



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

October 18, 1984

Behmler Hall Conference Room  
University of Minnesota, Morris  
10:30 - 12:00

AGENDA

1. Minutes of October 4 meetings, SCC and FCC (enclosed).
2. Reports:
  - A. Student Chair
  - B. Chair
  - C. Senate Finance Committee
  - D. Senate Budget Subcommittee.
3. Tracking the implementation of Senate-approved policies.
4. Faculty-student governance relationship.  
(Enclosures to SCC:
  - Chronicle articles on Kerr Commission report
  - Portions of Senate minutes from ages past.
5. Availability of Judicial Committee's abstracts of cases.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

CORRECTED  
MINUTES  
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
October 18, 1984  
Behmler Hall Conference Room  
University of Minnesota, Morris  
10:45 - 12:30

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Charles Farrell, Sue Gruenes, Joseph J. Latterell, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chairman), Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, Bernell Schleske (alt.), David Shope, Deon Stuthman, Burt Sundquist, Bruce Williams.

Guests: W. Donald Spring, Bruce Burnes.

Professor Merwin expressed the committee's pleasure at the opportunity to visit the Morris campus.

1. No corrections were offered to the FCC and SCC minutes of the October 4 meetings. Those minutes stand approved unless members notify the secretary promptly.

2. Reports.

A. Student Chair. Douglas Melby.

(1) Mr. Melby introduced Mr. Schleske, vice president of Crookston's student body, who was representing Crookston students at the meeting.

(2) Student representatives to the Board of Regents. The Regents' Office has asked SSCC and the student representatives to the Board to make sure there is a fair policy in place as regards naming the student reps. Several SSCC members and the student reps met on this at UMC October 11. (SSCC members also met that day with UMC student leaders.)

(3) Student Senate. The extended subcommittee has completed work to resolve differences between the Business and Rules Committee and SSCC for the bylaws. Bylaws <sup>now</sup> would make any student senator eligible to be chosen chair and would specify a much smaller Senate executive/steering committee than in the earlier proposal.

B. SCC Chair. Professor Merwin.

(1) The Senate and Assembly Facilitative Committees will meet in the week of October 22. Agendas will include the issue of implementation of Senate-approved policies. Professor Merwin will ask committees to meet together when they have common topics in order to make the best use of time of central administrators who would attend.

(2) Professor Merwin has met individually to date with the chairs of seven Senate committees. Committee on Business and Rules has agreed to address lingering questions regarding the Review Board on Advertising, Promotions, and Sponsorships -- that is, what group should be dealing with each of the three aspects of the job relating to the board.

Mr. Shope reported that Vice President Wilderson has said he would suggest to Student Organization Development Office director Tom Fiutak that Mr. Fiutak meet with the MSA Executive Committee regarding development of a process.

(3) Professor Merwin has asked the Business and Rules Committee to come up with motions on two other items for the November 15 Senate meeting:

(a) An amendment to Senate bylaws for duties and responsibilities of Senate Planning Committee which takes account of the end of the Planning Council;

(b) An amendment to Senate bylaws to legitimize a faculty member as well as a student member from the Planning Committee on the Finance Committee.

(4) The Presidential Search Advisory Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee will meet jointly on November 1 from 1:00-2:00. SCC members will receive copies of Professor Howe's letter suggesting the agenda.

C. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Stuthman.

SFC met October 5 to review the proposed prioritization of the Biennial Budget Request and the State Specials Request.

SFC's next meeting will be November 1, immediately following SCC. The main agenda item will be a consideration of the Association of American Universities' comparative data from thirty institutions on various kinds of expenditures (e.g., equipment purchases and maintenance) on a per faculty member basis and a per student basis. Professor Rubenstein commented that these data will be very important in the University's arguments to the legislature.

Professor Merwin referred to the new faculty salary data from AAUP which Professor Sloan of the local chapter has just compiled and forwarded. They show that among the top 30 research universities as identified in Dean Holt's task force report on Graduate Education and Research, University of Minnesota salaries for full professors are \$6,000 below the mean. Professor Merwin will talk with Vice President Keller about the figures.

