

**CONCURRENT MEETING OF:
THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
THE FACULTY SENATE
THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 2002

2:30 - 5:00 PM

**25 Mondale Hall--Twin Cities Campus
308 Selvig Hall--Crookston Campus
Kirby Student Center Garden Room--Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room--Morris Campus**

This is a concurrent meeting of the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly. There are 240 voting members of the University Senate, 182 voting members of the Faculty Senate, and 199 voting members of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

**1. ANNOUNCEMENTS
(2 minutes)**

**2. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 20, 2003
Action
(2 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/020220sen.html>

**CAROL WELLS, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

3. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Phillip P. Allen
Professor
Horticultural Science – Waseca
1922- 2002

Kinley Brauer
Professor

History
1935 – 2003

William S. Hays
Professor
Surgery
1964 – 2002

Ralph L. Hossfeld
Professor
Forest Resources
1914 – 2003

Andrew Hustrulid
Professor
Biosystems/Agricultural Engineering
1905 – 2003

Ralph H. Hopp
Director
Wilson Library
1915 – 2003

Albert B. Matongo
Professor
Social Sciences – Morris
1957 – 2003

Paul E. Meehl
Professor
Psychology
1920 – 2003

Carol J. Pederson
Professor
Nursing
1939 – 2003

Charles J. Scott
Professor
Mechanical Engineering
1929 – 2003

STUDENTS

Brent Hendrickson
College of Liberal Arts

Christopher Jenkins
Carlson School of Management

Troy A. Sikkink
Medical School

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

University Senate

Constitutional Amendment (Vice Chair Eligibility)

Approved by the: University Senate October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

Constitutional Amendment (Electronic voting)

Approved by the: University Senate October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

Constitutional Amendment (Faculty voting on tenure and Judicial Committee matters)

Approved by the: University Senate October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

Faculty Senate

Resolution to Eliminate the Waiting Period for the Faculty Retirement Plan

Approved by the: Faculty Senate October 3, 2002

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING (Response due date January 3, 2003)**

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Academic Unit Governance Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 20, 2003

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING (Response due date May 20, 2003)**

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

Twin Cities Campus Assembly

Constitutional Amendment (Vice Chair Eligibility)

Approved by the: TCCA October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

Constitutional Amendment (Electronic voting)

Approved by the: TCCA October 31, 2002

Approved by the: Administration January 28, 2003

Approved by the: Board of Regents March 13, 2003

5. CLERK OF THE SENATE/ASSEMBLY REPORT Nominating Committee Election Results Information for the Faculty Senate

FOR INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill vacancies on Nominating Committee, Professor W. Andrew Collins and Mr. Michael Darger were elected to three-year terms (July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2006).

**CAROL WELLS, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

**6. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Statement on the Regents Search
Information for the University Senate**

The Faculty Consultative Committee of the University of Minnesota Faculty Senate thanks the members of the Regent Candidate Advisory Council for their outstanding work in reviewing and interviewing candidates for the University of Minnesota Board of Regents. The Committee expresses its strong support for the work of the Council and the process that relies upon the Council to identify future Regents. The Committee commends the work of the Council to the Legislature.

**DANIEL FEENEY, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**7. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
Student Protest Resolution
Information for the University Senate**

Student Protest Resolution

Whereas the University of Minnesota encourages students to become active participants in the democratic process, and

Whereas the University of Minnesota seeks to internationalize the curriculum and encourage students to become conscious actors in the world community, and

Whereas demonstrations and protests are a fundamental aspect of political involvement and expression in a democracy, and

Whereas some political issues are so significant that they supersede the content of a single lecture, discussion, or lab in importance in the student's life and learning

Be it resolved that the faculty at University of Minnesota will not penalize students who miss classes, discussions, or labs as a result of participating in a potential, one day student protest on the first day of a United States invasion of Iraq, should the United States invade Iraq in 2003. Nor should those who choose to attend classes be in any way penalized for doing so.

Faculty Sponsors who brought the statement to the Committee on Social Concerns:

- Daniel Brewer, Associate Professor, French and Italian;
- Juliette Cherbuliez, Assistant Professor, French and Italian;
- Carol Chomsky, Professor, Law School;
- Lisa Disch, Associate Professor, Political Science;

- Katherine Fennelly, Professor, Humphrey Institute;
- David L. Fox, Geology and Geophysics;
- Woods Halley, Professor, Physics and Astronomy;
- Kristine F. Miller, Assistant Professor, Landscape Architecture;
- Mark Pedelty, Associate Professor, General College;
- Philip Regal, Professor, Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior;
- Wade Savage, Professor, Philosophy;
- Joe Schwartzberg, Professor Emeritus, Geography;
- George R. Spangler, Professor, Fisheries and Wildlife

Adopted unanimously by the Senate Committee on Social Concerns on March 3, 2003

**MARK PEDELTY, CHAIR
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE**

**8. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
(5 minutes)**

**9. SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Standards for the Semester Conversion
Action by the University Senate
(15 minutes)**

MOTION:

To amend Section 5A of the "Standards for the Semester Conversion" as follows (new language is underlined):

SECTION 4A: The Senate affirms the standard (first adopted by the University Senate on February 16, 1922, and reaffirmed subsequently) that one semester credit is to represent, for the average University of Minnesota undergraduate student, three hours of academic work per week (including lectures, laboratories, recitations, discussion groups, field work, study, and so on), averaged over the term, in order to complete the work of the course. Enrollment for 15 credits in a semester would thus require approximately 45 hours of work per week, on average, over the course of the semester. All grades for academic work are based on the quality of the work submitted, not on hours of effort. It is expected that the academic work required of graduate and professional students will exceed three hours per credit per week or 45 hours per semester.

Instructional units should periodically review course syllabi to determine whether the course credit is appropriate.

All courses proposed for the semester calendar shall include a student workload statement demonstrating how the course conforms to this policy. College and campus curriculum committees and other approving bodies (e.g., the Council on Liberal Education) must consider the student workload statement in reaching a decision on whether to approve a proposed semester course, and should normally reject any course which does not meet, or significantly exceeds, the requirement of three hours of academic work per week for each course credit.

