA meet and confer memorandum of 10/23/84 at its meeting of November 15, 1984. The Committee's views on the three matters are as follows:

1. Request for agendas of Senate committees identified -- The chairs of these committees will be asked to add the presidents of the UEA on the UMD and UMW campuses to their mailing lists for distribution of agendas.
2. Request for minutes -- Similarly, the chairs of the designated committees will be requested to send copies of minutes of their meetings to the two campus presidents when they are distributed to others on their lists for minutes.
3. Request for travel expenses of up to three people for meetings of these committees to come out of Senate Travel Budget -- The Senate Travel Budget was established to cover the travel costs of duly elected or appointed Senate committee members. These funds are not available for observers from UMM or UMC, and the Committee feels it would be inappropriate for them to be used for observers from UMD and UMW. The Committee recommends that funds be sought from the travel budgets of their respective provosts. Or, if UEA feels strongly enough about the matter, it suggests that they propose it as an item for negotiation.

President Keller
November 16, 1984
page two

The general tone of the discussion was one of welcoming the interest of our Waseca and Duluth faculty colleagues in the work of these Senate committees. We would look forward to their joining us as observers at our committee meetings if the logistics of attendance can be managed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jack Merwin". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Jack Merwin, Chairman,
Senate Consultative Committee

JM:mp



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

November 26, 1984

Professor Thomas Clayton
Chairman, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Department of English
210B Lind Hall

Dear Tom:

The University Education Association (UEA) has requested that it regularly receive the agendas and minutes of certain Senate committees, and that the Senate provide travel funds for UEA observers to attend meetings of those committees when they wish to be present. (See the attached list of requests from UEA, dated 10/23/84.) The Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees have agreed to send their agendas in advance and the minutes as soon as they are approved and ready to send to the rest of the regular mailing list.

The Consultative Committee, however, found no precedent for Senate funding for travel for any other than duly elected or appointed Senate committee members and so concluded it would be inappropriate for the Senate to fund travel for UMD and UMW observers. SCC favors collegiality and would welcome the attendance of UEA representatives at its meetings. It has suggested that UEA seek funding from the Provost on each of the two campuses (Waseca, Duluth) and, if the matter is of sufficient importance to UEA members, that it propose such funding as an item for negotiation.

We hope you will join SCC/FCC in adding the presidents of the UEA at Duluth and Waseca to your mailing list for distribution of agendas and minutes. As far as we can determine from the '83-'84 staff directory, these are the current addresses for the two presidents:

Professor Virginia T. Katz
President, UEA
459 A. B. Anderson Hall
University of Minnesota
Duluth, Minnesota 55812

Professor Peter A. Fog
President, UEA
Administration Building
University of Minnesota Technical College
Waseca, Minnesota 56093

Thanks for considering this request. Don't hesitate to 'phone me if you'd like to talk about the matter.

Sincerely,

Jack Merwin, Chairman,
Faculty and Senate Consultative Committees

JM:mp
Encl.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

November 26, 1984

Professor Mark Brenner
Chairman, Senate Planning Committee
Horticultural Science and Landscape Architecture
324 Alder Hall

Dear Mark:

The University Education Association (UEA) has requested that it regularly receive the agendas and minutes of certain Senate committees, and that the Senate provide travel funds for UEA observers to attend meetings of those committees when they wish to be present. (See the attached list of requests from UEA, dated 10/23/84.) The Senate and Faculty Consultative Committees have agreed to send their agendas in advance and the minutes as soon as they are approved and ready to send to the rest of the regular mailing list.

The Consultative Committee, however, found no precedent for Senate funding for travel for any other than duly elected or appointed Senate committee members, and so concluded it would be inappropriate for the Senate to fund travel for UMD and UMW observers. SCC favors collegiality and would welcome the attendance of UEA representatives at its meetings. It has suggested that UEA seek funding from the Provost on each of the two campuses (Waseca, Duluth) and, if the matter is of sufficient importance to UEA members, to propose such funding as an item for negotiation.

We hope you will join SCC/FCC in adding the presidents of the UEA at UMD and UMW to your mailing list for distribution of agendas and minutes. As far as we can determine from the '83-'84 staff directory, these are the current addresses for the two presidents:

Professor Virginia T. Katz
President, UEA
459 A. B. Anderson Hall
University of Minnesota
Duluth, Minnesota 55812

Professor Peter A. Fog
President, UEA
Administration Building
University of Minnesota Technical College
Waseca, Minnesota 56093

Thanks for considering this request. Don't hesitate to 'phone me if you'd like to talk about the matter.