D. Senate Budget Subcommittee. Professor Clark.

The Vice Chairwoman of the Senate chairs this subcommittee; other members this year are Professors Merwin and Freier, Mr. Melby and Ms. Birk, and the ex officio member and staff, Marilee Ward.

Subcommittee met October 4 to discuss the requests Senate committees had submitted for the 1984-85 year. Requests totaled \$45,900; Subcommittee has allocated \$44,045 and knows of a few additional requests to come. Student Committee on Committees will be given an allocation after it submits its formal request. The Subcommittee will meet again as needed during the year.

The information on committee requests and awards was circulated in the meeting.

E. Reports from October Regents meetings.

The student members who had traveled to UMC reported. Among other actions, the University will write off \$1.4 million in uncollectable student loans accumulated over many years. Collection efforts were costly. In the future, the University will try to resolve collectable vs. uncollectable loans annually and avoid fruitless collection expense.

Groundwater contamination at Rosemount: the University is supplying residents with drinking water and is conducting tests which will cost \$87,000. Regent Moore requested that the University's other dumps be checked as well. SCC discussed briefly the background of and prospects for solving the Rosemount disposal leak problem.

Mr. Shope expressed his hope the University will take a bold and responsible step to move to a new, sound waste disposal means.

3. Tracking the implementation of Senate-approved policies.

SCC and other committees have observed that some Senate-approved policies are acted upon and some are neglected. They are asking who should follow through.

Professor Merwin noted that Vice President Keller recently pointed out to the FCC reasons why the May 1984 SGFA-Senate policy on inloading should not be implemented (it prohibits flexibility and conflicts with a 1981 SCEP-Senate policy).

Mr. Shope recommended appointing a special body to see that the appropriate people are informed and follow through after Senate action. Professor Merwin said more communication needs to be built into the system. Professor Stuthman urged computerizing the information and not having to rely on human memory.

Professor Merwin said that deans reportedly are concerned because they are held responsible to implement policies they have had no part in developing. He proposed that the SCC meet with a group of deans to discuss their concerns.

Professor Clark suggested that the President might be asked to report once a year to the Senate on his reaction to actions taken by the Senate in the previous year. She noted that in certain areas there have been instances of legal constraints which prevented for a time any action at all.

Professor Clark said the fact that a Senate policy is sometimes later alleged to be something the University cannot live with demonstrates the importance of the ex officio members' being active in their committees and bringing to the committees' attention and then, if necessary, the Senate's, any problems central administration sees.

4. Faculty-student governance relationship.

Background material: Senate minutes of February 1969 when the Senate affirmed the conclusion of a task force report and incorporated student representation into the Senate.

Professor Merwin reported to student members that the FCC discussion of October 4 had focused on getting a large perspective:

- To address whether governance is working we must consider what we really want from governance;
- We should consider the times in which the union came about;
- The issue does not seem to be the complete separation of faculty and student governance but rather of perhaps finding some other alternative to the present arrangement.

It is anticipated that any motion or motions on the question will go to the Senate for its Winter Quarter meeting.

Mr. Melby reported on student discussions to date. Students see two main issues -- one rather mechanical and one philosophical. Students recognize attendance and participation as a real concern, and one they want to improve. But philosophically, he asked, do we want to split the constituencies, or to remain united? The students believe trust, cooperation, and equality of treatment are better when faculty and students are in one body. The reasons for students being involved are as valid as in 1969. Nothing has changed. Mechanical problems do not justify a philosophical change but rather an approach to solving the mechanical problems. He believes this concern is more in the purview of Committee on Committees.

This is an institution of learning, he continued, and participation in joint governance is a way in which students can learn directly from particularly respected faculty members. We should focus on University issues instead of spending a lot of time addressing structure. And he questioned whether the difference between student attendance in recent years of 60-65% and faculty attendance of 80% is very significant.