It is understood that professional norms and the nature of the activity may in some cases require more than three hours of work per week or 45 hours per semester per credit. Clinical experiences, some laboratory work, and some studio activities may be unable to adhere to this

three-hour-per-credit standard; with college approval and with appropriate notification to the student of the amount of work expected for the course or educational experience (e.g., in class schedules, bulletins, or syllabi), demands on the student in excess of the 45 hours per semester credit are permissible.

SECTION 5A: The hours of contact time for a course normally shall equal at least the number of credits for the course times the number of weeks the course is offered. In the majority of cases, this would mean the number of contact hours per week would equal the number of credits for the course, but the contact hours need not be spread out evenly by week.

A contact hour is defined for these purposes as formal instruction by an individual appointed for that purpose by the department or faculty member, including faculty members, graduate teaching assistants, teaching specialists, or, in unusual instances, advanced undergraduates. This standard applies to all enrollment periods. The student workload statement (required in the preceding section) must justify fewer total contact hours than the number of credits for the course times the number of weeks the course is offered; contact hours of all types equal to or in excess of at least one hour per week per credit, on average, need not be justified. College and campus curriculum committees and other approving bodies (e.g., the Council on Liberal Education) must consider the contact hours in reaching a decision on whether to approve a proposed semester course; such bodies should normally reject course proposals which have fewer contact hours than the number of credits times the number of weeks the course is offered, barring significant evidence that reduced instructional contact hours are appropriate.

Explicitly exempted from this standard are research seminars, studio courses, clinical experiences, correspondence courses and independent study, directed study or readings or field work, directed research, internships and practicums, honors thesis credits, and other experiences faculty offer to students outside the normal laboratory or classroom setting (many of which include activities beyond the physical boundaries of the campuses). Included in the standard are interactive video classes (which in practice should be no different from in-class instruction) and one-way transmission of instruction from the instructor to the students (it is assumed that other avenues of two-way interaction are used in this instance, such as email and the telephone).

COMMENT:

The Committee on Educational Policy was asked whether Section 5A should be repealed and Section 4A left as the controlling language for student academic workload. After extended discussion, the Committee concluded that 5A, if modified with the addition of one word so that it was not unnecessarily rigid, remained a useful rule governing the amount of contact time that should accompany a course. The Committee concluded it would be unwise to eliminate the rule because having it sets a standard to which the University should continue generally to adhere, eliminating it might allow slippage over the years, and because to do so could unnecessarily cause difficulties for the University at a time of significant budget difficulties.

The Committee thus recommends the Senate approve the one-word amendment.

The Senate Consultative Committee voted 6-5 in favor of the motion.

**MARTIN SAMPSON, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**10. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Student Conduct Code
Action by the University Senate**

MOTION:

To approve amendments to the Student Conduct Code as follows (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is ~~struck-out~~).

A paper copy of the policy will be available at the meeting. Prior to the meeting, the policy will be available on the web at: <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/stuconductcode.html>

MOTION A
UNIVERSITY SENATE/TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY
CONSTITUTION, BYLAWS, AND RULES AMENDMENTS
Action by All Bodies
(5 minutes)

COMMENT:

Agenda Items 11. through 12. are offered as a one motion to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator.

As an amendment to the Assembly Bylaws, a motion requires either a majority of all voting members of the Assembly (100) at one regular or special meeting, or a majority of all members of the Assembly present and voting at each of two meetings.

11. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Intercollegiate Athletics
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 6 the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws, as follows (new language is underlined):

6. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

...

The Regents Policy declares that all aspects of the programs will be administered by central administration, the athletic directors, and the coaches, with direct oversight and involvement by the faculty representatives through an Assembly committee. (Sec. III, subd. 10, para. 2), but also provides that a committee of this Assembly is responsible for the formulation of all policy on intercollegiate athletics within the policies provided by the Board. (Sec. III, subd. 13.) All policies formulated by the committees established by this bylaw will be reported to the Assembly Steering Committee for action and to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly for information after the Assembly Steering Committee has acted. The Assembly has the authority to reverse or change a decision by the Steering Committee.

...

COMMENT:

Before the establishment of the two existing committees that deal with intercollegiate athletics, the bylaw governing the athletic committee provided that all policy approvals and policy changes

Before the establishment of the two existing committees that deal with intercollegiate athletics, the bylaw governing the athletic committee provided that all policy approvals and policy changes were to be brought from the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics to the Assembly Steering Committee. When the new bylaws were adopted, there was no language establishing how policies were to be approved or changed.

The Steering Committee recommends that the authority to approve the policies rest with it, with all adoptions and approvals reported thereafter to the Assembly for information, with the understanding that the Assembly could reverse the action of the Steering Committee. There are a substantial number of these policies, many of which involve details that are not of sufficient importance to bring to the Assembly every time there is a need for change or updating. The changes to these policies are made rather frequently so if they all needed to come to the Assembly for action they would take up a large part of each agenda. Such a process would also slow down the approval.

**DANIEL FEENEY, CHAIR
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE**

**12. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY BYLAWS AMENDMENT
Committee on Committees
Action by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly**

MOTION:

To amend Article III, Section 2 the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws, as follows (new language is underlined):

2. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Senate Committee on Committees

The Senate Committee on Committees appoints members of certain committees of the Senate and advises the Senate Consultative Committee on the committee structure of the Senate. The faculty/academic professional representatives shall serve as the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees and the student representatives shall serve as the Student Senate Committee on Committees.

Membership

The Senate Committee on Committees shall be composed of at least 13 and no more than 15 elected tenured or tenure-track faculty members, at least 2 and no more than 4 elected academic professional members, 6 elected undergraduate students, and one elected graduate/professional student.

COMMENT:

As the Nominating Committee was identifying candidates for the Faculty Committee on Committees, it concluded it would be able to bring more breadth to the membership if it had somewhat more flexibility in appointing faculty from various colleges and disciplines. It thus proposes that it be given the authority to nominate individuals for between 13 and 15 slots. By the same token, it wished to have somewhat more flexibility in identifying candidates for the P&A positions.