Sincerely,

Jack Merwin, Chair,
Faculty and Senate Consultative Committees

JM:mp
Encl.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

November 26, 1984

Professor Deon Stuthman
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee
308 Agronomy

Dear Deon:

You already know from our recent SCC and FCC meetings of the UEA's requests regarding access to certain Senate committees, and of the Consultative Committees' responses. I've written President Keller to report that SCC and FCC will send the UEA presidents our agendas and minutes in the same manner as to the rest of the mailing list. I've noted that we would welcome their observers at our meetings but find it inappropriate and without precedent for the Senate to fund observers' travel.

I hope the Finance Committee will see fit to join in adding the two presidents to the committee's mailing list, and I'm making the same request of the Planning and Faculty Affairs Committees (see UEA request attached).

As far as we can determine from the '83-'84 staff directory, these are the current addresses for the two presidents:

Professor Virginia T. Katz
President, UEA
459 A. B. Anderson Hall
University of Minnesota
Duluth, Minnesota 55812

Professor Peter A. Fog
President, UEA
Administration Building
University of Minnesota Technical College
Waseca, Minnesota 56093.

Do call me if you want to talk further about this.

Sincerely,

Jack Merwin, Chair,
Faculty and Senate Consultative Committees

JM:mp
Encl.



3-7-77
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

rec'd SCC office 12-5-84
after request slip from
Tom Fintak
Minnesota Student Association
240 Coffman Memorial Union
300 Washington Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2414

OCTOBER 18, 1984

GUIDELINES FOR CO-SPONSORSHIP OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS
BY OFF-CAMPUS SPONSORS

PROCESS

To facilitate the best interaction of student leaders, off-campus sponsors and the University, through the Student Organization Development Center, the following process is established:

1. Any request by a student organization or offer by a co-sponsor to the student organization in excess of \$500, including in-kind services and materials, must be approved by the Director of the Student Organization Development Center. This approval will be granted after an initial sponsor proposal has been negotiated between the student organization and the co-sponsor. The student organization is urged to invite the Director of SODC to the initial meeting, if needed.
2. A final accounting sheet must be prepared and signed by the student organization and the co-sponsor accounting for expenditures of co-sponsor monies. This must be filed 30 days after the program with the Student Organization Development Center.

CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

1. Co-sponsor money must be deposited in the Student Organization Finance within the student organization account.
2. In-kind services and materials will be appraised at market value by the sponsor.
3. The off-campus sponsor, if it chooses, will be acknowledged for its contribution through appropriate identification of this relationship on printed material. Those materials (banners, clothing, gifts, etc.) will be supplied by the co-sponsor and through other publicity forms such as radio and television.

4. Appropriate identification of this relationship with the University related program will be regulated in the following manner:
- a. Acknowledgement on printed advertising, media broadcasting and donated paraphernalia must include: the Univeristy organization and "Co-sponsored by _____."
 - b. Logos, slogans, and specific product indentification must meet approval of student organization and co-sponsor and may not exceed in prominence through size and location the logo or title of the University event itself.
 - c. Product give-away, discounts, raffles or samples may be used as part of the event being co-sponsored.
 - d. All material, clothing, advertising paraphernalia related to any given campus related event on which co-sponsorship is acknowledged must be approved by the student organization and SODC. (All such material must be distributed by the members and volunteers of that organization only.)
 - e. The number and types of co-sponsors for each campus related event are at the discretion of the student organization. Co-sponsors may be granted sole sponsorship of a specific event on a one-time basis.
 - f. Student Organization Event Budget, appropriately designed for each individual event, must be filled out at the start and at the end of the event.

REVIEW OF THE PROCESS

This set of guidelines is established to aid student organizations and co-sponsors.

The above has been discussed and agreed upon by the following parties:

_____ Chairperson, Student Organization

Date _____

_____ Representative, Co-sponsor

Date _____

_____ Advisor, Student Organization

Date _____

_____ Director, Student Organization
Development Center

Date _____

(Signatures can be obtained independently.)

Co-sponsors' logos OKed for U events

By Gary Cozine

Student organizations will find it easier to attract sponsors for campus events as a result of the Student Affairs Committee's (SAC) Tuesday decision.

The committee sided with students in a dispute between student leaders and the head of the Student Organization Development Center (SODC) over the use of a co-sponsor's advertising logo at a campus event. SODC director Tom Fiutak had ruled spring quarter that logos could not be used at a campus event. Student leaders said they couldn't attract sponsors because the logos were banned.

The committee's decision will allow logos on banners, posters and other printed material as long as the logo isn't larger than the University's logo or the title of the event.