Professor Stuthman noted what has changed since 1969: there is now a student member on the Board of Regents and there are student representatives to the Board of Regents. The faculty have no such access.

Professor Sundquist noted another concern which argued for last spring's motion in SCC was that Senate committees use central administrators' time inefficiently. We ask them to report to FCC on an item and then to SCC, and sometimes they separately address the same business also with student leaders. Some issues are primarily of faculty concern, others of primarily student concern, and others of concern to both. Among University employees there is now a third group interested in some decision-making participation. Our current system may have gotten unwieldy, he suggested. It is not best to pull together three groups for an issue which really involves only one.

Professor Spring said it would be a mistake either to say the systems must be wholly separate from each other, or to dismiss the question. The concerns are real; he felt them each year of the past six in his service on the Consultative Committee. We are moving toward a crisis and should address it, he told the committee. But student interest is genuine and we should not just take apart the existing structure.

Effectiveness and efficiency are different things, he said. It is a mistake to dismantle a system that can work as effectively as it does on some issues (e.g., developing the policy and procedures on sexual harassment and sanctions). But it does not follow that because we work effectively jointly on some matters we should work jointly on all matters. Both faculty

and students seem to be growing in awareness that there are more issues on which we want to work separately (e.g., development of the Student Senate, revision of the Tenure Code).

A proposal. Professor Spring suggested the SCC might try an experiment: In its role of conveying its constituents' views to the President, it might hold one joint meeting quarterly and hold the other meetings separately. FCC and SSCC would bring to the quarterly meetings issues that can be shared effectively between the groups.

Mr. Shope said that the fact that students have a representative on the Board of Regents reflects that students are effective in getting to the place where decisions are made. He asked why that should make anyone want to disassociate with the students.

To ask the administration to meet separately with the two components of SCC, he said, means a dilution of central administration time and conflicts with another concern FCC has expressed. SCC is, we know, not the right body to address all the issues and the separate structures (FCC and SSCC) do exist, are active, and do work on their separate issues.

Mr. Rubenstein recalled that Professor Turner's statement of last spring reflected faculty sense that faculty impact on central administration has been weakened because the students, in their participation with the Regents and in their breakfast meetings with the president, have accesses the faculty don't have.

Mr. Melby read from the report of the 1968 task force which recommended the change in the Senate's composition and was concerned with joint partnership in arriving at decisions. He commented that the philosophy of involving groups beyond the faculty hasn't changed. What bearing the student relationship to the Regents has on the question of representation to the Senate is not obvious, he added.

Mr. Melby suggested that the efficiency of our system is poor not because of the blending of student and faculty governance, but that it results instead from the huge size of the University and the enormous amount of information which no one except those in the administration can grasp. He referred to studies and analyses such as George Keller's Academic Governance that report findings that professional managers and planners hold all the power and really make the decisions. Senates at some institutions are defunct. He called it a testimony to faculty and student concern at Minnesota that the Senate and its committees stay active.

He also remarked that students without institutional access have no access to central administrators (most of whom came from faculty ranks) while faculty do, in both social and collegial situations.

Professor Sundquist expressed his support for Professor Spring's suggestion to experiment with some separation and some juncture, and he asked that SCC work on drawing up lists of topics which are appropriate to each of its branches. He cited tuition as an example of a topic on which student and faculty viewpoints are very different. Maybe these perspectives have to be developed somewhat independently, he said, and then brought to each other.

Mr. Schulte called it a healthy sign that this governance body is willing to take the time to deal with the questions. Volunteer governance structures of every sort have to change with time or they go out, he said. He voiced his support for Professor Spring's experiment proposal.

In closing the discussion, Professor Merwin noted a further reason which has been given for examining the faculty-student governance relationship: the longevity with which people have to live with whatever is done in governance is very different for students than for faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

October 8, 1984

Professor W. D. Spring  
204 Humanities Building  
University of Minnesota  
Morris, Minnesota 56267

Dear Don:

The Committee looks forward with real pleasure to our visit to the Morris campus and those few members who must be elsewhere have expressed their regret. We're hoping your schedule will allow you to join us throughout the planned day -- at the 10:30 SCC business meeting, the 12:30 lunch, and the 2:45 open forum.