This recommendation does not impinge on the student membership of the committee because the two groups only rarely meet together--and when they have recently, there has been no disagreement on issues. The Nominating Committee would not, in any event, be opposed to a similar expansion of the student membership, if the students wished. For now, however, the Nominating Committee would like the option of flexibility as it considers members for 2003-04.

**CHARLES CAMPBELL, CHAIR
NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

END OF MOTION A

**13. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
(10 minutes)**

**14. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT
(10 minutes)**

Questions to the President should be submitted in writing to the University Senate office no later than Tuesday, March 25, 2003.

**15. REPORT OF THE FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS
Discussion by the Faculty Senate
(10 minutes)**

**16. RETIREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
Post-Retirement Health Care Savings Plan
Action by the Faculty Senate
(30 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the following plan:

The merits of a post-retirement health care savings plan (PRHCSP) are evident. A key concern to present (and certainly future) retirees is the cost of health care, which now comes from their post-tax dollars. This is often a rude awakening for faculty entering retirement, as during employment the University not only covers the major portion of the cost, but most additional costs come from an employee's pre-tax dollars.

A PRHCSP has the advantages that each of our present 401a, 403b and 457 plans have; all University and employee contributions come from pre-tax dollars and earnings on the balance invested are not subject to income taxes. The contributions can be invested in one or more funds chosen by the employee from a select group of investment options. A PRHCSP has another very important advantage; upon retirement or termination of employment from the University, withdrawals to pay for health insurance premiums and other appropriate health care costs are not considered to be taxable income. Thus, the PRHCSP avoids taxation on contributions as they go in, on accumulated investment earnings, and on tax post-employment distributions when used for health care

We believe there is no question that the University should embrace this plan. However, there are questions about the amounts to go into the savings plan and the source of these funds. The rules of the program say that each individual in a given "class" must put in the same amount (\$ or % of salary). This "class" cannot be directly defined by age. However, those nearing retirement would probably want to (and certainly should) put in more than younger faculty as they have fewer years to put in funds or have the earnings accrue.

Recommendations:

- 1) For Faculty Members* the "class" is defined as the number of years employed at the University.
- 2) Plan contributions will be collected and invested by Minnesota Life Insurance Company.
- 3) Claim payouts will be managed by the University's Employee Benefits Department.
- 4) Plan implementation will ideally be by July 1, 2003 but no later than January 1, 2004.
- 5) All Faculty Members would have a basic contribution each year to the PRHCSP of one and a half percent (1 1/2%) of salary. This would, for now, come from the 13% contribution of the University to each individual's Faculty Retirement Plan (FRP).
- 6) All Faculty Members who in fall 2003 have served seven years or more would contribute an additional amount as a catch-up provision. Additional contributions from those starting their eighth (8th) or later year in fall 2003 should be in steps of 0.2% per service year up to those in their 25th year of employment at the University when it would reach 3.6%. This additional 3.6% contribution, over and above the one and a half percent new contribution from the University, would be the same for all eligible employees with 24 or more years of service in Fall 2003. For a given individual these contributions would be frozen at the percentage dependent on their service at the U up to fall 2003. It should be clear that the contributions to the new fund would be mandatory; each member of each specific class (years of service with our definition) must contribute in the same manner. The recommended input by faculty members with different degrees of service should be reexamined at least once every three years.
- 7) The additional money, 0.2% to 3.6% of salary, would also come from the university's present 13% contribution to the basic (401a) plan, reducing the input to that plan by the amount going into the PRHCSP. This is not a reduction to the individual's total retirement funds; rather a transfer to a more tax advantaged plan (PRHCSP). If the individual wishes to make up for the smaller amount going to the 401a plan, additional funds could be contributed to either of the Optional Retirement plans (403b or 457) up to the maximum permitted.

The rationale for these contributions is to provide a reasonable sum of money at the time of an individual's retirement. Though people now very close to retirement can never completely catch up to accumulate enough money to pay for a significant fraction of their health care premiums, these additional steps will help and would perhaps be sufficient for those who still have a fair amount of time left before retirement. The goal is to have the accumulated savings in this plan reach something in the order of magnitude of an individual's last year's salary within +/-25%, though this is unrealistic for those with less than 10 to 15 years to retirement. Even one year's salary would probably not provide (based on an annuity analysis) all of the funds for health care insurance, but could provide a significant fraction.

- 8) We also believe that those in Phased Retirement should be in a separate faculty class. For this class we propose a significant increase in the individual's input (essentially taken from the University's contribution to the basic Faculty Retirement Plan) to the PRHCSP, tentatively 10%

of salary. This would greatly help those now approaching retirement through the Phased Retirement Plan. This contribution would be reviewed periodically when the entire plan is reviewed and may eventually be phased out.

9) For faculty in either a Phased Retirement or a Terminal Leave program, there should be a change in how the University pays the additional health care coverage after leaving the University (two or more years depending on eligibility for Medicare benefits). At the time a faculty member ends regular employment at the University, a sum equal to the University cost of faculty health care (either single or family coverage) for the total time involved should be placed in the individual's PRHCSP fund. This would not represent a change in the present University rule, which provides health care benefits for retirees during the phased retirement period.

Summary:

A recurring annual contribution of one and a half percent (1 1/2%) of salary would be made by all participants in the FRP. For the present that would come from the 13% University contribution to each individual's FRP. An additional contribution by each individual who has been here for seven years (i.e. in the eighth year of service) would be 0.2% of salary. For those who have been here longer this would rise by 0.2% for every year of service until the 25th year of service (after 24 years) when the individual's contribution would be 3.6%. This (3.6%) would be the same for those with still longer service. Thus the maximum input to an individual's PRHCSP would be 5.1% of salary. The additional money, 0.2% to 3.6% of salary would also come from the university's present 13% contribution to the basic (401a) plan. Those in phased retirement would make still larger contributions. Those leaving the University through Phased Retirement or Terminal Leave would receive whatever funds due for future health care as a lump sum into their PRHCSP account.