Fiutak said he worries that the committee's ruling may lead to confusion over who is sponsoring an event. He pointed to a 1984 Homecoming calendar that had a prominent logo of the company co-sponsoring the event. "It makes it look like Miller High Life is sponsoring Homecoming," Fiutak said.

The University market is a lucrative one for advertisers, Fiutak said. Companies want to influence this

"critical population" by linking their products with the University's esteem, he said. And a logo is a direct attempt to force product choice, he said.

But Shane Schmidt, who was Homecoming chairman this fall and who approved the calendar to which Fiutak took exception, said the University's reputation hadn't suffered because of the calendar.

"If we aren't able to use logos, we won't be able to finance our events," Schmidt said. A company co-sponsoring a University event wants something in exchange for the money it gives to the student organization, he said.

The committee's decision is not final, said SAC Chairman Don Kahn. First, Kahn said, he wants to give committee members who were absent on Tuesday the opportunity to vote. The issue then will be referred to Frank Wilderson, vice president for student affairs, for final approval.

Even though there wasn't a quorum of committee members at the Tuesday meeting, a decision was made because the dispute had gone unresolved for so long, Kahn said. Student leaders said the committee's indecision about the use of logos was scaring away potential co-sponsors.

The money involved can be considerable. Campus Carnival organizers will ask a co-sponsor for \$18,000 this year.

According to Pam Perri, co-chairwoman of Campus Carnival, the committee's decision means she can seriously negotiate with potential co-sponsors. All through the summer and into the fall, Campus Carnival organizers have had to operate under Fiutak's logo ban. The confusion over what exactly would be allowed at the event has made sponsors reluctant to commit themselves, she said.

Shelly Sippl, the other Campus Carnival co-chairwoman, said the size restrictions on the logos would strengthen the students' position as they negotiated with sponsor companies.

Fiutak said that while he didn't agree with the committee's decision, he would work with students to implement the policy.

Daily

11-14-84



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Clerk of the Senate
424 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2125

Oct. 31, 1984

Professor Jack Merwin, Chair
Senate Consultative Committee
210E Burton Hall
Minneapolis Campus

Re: Sponsorship, Advertisements, and Promotion Policy

Dear Jack:

Business and Rules has met twice now in its consideration of the SCC's request for an interpretation and recommendation on the Campus Assembly's adopted policy statement on Sponsorship, Advertisements, and Promotions. We have concentrated particularly on the statement's last two clauses (Sections 4 and 5) as you requested. We would comment, however, that the first three clauses do acquiesce to the administration in allowing them to basically determine what the policy should be, with the last two clauses recommending something about how the administration should consult in the determination of the policy. It is our considered opinion that the statement's last two clauses (Sections 4 and 5) do contain considerable ambiguities which should be cleared up by new legislation. Further, we point out that while the circumstances which led to this policy, and the present disputes about it, stem from the interactions of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and various student groups, the policy statement itself is much broader, covering all the University of Minnesota. As such, the statement cuts across the jurisdiction of many deans, and at least the Vice Presidencies for Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and perhaps, Finance, and probably all four Provosts' Offices. Consequently, administration of the policy is likely to be rather difficult in detail.

Interpretation

As now written, the recommended Review Committee is not an Assembly Committee. It would be a committee of the administration's making, in which the Assembly agrees to provide the names of two faculty and two students for inclusion in its membership. Sections 4 and 5 do not specify whom this Review Committee will report to in the administration, who will staff it, etc. As we interpret it, Section 5 does say that the Review Committee might report to the Campus Assembly if it felt the need to do so, but here again details on whom the Review Committee would report through and whether it would be entitled to move adoption of policy or simply report informational items is unspecified. This last is of concern in that we do not look favorably on non-Assembly Committees ordering or moving policy recommendations on that body.

As to the substantive duties of the Review Committee, it is the impression of Business and Rules that those duties are vague and probably conflicting with respect to clarification of procedures, helping to set policy, monitoring, and

hearing appeals. While it appeared to us that no one objected to Items 1, 2, and 3 of the policy statement, as these were more or less in keeping with the sense of Regent policy pronouncements on this issue, it was also our understanding that Sections 4 and 5 were included out of a wish by student government to have some student involvement in setting policy guidelines and particularly in having an appeals option. While we are sympathetic to these motives, we stress that the policy and matters of appeals on the policy affect all the constituencies of the University. Therefore, as in the cases of other appeals and grievances, appeal measures must be clearly set out, not only as to who will hear appeals, but also to whom the appellate body reports, and the nature of the authority of its decisions. In general, grievance boards within the University are advisory to and report to someone in the administration who is delegated the actual authority to decide. Our reading of Sections 4 and 5 indicates that nowhere in them is any consideration given to these realities, unless one assumes that the Review Committee as an administrative vehicle is advisory to itself.