The major morning agenda item is discussion of the relationship between faculty and student governance. The FCC and the Student SCC have separately had preliminary talks addressing the Turner motion SCC passed last spring. As we pursue the question this fall, we seek to remind ourselves of the purposes of governance and to appreciate anew the contexts which stimulated first the incorporation of students into the University Senate in the 1960's and then the restructuring of the Senate between 1979 and 1981. It's especially appropriate that this be on our agenda at Morris, for we want to pick your brains. Because of your long active participation in and observation of University affairs, because of your tenure at a coordinate campus, and because of your keen grasp and articulation of issues, we hope to hear your insights into the broad questions concerning governance.

Also, in the morning we'll address the availability of abstracts of Judicial Committee cases and take a first look at issues raised by the Kerr Commission report on presidential leadership.

Cordially,

Jack Merwin, Chair

JM:mp

already at work and hopes for University requests in February, 1958. There had been administrative review of the 1959 portion of the long-range building needs survey, with which the Administrative Committee was generally familiar, and the showing of that survey, along with any new factors of need, had received preliminary consideration. Some details of the work were given to the Committee, but various conferences will be called soon.

10. *Work for a New Interim Commission on Higher Education.* The President reminded the Committee that there was named in the last legislature a new interim commission on higher education and that that group is at work and plans a meeting with University authorities on November 8, 1957. This is one of three such interim commissions of special interest to the University. Another is the one on state building needs, mentioned elsewhere in the minutes, and the third is the group charged with a study of the schools of agriculture.

11. *Report on University Computer Facilities.* An all-University committee on computer facilities had been appointed by the President and certain correspondence from that committee suggested a review of the program. Professor William G. Shepherd discussed the installation possibilities which the committee had explored and Dean Blegen and other members of the Administrative Committee remarked concerning the rapid growth of demand for a modern high-speed computer at the University and on the diversity of instruction and research areas now making use of or requesting use of such devices.

12. *Subcommittee on United Appeal Plan of Staff Solicitation.* There had been discussion in the Administrative Committee (December 5, 1956) of the possibilities for an United Appeal type of solicitation of charitable giving on campus. Since it was the decision of the Committee that this kind of a procedure might be given explicit consideration, the President appointed a subcommittee for that purpose. Named were Comptroller Lunden, Chairman; Dean Kozelka, Dean Morse, and Vice President Willey. The group is to meet at its early convenience, on call of the chairman.

13. *Advisory Committee to University Branch of the State Capitol Credit Union.* Note was taken of the operation of the State Capitol Credit Union, of the establishment of a University branch, and of the existence of a staff advisory committee for the activity.

14. *Granting of Degrees with Distinction and with High Distinction by the School of Dentistry.* It was reported for information that the School of Dentistry proposes to award certain of its Bachelor of Science degrees with distinction or with high distinction, according to standards approximately as maintained elsewhere on campus. There being ample precedent for this, and no question occurring on the authority of the faculty, it was taken by common consent that special distinction will be accorded to these degrees, as appropriate.

R. E. SUMMERS, Secretary

Accepted

VIII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

Reported for Action

- 1. *Election Units.* The present By-Law on election units is as follows: By-Laws, Article I Senate Membership, Elections, and Officers
1. For the purpose of electing members to the Senate, qualified faculty members shall vote as members within each of the following units of the University: (1) Agriculture, (2) Busi-

ness Administration, (3) Child Welfare, (4) Dentistry, (5) Duluth Branch, (6) Education, (7) Extension, (8) General College, (9) Law, (10) Medical Sciences, (11) Pharmacy, (12) Physical Education for Men, (13) Physical Education for Women, (14) Science, Literature, and the Arts, (15) Technology, and (16) Mayo Foundation.