* The actual definition of a "Faculty Member" in the Faculty Retirement Plan is rather lengthy, but is essentially: "any employee of the University who holds an appointment of at least 67% time for a duration of at least nine months and holds one of the following titles (if an employee holds more than one appointment, the first title of appointment will govern): a) Faculty (94xx classes); b) Administrative staff members with personnel classifications 9301-9399; c) Professional staff members with personnel classifications 9701 through 9799; and d) University of Minnesota Extension Service (MES) academic staff with personnel classifications 9621 through 9640 who are not eligible for a federal appointment. A "T" temporary appointment does not affect an employee's status in one of the above-described categories. "Faculty Member," however, shall not include the following: 1) Faculty members with Visiting, Adjunct, or Clinical prefixes; 2) Staff members filling administrative or professional positions on an acting basis; 3) Research Specialists (9755); 4) Clinical Preceptors (9756); and 5) Industrial Fellows (9757)."

There are exclusions from the PRHCSP: "An employee shall be ineligible for future contributions to the PRHCSP if the MSRS determines that the employee falls within any one of the following categories: a) The employee is a foreign national and plans to return to the country in which he or she is a citizen upon termination of public employment. b) The employee will receive employer-paid post retirement health care coverage through his/her public employer, or through a spouse's employer. The insurance must provide full-coverage for the employee's lifetime. c) The employee will receive post retirement health care coverage from the military."

COMMENT:

Note, because of the difficult financial circumstances for the University this year, we have modified our previous plan which was submitted 13 December 2002. In that plan, we had proposed one-and-a-half percent of salary would be contributed by the University to the Post-

Retirement Health Care Saving Plan (PRHCSP). Now the expectation is a zero salary increase, and yet we believe that this program should be initiated now. Thus, we propose that for the present, the base one-and-a-half percent of the salary going into PRHCSP for all faculty would come out of the University's present contribution to the retirement plan (13% of salary). Aside from this, the plan would be the same as recommended previously, including the increased contributions for those who had been at the University seven years or more and the increased contribution for those in phase-retirement.

There are two very strong caveats that we would like to add. First, we are going under the assumption that there will be no additional funds for any University group this year for PRHCSP. If this is not the case, then we would expect that similar funds would go into PRHCSP for faculty, rather than having all of the money coming out of the faculty members' present retirement plan contributions.

Second, we ask that in the future, when the University again reaches a point that there are reasonable new funds, that the one-and-a-half percent taken out of the basic faculty retirement plan would be put back in, returning the University's FRP contribution to 13% of salary. The University FRP has been an excellent one. We greatly regret the need to reduce the basic plan by this change yet we think overall it is a good idea. However in the future, we are very desirous of seeing the plan return to its present level of contributions.

This plan was approved by the :

- Retirement Subcommittee on Monday, March 10, 2003,
- Faculty Affairs Committee on Tuesday, March 11, 2003,
- Faculty Consultative Committee on Thursday, March 14, 2003.

**RICHARD GOLDSTEIN, CHAIR
RETIREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE**

**JOHN FOSSUM, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

17. OLD BUSINESS

18. NEW BUSINESS

19. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE STUDENT SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 2003

11:30 AM - 1:30 PM

**25 Mondale Hall--Twin Cities Campus
308 Selvig Hall--Crookston Campus
Kirby Student Center Garden Room--Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room--Morris Campus**

This is a meeting of the Student Senate. There are 53 voting members of the Student Senate. A simple majority must be present for a quorum. Most actions require only a simple majority for approval. Actions requiring special majorities for approval are noted under each of those items.

**1. ANNOUNCEMENTS
(2 minutes)**

**2. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 20, 2003
Action
(2 minutes)**

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URLs. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/030220stu.html>

**CAROL WELLS, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

**3. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT
(5 minutes)**

**4. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(5 minutes)**

**5. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES
(5 minutes)**

**6. DISCUSSION OF THE STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
TASK FORCE
(5 minutes)**

7. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

**Student Conduct Code
Action
(15 minutes)**

A paper copy of the policy will be available at the meeting. Prior to the meeting, the policy will be available on the web at: <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/stuconductcode.html>

**8. MINNESOTA PRIVATE COLLEGE COUNCIL PROPOSAL
Discussion
(10 minutes)**

9. OLD BUSINESS

10. NEW BUSINESS

11. ADJOURNMENT

SSCC Draft Proposal

By

University Student Senate Task Force

R. Reid LeBeau II, Chair of Task Force

Khama Sharp, U of M, Morris

Tom Rutledge, U of M, Duluth

Jean Korkowski, U of M, Crookston

Jake Elo, U of M, Twin Cities, Minneapolis Campus

Charge of the Task Force:

To review the current structure of the SSCC and make suggestions and recommendations for the purpose and future of the committee.

Background:

The Student Senate Consultative Committee is the executive and steering committee of the Student Senate and assists the Senate Chair in setting the agenda for each Senate meeting. The SSCC is made up of one elected representative from each coordinate campus and five members form the Twin Cities campus. The SSCC chair, elected by its members, serves on other University Senate committees besides chairing the SSCC meetings. Over that past five years conflict between the Senate and the SSCC have grown. Questions have been raised throughout the University and the Administration as to which body serves as the official voice of the students of the University. The SSCC has been given wide latitude in making University wide decisions, and speaking for students. It is necessary to decide who the SSCC should function in the current University governance system. How best can the SSCC fulfill its duties and responsibilities, and how can this aspect of the Student Senate be structured to maximize the influence and authority that students have within the University system and the state of Minnesota.

Goals:

The overall goal of a possible SSCC modification would be to eliminate the systemic confusion created by the existence of a de facto bi partied governmental system. Currently, administration, students, faculty, general public, and no doubt the state legislature, have wondered exactly what body of student government represents the entire University of Minnesota system. With each campus having their own student government, and the Twin Cities campuses have both undergraduate, graduate, and senate governments, the confusion is justified. The overall of goal of any modification must be:

- (1) To make the student governmental system more responsive and responsible to student needs.
- (2) To be organized in such a fashion that all interested parties are able to clearly identify the scope and responsibility of each facet of student government.