It is not within our purview to lecture the administration on administrative procedures. For the purpose of clarifying Assembly policy, however, we would point out that the administration should be quite capable of structuring a Review Committee that could allow for the expression of administrative, faculty, and student viewpoints in rendering rulings without a lot of help from the Assembly. We would suggest that such a Review Committee, because it is University-wide in scope, might most properly be lodged within a relatively neutral administrative office such as Planning or Finance or Academic Affairs, to avoid giving absolute policy authority on issues that affect virtually all University constituencies to the Office of Student Affairs which ordinarily is preoccupied in dealing with only one of these constituencies. For restructuring the Assembly policy statement, we would recommend several options which are open to the SCC at the present time.

Recommendations

First, the SCC should decide if the policy statement is germane to the whole University and should therefore be a Senate matter rather than one of concern only to the Twin Cities Assembly. Subsequent action would depend upon this determination.

Second, Business and Rules recommends that a new motion be sponsored by the SCC (or Assembly Steering Committee) which will abolish Numbers 4 and 5 of the presently adopted Assembly policy. In its place the SCC should consider adopting one of the following options:

1. Insert a new Section 4 recommending strongly that the administration put in place a Review Committee that will assemble and distribute Regents policies and administrative guidelines on sponsorships, advertisements, and promotions. Such a committee should be clearly identified with some administrative office (preferably "neutral" as commented on above), such that Deans, Directors, etc., who wish to know about such things before making a decision will have a place to go for information. The Review Committee

should be similarly identified to student, faculty, and other groups who might wish to involve themselves with outside sponsors, be it for Homecoming, Campus Carnival, Medical Education forums, Business Management sessions, etc. If the administration feels the need for a monitoring function (likely a difficult and quite likely expensive undertaking in this decentralized University) it can further specify such duties for the Review Committee or another administrative committee or office without the need for additional Campus Assembly or Senate input. It would also seem reasonable that this Review Committee be given the duty of further rule-making on this issue, since it would be the central clearing house for information on the policy. It therefore makes good sense for the administration to consider choosing student and faculty members to serve with administrators on this committee, and designating this committee as the entry office for a complaint against a decision made by a Dean, Director, or other authority.

2. Insert a new Section 4 as above and insert a new Section 5, structuring an independent body to hear appeals of administrative decisions handed down by the Review Committee. This independent body could take several forms, but in any of them it should be carefully specified as to whom the committee will report and as to how fair rules of appellate procedure are to be structured. This appeals body could:
 - a) be a new Operations Committee of the Assembly or Senate, reporting through any regular Senate or Assembly committee. We suspect, as the issues on sponsorship affect virtually any sanctioned University organization, the appeals committee might have to report through the Steering Committee of the Assembly or the SCC of the Senate. Social Concerns might be another logical committee to have jurisdiction. At any rate, it should also be specified what administrative office this committee would be advisory to, as in grievance mechanisms the appellate body is advisory to the administration. An Operations Committee is appointed by the President with the advice of the Committee on Committees. (One particular drawback to this option is that it is quite likely that several years might go by without any appeals, leaving the new Operations Committee with nothing to do and wasting much time of the President's Office and of the Committee on Committees.)
 - b) delegate the question of appeals to one or another of the Assembly or Senate Committees such as ACSA, the Assembly Steering Committee, the SCC of the Senate, or Social Concerns, instructing them to appoint an appeal panel from among their membership when and if an appeal is made and further instructing them on how they shall hear appeals, whom they report to having heard an appeal, and further making it clear whether or not higher levels of appeal will be possible (the Regents are always there for ultimate jurisdiction if they so wish).
 - c) delegate the question of appeals to an already existing grievance hearing body (or bodies if concerns are present on the origination and proper jurisdiction for originating appeals).
3. Having reviewed the above material, one final option suggests itself: simply repeal the entire Assembly policy statement on the grounds that the matter is not of significant importance for the time and effort required. We suspect that indoctrinated bureaucrats within us would reject this option. The Regents have pronounced policy several times on this issue. That makes it

Professor Jack Merwin

Page 4

important. Moreover, the messy box has been opened to view and a good bureaucrat is duty bound to now tidy it up. Nevertheless, some of us on the Business and Rules Committee would be inclined to simply slam the lid back down. The substantive issues should be for SCC to decide. If you would like to have Business and Rules help in drafting a new section or two of policy on this matter, we stand ready to be of whatever assistance you so direct.

Sincerely yours,

Rick/mw

Richard Purple, Chair
Business & Rules Committee