During the past year Child Welfare and Physical Education for Women have become parts of the College of Education and the College of Veterinary Medicine has become a separate unit. In recognition of these changes the following action is recommended:

PROPOSED

That By-Laws, Article I, Senate Membership, Elections, and Officers, Section 1, be amended to delete Child Welfare and Physical Education for women, and add Veterinary Medicine.

Adopted

2. *Student Attendance at Meetings of the University Senate.* The Committee on Business and Rules received the following proposal for study and recommendations:

- a. That all student members of committees of the Senate be permitted to attend the entire meeting of the Senate, when their committee is reporting. This would have the added advantage of providing student committee members with a broader view of their own committee's actions, in that they could become aware of the actions of other committees of the Senate.
b. That the President and Vice-President of the All-University Congress should be permitted to attend all meetings of the University Senate, regardless of their committee membership.

The committee believes that while it is true that a good portion of the business that comes before the Senate is of vital concern to students as well as faculty and should be considered by both students and faculty, it is not unlikely that certain business for Senate consideration would render it quite unwise for students to attend entire Senate sessions. If increased student participation is deemed desirable, the committee believes it should be accomplished by enlarging student representation on Senate committees where students now hold membership and by appointing student members to other committees as may be warranted.

For these reasons, it is recommended that the proposal be not approved.

Action: It was voted to approve the committee recommendation that the proposal be not approved.

ELIO D. MONACHESI, Chairman

IX. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Reported for Action

Background: On May 2, 1957, this Committee presented a report on University curriculum practices. One part of the report was presented to the faculties of the various colleges and departments as a series of recommended principles and practices to be considered whenever curriculum modification is under study. This section was adopted by the Senate and later transmitted by the Committee to all chairmen of curriculum committees.

The other part of the report proposed a study of the over-all curriculum



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

August 30, 1984

Provost John Imholte  
309 Behmler Hall  
University of Minnesota  
Morris, Minnesota 56267

Dear Jack:

Following up on our conversation at the Arboretum earlier this month, the Consultative Committee would welcome the opportunity to visit the Morris Campus this fall and finds October 18 the best possible date. Based on your comments and discussion with Joe Latterell since, I take it that this being homecoming week on your campus would not make the visit a major inconvenience for you.

Joe and I would like to suggest an outline for the day similar to that of three years ago:

- a regular business meeting of SCC in the morning, open to anyone interested;
- a lunch at which the Committee could talk with you and any of your administrators and other staff you would like to convene;
- some time during which SCC members could either tour parts of the campus and facilities according to their interests, or could fit in individual conferences;
- an open forum for faculty to be held simultaneously with and separate from a student event Morris student leaders and the Student SCC would mutually design.

Regarding content for the forum, we have no particular theme in mind. We think it would be useful if Morris faculty members could be encouraged to submit questions to us in advance, so that we can gather any relevant data and background and be prepared to discuss the issues in an

Provost John Imholte  
August 30, 1984  
Page two

informed way. Similarly, if people want to discuss matters on which Morris has the best background, do not hesitate to send us materials in advance.

We will travel to Morris by car. I'd like to propose a starting time for the morning session of no earlier than 10:30 and an afternoon wrap-up of no later than 4:30.

We look forward to the visit with pleasure. While it seems a shame, the fact is that many of the Committee members will be seeing UMM for the first time.

Cordially,



Jack Merwin, Chair,  
Senate Consultative Committee

JM:mp

cc: Joe Latterell  
Charles Farrell  
Paul Schulte

PROPOSAL:

APPROXIMATE SCHEDULE

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

October 18, 1984

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MORRIS

10:15	Coffee and rolls.
10:30	SCC business meeting.
12:30	Lunch: SCC members, UMM Consultative Committee, UMM administration. Presentation by administration.
2:00	Tour or free time. Opportunity to visit some of the most significant new developments on the campus.
2:45 or 3:00	Student general meeting held concurrently with faculty open forum.
4:15	Departure.

For members traveling from the Twin Cities, the above schedule suggests a departure time of approximately 7:00 a.m. and an arrival time in the evening of about 8:15 p.m., allowing for a supper stop.