- (3) To eliminate the internal competition between those with elected duties, by clearly outlining the role and scope of each office.

Identifying the Options:

At first blush the some options leap out as possible solutions to the current SSCC conflict. It is important to note that each of these is presented in a form that can be combined with the others. Each item has an individual component that can be modified or supplemented by another.

Option 1:

Restructuring Membership/ Reasserting its Position

The Senate would change the overall membership of the SSCC. To address the conflicts between the Senate Chair and the Chair of the SSCC, these functions would be consolidated into one role. Two possible options are:

(1) Equal Membership: Two members from each campus assembly.

It would serve as the Executive Committee of the Senate and would be headed by the Senate Chair. The Senate Chair would assume the head of this committee by virtue of his election to the Chair position. This would provide a more streamlined hierarchical structure. The Executive Committee would set the agenda for each Senate meeting but would not act in lieu of the Senate. They would have the ability to call Senate meetings as they are needed and set the year long calendar for business. They would approve the Chair's appointments to Student Senate Committee's, and could work on lobbying efforts.

(2) Proportional Membership:

The Student Senate would no longer meet apart from meetings of the full University Senate. The SSCC would be charged with performing any critical duties currently performed by the full Student Senate. The Chair of the Senate and SSCC Chair would be consolidated into the SSCC Chair position. The full Student Senate would elect the SSCC Chair. The Vice Chair would be elected by the SSCC.

Representation would be restructured so that representation would be more based on the student population of each campus. After this restructuring each student association and assembly would have the following number of seats:

Crookston (CSA)	- 1
Duluth (UMDSA)	- 2
Morris (MCSA)	-1
Twin Cities (MSA)	-3
Graduate (GAPSA)	-2

In addition to their current duties, SSCC members from each campus would act as "Senate Coordinators" for the Student Senators from their campus. This would involve communicating important information, and whatever additional duties each student association or assembly deems appropriate.

Option 2

President's Advisory Board

The Senate would vote to eliminate the SSCC and replace it with a President's Advisory Board. The Board would be comprised of each President from all of the University Campuses. The Board would be chaired by the Senate Chair and would be responsible for setting the agenda for each Senate meeting. The President's Board would improve the relationships between the various campuses of the University and would be the only group that assembles all of the Presidents (due to the absence of the SLC.) Each campus would be represented by the person elected by their entire student body and would be most responsive to the needs of their own campus. The Board would also be able to coordinate better with the Central Administration on issues key to their campus.

For reasons of decentralization from particular people; it may also be advisable to comprise the Board with one of the campus Vice Presidents, particularly that for Student Affairs, or the equivalent. They would have the ability to call Senate meetings as they are needed and set the year long calendar for business. They would approve the Chair's appointments to Student Senate Committee's, and could work on lobbying efforts.

Option 3:

SSCC as an Advisory Committee

The Senate would modify the SSCC rules to make them a wholly advisory committee with no binding power over Senate business and would include campus leadership beyond the now elected/appointed members. The SSCC chair would serve as an advisor to the Senate Chair, but at no time would be empowered to act in lieu of the Senate Chair. This structure would centralize the leadership of the Senate while at the same time giving the campuses a limited role in determining Senate business. This would also provide a more informal setting for airing grievances and attacking systemic problems in a more open environment.

Committee Findings

A majority of the committee has expressed their support for Option 1 § 1. The minority have expressed their support for option 1 § 2. The division is not wide and the disagreements are not great. Overall we agree that the Senate and SSCC relationship needs to be improved and that the best way to effectuate this is to significantly change the structure of the Senate and/or SSCC. We recommend that the Senate act decisively and choose one of the options listed that brings about this change. We recognize that change is often viewed with skepticism and it is often seen as the better part of valor to approach these decisions with caution. Yet, the divide within the Senate and the ever diminishing unified voice of the students of this University is rapidly deteriorating. Delaying in this decision will only compound the current quagmire and succeed in removing all legitimacy from centralized student governance. We strongly encourage action on this matter, and we thank you for your time.

Respectfully Submitted on behalf of the entire Task Force,
R. Reid LeBeau II

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 1 of 9

DRAFT**STUDENT CONDUCT CODE****SECTION I. INTRODUCTION.**

Subd. 1. Purpose. ~~The Regents of the University of Minnesota are charged with the duty of adopting regulations for the governance of the University (Territorial Laws, 1851, sec. 3; Minn. Const., art. VIII, sec. 3) to provide educational opportunities to its students, to transmit and advance knowledge and to provide a wide range of services to both students and the general public. To carry out these responsibilities, Policy Statement. It is the policy of the University of Minnesota (University) that certain minimum standards of conduct are necessary to safeguard the rights, opportunities, and welfare of students, faculty, staff, and guests of the University community and to assure protection of the interests of the University as it seeks to carry out its mission.~~

~~†The University requires a community free from violence, threats, and intimidation; protective of free inquiry; respectful of the rights of others; open to change; supportive of democratic and lawful procedures; and dedicated to the a rational and orderly approach to the resolution of human problems conflict. To safeguard the rights, opportunities, and welfare of students, faculty, staff, and guests of the University community, and to assure protection of the interests of the University as it seeks to carry out its mission on behalf of the citizens of Minnesota, certain minimum standards of conduct become necessary.~~

Subd. 2. Establishment of Standards of Student Conduct. ~~In the past, the University had been guided by a code of conduct consisting of rules, statement, and policies stemming from many sources. As the structure of the University expanded and in recognition of the need for the clarification and definition of standards of behavior in contemporary society, the Committee on Student Behavior and the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs recommended that the University establish and maintain standards of student conduct.~~

Subd. 32. President's Responsibility Delegation of Authority. ~~The president or delegate shall was directed to promulgate these standards of conduct on all campuses with appropriate explanation, including publication and distribution of the Student Conduct Code (Code), procedures, and standards governing student conduct at the University.~~

Subd. 3. Application. ~~This policy applies to all students and student organizations of the University.~~

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 2 of 9

DRAFT

~~Subd. 4. Board Adoption. This statement of standards was adopted by the Board of Regents in 1970. A revision of section IV, the conduct code was approved by the board at its December 1974 meeting. A revision of the "Procedures for Disciplinary Proceedings—Twin Cities Campus" was approved at the July 1978 meeting of the board. These revisions were developed through consultation with the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs and are the result of lengthy review by many students, faculty, and staff.~~

~~Subd. 5. Sexual Harassment Policy. The "Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment" was approved by the University Senate at its May 1984 meeting. The policy applies to the entire University and to the conduct of students, civil service persons, and academic staff alike.~~

~~Subd. 6. Publication of Policies. This statement of standards, including the conduct code and the Twin Cities disciplinary procedure, and the Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment are published and made available on request in order to inform all members of the University community of the code, procedures and standards governing student conduct at the University of Minnesota.~~

SECTION II. INTERESTS OF THE UNIVERSITY RELEVANT TO A CODE.

Over a period of years, University adjudicative bodies have decided questions of jurisdiction by identifying University interests. These interests listed below provide a substantial foundation for the building of a code.

- (1) The University has a primary concern with matters ~~which~~ that impinge upon academic achievement and integrity.
- (2) The University has a fundamental concern with conduct ~~which~~ that breaches the peace, causes disorder, and substantially interferes with the rights of others.
- (3) The University has a ~~special interest in~~ fundamental concern with behavior ~~which~~ that threatens or actions ~~which~~ that imperil the physical and mental health and safety of members of the University community.
- (4) The University has an obligation to protect its property and the property of members of its community from theft, damage, destruction, or misuse.

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 3 of 9

DRAFT

- (5) The University has a commitment to enforce its contractual agreements.
- (6) The University has an obligation to support and be guided by applicable state and federal laws ~~of the land~~.
- (7) The University has a concern about behavior repugnant to or inconsistent with an educational climate.

SECTION III. THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF DUAL MEMBERSHIP.

Students are both members of the University community and citizens of the state. As citizens, students are responsible to the community of which they are a part, and the University neither substitutes for nor interferes with regular legal processes. Students are also responsible for offenses against that academic community. Therefore, an action involving the student in a legal proceeding in a civil or criminal court does not necessarily free the student of responsibility for this conduct in a University proceeding. When a student is charged in both jurisdictions, the University will decide on the basis of its interest and the interest of the student whether ~~or not~~ to proceed with its internal review simultaneously or to defer action.

SECTION IIIV. CONDUCT CODE DISCIPLINARY OFFENSES.

Listed below are the ~~The following are defined as~~ disciplinary offenses actionable by the University:

- (1) ~~Subd. 1.~~ Scholastic Dishonesty. Scholastic dishonesty means plagiarizing; cheating on assignments or examinations; engaging in unauthorized collaboration on academic work; taking, acquiring, or using test materials without faculty permission; submitting false or incomplete records of academic achievement; acting alone or in cooperation with another to falsify records or to obtain dishonestly grades, honors, awards, or professional endorsement; Submission of false records of academic achievement; cheating on assignments or examinations; plagiarizing; altering, forging, or misusing a University academic record; or fabricating or falsifying data, research procedures, or data analysis ~~taking, acquiring, or using test materials without faculty permission; acting alone or in cooperation with another to falsify records or to obtain dishonestly grades, honors, awards, or professional endorsement.~~

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

Page 4 of 9

DRAFT

- (2) Disruptive Classroom Conduct. Disruptive classroom conduct means engaging in behavior that substantially or repeatedly interrupts either the instructor's ability to teach or student learning. The classroom extends to any setting where a student is engaged in work toward academic credit or satisfaction of program-based requirements or related activities.
- (3) ~~Subd. 2.~~ Falsification. Falsification means ~~W~~willfully providing University offices or officials with false, misleading, or incomplete information; ~~intentionally making a false report of a bomb, fire, natural disaster, or other emergency to a University official or an emergency service agency, misusing, altering, forging, falsifying, or transferring to another person University issued identification; forging or altering without proper authorization official University records or documents or conspiring with or inducing others to forge or alter without proper authorization University records or documents; misusing, altering, forging, falsifying, or transferring to another person University-issued identification; or intentionally making a false report of a bomb, fire, natural disaster, or other emergency to a University official or an emergency service agency.~~
- (4) ~~Subd. 3.~~ Identification and Compliance-Refusal to Identify and Comply. Refusal to identify and comply means ~~W~~willfully refusing to or falsely identifying one's self; or willfully failing to comply with a proper order or summons when requested by an authorized University official.
- (5) Attempts to Injure or Defraud. Attempts to injure or defraud means making, forging, printing, reproducing, copying, or altering any record, document, writing, or identification used or maintained by the University when done with intent to injure, defraud, or misinform.
- (6) Threatening, Harassing, or Assaultive Conduct on Campus. Threatening, harassing, or assaultive conduct on campus means engaging in conduct on campus that endangers or threatens to endanger the health, safety, or welfare of another person, including, but not limited to, threatening, harassing, or assaultive behavior.
- (7) Disorderly Conduct on Campus. Disorderly conduct on campus means engaging in conduct on campus that incites or threatens to incite an assault or breach of the peace; breaching the peace; obstructing or disrupting teaching, research, administrative, and public service functions; or obstructing or disrupting

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

Page 5 of 9

DRAFT

- disciplinary procedures or authorized University activities.
- (8) Possession or Use of Weapons on Campus. Possession or use of weapons on campus means possessing or using on campus weapons or articles or substances usable as weapons, including, but not limited to, firearms, incendiary devices, explosives, and dangerous biological or chemical agents, except in those instances when expressly authorized by an appropriate University authority for activities properly requiring the use or possession of the item.
- (9) Unauthorized Possession or Use of Drugs or Alcohol on Campus. Unauthorized possession or use of drugs or alcohol on campus means possessing or using drugs or alcohol without authorization.
- (10) Subd. 4. Unauthorized Use of University Facilities and Services. Unauthorized use of University facilities and services means wrongfully using University properties or facilities; ~~Acting to obtain fraudulently—by deceit, by unauthorized procedures, by bad checks, by misrepresentation—goods, quarters, services, or funds from University departments or student organizations or individuals acting in their behalf; misusing, altering, or damaging~~ of fire-fighting equipment, safety devices, or other emergency equipment or ~~interference in~~ with the performance of those specifically charged with to carrying out emergency services; ~~wrongful use of University properties or facilities or acting to obtain fraudulently—through deceit, unauthorized procedures, bad checks, or misrepresentation—goods, quarters, services, or funds from University departments or student organizations or individuals acting in their behalf.~~
- ~~Subd. 5. —Disorderly Conduct on Campus. Threats to, physical abuse of, or harassment which threatens to or endangers the health, safety, or welfare of a member of the University community; breach of the peace; physical assaulting another; fighting; obstructing or disrupting teaching, research, administrative, and public service functions; obstructing or disrupting disciplinary procedures or authorized University activities; vandalism.~~
- (11) Subd. 6. Theft, and Property Damage, and Vandalism. Theft, property damage, and vandalism include ~~T~~theft or embezzlement of, ~~destruction of,~~ damage to, ~~destruction of,~~ unauthorized possession of, or wrongful sale or gift of property belonging to the University, a member of the University community, or a campus guest.
- (12) Unauthorized Access. Unauthorized access means accessing without

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 6 of 9

DRAFT

authorization University property, facilities, or services, or obtaining or providing to another person the means of such unauthorized access, including, but not limited to, using or providing without authorization keys, access cards, or access codes.

- (13) Disruptive Behavior. Disruptive behavior means willfully disrupting University events; participating in a campus demonstration that disrupts the normal operations of the University and infringes on the rights of other individuals; leading or inciting others to disrupt scheduled or normal activities of the University; engaging in intentional obstruction that interferes with freedom of movement, either pedestrian or vehicular, on campus; using sound amplification equipment on campus without authorization; or making or causing noise, regardless of the means, that disturbs authorized University activities or functions.

- (14) ~~Subd. 7. Violation of University Rules. Violation of the University rules means engaging in conduct that violates University, college collegiate, or departmental, union and residence regulations which that have been posted or publicized, including provisions contained in University contracts with students shall be deemed "rules" under this code.~~

~~Subd. 8. Weapons on Campus. Possession of firearms, incendiary devices, explosives, articles, or substances usable as weapons or means of disruption of legitimate campus functions, activities, or assemblies, or using firearms, incendiary devices, explosives, articles, or substances calculated to intimidate, disturb, discomfort, or injure a member of the University community, except in those instances when expressly authorized by the head of a University department whose activities properly require the use or possession of any of the enumerated items.~~

~~Subd. 9. Disruptive Demonstrations. Intentional participation in a campus demonstration which disrupts the normal operations of the University and infringes on the rights of other members of the University community; leading or inciting others to disrupt scheduled and/or normal activities of any campus building or area; intentional obstruction which unreasonably interferes with freedom of movement, both pedestrian and vehicular, on campus.~~

~~Subd. 10. Keys. Possession, making, or causing to be made any key to operate locks or locking mechanisms on campus without proper authorization or using or giving to another a key for which there has been no proper authorization.~~

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY

Page 7 of 9

DRAFT

(15) ~~Subd. 11. Violations of Federal or State Laws on Campus. When the~~
~~v~~Violation of a federal or state laws on campus means engaging in conduct on
campus that violates a federal or state law, including, but not limited to, those
laws governing alcoholic beverages, drugs, gambling, sex offenses, indecent
conduct, or arson, occurs on campus, the offense will also constitute an offense
against the University community.

~~Subd. 12. Sound Amplification. Using sound amplification equipment such as a~~
~~bullhorn on campus or in a campus building without written permission of the vice president~~
~~for student affairs or the vice president's designee, except when such use is authorized for~~
~~official University purposes.~~

~~Subd. 13. Disruptive Noises. Making noise or causing noise to be made with objects~~
~~and instruments which disturbs classes, meetings, office procedures, and other~~
~~authorized University activities.~~

~~Subd. 14. Attempts to Injure or Defraud. To make, forge, print, reproduce, copy,~~
~~or alter any record, document, writing, or identification used or maintained by the University~~
~~when done with intent to injure, defraud or misinform.~~

~~Subd. 15. Disruption of University Events. Unauthorized entry upon the playing~~
~~performance area or the spectator areas of any athletic contest, exhibition, or other event.~~

(16) ~~Subd. 16. Persistent Violations. Persistent violations means engaging in~~
~~R~~Repeated conduct or action in violation of the above this cCode is relevant in
determining an applicant's or a student's membership in the University.

SECTION IV. PROCEDURES AND SANCTIONS.

Listed below are the sanctions available if any person student or student organization
is found guilty or pleads guilty to an offense under this cCode, the sanctions available shall
include the following.

- (1) ~~Subd. 1.~~ **Subd. 1.** Warning and Admonition. A warning or admonition means ~~T~~the
issuance of an oral or written warning, admonition, or reprimand.
- (2) ~~Subd. 2.~~ **Subd. 2.** Required Compliance. Carrying out Required compliance means
Ssatisfying a bona fide University rule requirement as a condition for being
admission~~tted~~ or continuing membership in the University; restriction of

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY**

Page 8 of 9

DRAFT

privileges; restitution; removal from quarters; or withholding of diploma and degree for a specified period of time.

- (3) ~~Subd. 3:~~ Confiscation. Confiscation means confiscation of goods used or possessed in violation of University regulations; or confiscation of falsified identification or identification wrongly used.
- (4) ~~Subd. 4:~~ Probation. Probation means special status with conditions imposed for a limited time after determination of misconduct.
- (5) ~~Subd. 5:~~ Suspension or Expulsion. Suspension or expulsion means termination of status in a given course for not more than one calendar year, termination of student status for not more than one calendar year, or indefinite termination of student status.
- (6) ~~Subd. 6:~~ Interim Suspension. Pending a hearing before the appropriate disciplinary committee, the president or delegate may impose immediate suspension with resultant loss of all student rights and privileges; after evaluating the evidence received, the identification of parties, and the safety and well-being of students, faculty, staff, campus guests, and University property, and, in those cases where Immediate suspension is reserved for those cases in which: (a) there is an indication that a student's misconduct will be repeated or continued or (b) where the president or delegate believes it immediate suspension is necessary to permit the University to carry on its functions, ~~impose immediate suspension with resultant loss of all student rights and privileges, pending hearing before the appropriate disciplinary committee.~~ The student has a right to a prompt hearing before the president or ~~the president's delegates~~ signee on the limited questions of identification and whether the interim suspension should remain in effect until the full hearing is completed.

SECTION VI. REPEAL OF CONTRADICTORY RULES:

~~This student code supersedes the definition of student misconduct published in the "Laws and Regulations Governing the University of Minnesota," 1931 edition, sections I and II of the regent actions of June 10, 1914, and any other university, college, or departmental regulations found in contradiction.~~

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

Adopted: July 10, 1970

Amended: December 13, 1974; March 11, 1994

Supersedes: (see end of policy)

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY****DRAFT**

Page 9 of 9

SECTION VH. APPEALS OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE.

Any student or student organization charged with violation of a University rule or standard must have the opportunity to receive a fundamentally fair hearing and access to at least one campus-wide appeal. In order to safeguard the rights of students and student organizations, the president or delegate shall ensure that each campus must have developed and approved has an appeals procedure to govern alleged violations of this Code those cases of individual scholastic, non-scholastic, and student organization misconduct heard in original campus jurisdictions. The appeals procedure must shall reflect the University's concern for both substantive and procedural fairness for the accused student or student organization, including both the student's/student organization's and institution's right of all parties to the resolution of a case within a reasonable period of time.

The procedure must specifically include sections stating:

- (1) ~~the~~ grounds for an appeal;
- (2) ~~the~~ procedures for filing an appeal; and
- (3) the nature of an appellate review.

COMMENT:

The Student Senate Consultative Committee accepted the changes proposed with three conditions that were outlined by Vice President Kathy Brown. One, jurisdiction is defined as on University of Minnesota owned property, directly related to the classroom environment, or representing the University (i.e. as an athlete). Two, the revisions are to update the language, not to change the current interpretation of the Code. Three, past judgments and rulings will continue to be precedents. The committee felt no radical changes would not bring about new interpretations of the code and therefore the students of the University would continue to be protected by the Code.

**JUDY BERNING, CHAIR
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS
Statement on Intercollegiate Athletics

Eugene Borgida, Chair
January 24, 2002

"The Advisory Committee on Athletics (ACA) is a committee established to provide advice and consultation to the President, to the senior administrator responsible for athletics (i.e., Vice President Brown), and to the departments of intercollegiate athletics on policies and other major decisions. Of the two athletics committees, the ACA has the broadest membership including faculty, collegiate deans, students, alumni, and civil service staff. In addition, both athletics department directors, the director of academic counseling, and the director of the University's compliance office serve as non-voting ex-officio members. Since its inception last year, the ACA has been charged with advising the athletics directors on a variety of policy matters, consulting with the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA) when appropriate, providing advice and consultation on issues of gender equity, student welfare, the physical facilities and services and their use, and the finances of the athletics departments. There are a few other designated responsibilities, but these represent the key set of issues that the committee has dealt with intensely for the past year and a half.

The ACA, as a committee, has immersed itself in the wide range of issues concerning intercollegiate athletics at the University, and strongly wishes to underscore the complexity of the entire set of issues surrounding the concerns that have been expressed about the current and projected state of funding for intercollegiate athletics. In contrast to other statements of concern about this matter that have been expressed, the ACA believes that budget concerns about intercollegiate athletics must be considered thoroughly and systematically in the context of institutional and academic values, in the context of complex organizational and legal issues, and most certainly in the context of student welfare concerns and the ways in which the undergraduate experience for student-athletes at this institution would be affected, favorably and unfavorably. The ACA asks that Joseph Massey, chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), convey to the Regents public forum the committee's belief that the complexity of this context must be considered carefully before decisions are made about subsidies and cost savings and other budgetary matters. To focus narrowly and single mindedly on the financial aspects of this situation would be unwise."

Endorsed by the ACA on January 24, 2002.

EUGENE BORGIDA, CHAIR
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS

**FACULTY ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
STATEMENT ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

The Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA) has responsibility for eligibility, compliance, and other issues relating to academic integrity of participants in the programs. In this regard, FAOCIA advises the senior administrator responsible for athletics, the Provost, the President, and the Assembly Steering Committee regarding the support for academic achievement. Although FAOCIA does not have direct fiscal oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics, any financial and/or structural decisions that impact the quality of academic standards and opportunities for success are of great concern. Therefore, we believe the Board of Regents should consider the following principles in resolving the financial problems associated with intercollegiate athletics at the University of Minnesota:

1. Academic services for student-athletes are not compromised. Access to academic support services for student-athletes that assist the student to reconcile the demands of academics and sports must be preserved.
2. Any proposed changes that may impact academic support be reviewed by FAOCIA prior to implementation, particularly those that make hinder a student-athlete's progress toward a degree.
3. The welfare of student-athletes be a high priority as discussion of changes takes place, during any transitions that may occur, and after, if in fact changes are made. Provisions should be made to insure that the university maintains commitments of financial support it made to student athletes that influenced their decisions to attend the University of Minnesota. If, in this process, any intercollegiate sport is discontinued, scholarships should be honored for student-athletes electing to complete their degrees at the University of Minnesota.
4. At no time should the role of the Office of Athletics Compliance be compromised. This is particularly important during times of transition as the University needs to maintain the standards set forth in its own policies, those of the Big Ten, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Endorsed by the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee January 24, 2002

**LAURA COFFIN KOCH, CHAIR
FACULTY ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**