



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee  
5-255 Millard Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455  
Telephone (612) 373-3226

DRAFT

Approved 4/24/80

MINUTES

Facilitative Committee of the University Senate  
March 18, 1980

A meeting of the Facilitative Committee of the University Senate was called to order by Richard Purple, Chairman of the Senate Consultative Committee, at 10:30 a.m. on March 18, 1980, in room 402 of the Campus Club. Others present were Benjamin Bayman, Committee on Committees (for V. Fredericks); Chuck Wolfram, Judicial (for R. Park); Arthur Williams, SCFA; Russell Hobbie, Vice-Chairman of the Senate; Isabel Harris, Academic Standing, Paul Grambsch, SCRAP; Josef Altholz, Business and Rules; Jim Terwilliger, SCEP; Rich Kottke, Vice-Chairman of the Assembly; Frank Wood, Social Concerns; and Don Spring, Chairman of the SCC Subcommittee on Senate Reorganization.

Minutes. A corrected page 5 to the minutes of February 21 was distributed. The minutes of that meeting were approved as thereby amended.

Senate Reorganization Proposal. Professor Purple turned the meeting over to Professor Spring for his presentation. (All the participants had previously received a copy of the subcommittee proposal.) Professor Spring first outlined what course the proposal will now follow. On March 20 the subcommittee will seek the approval in principle of the SCC of the present draft. The Senate must approve the changes in principle, after which the exact task of Business and Rules and of the Committee on Committees will become clearer. The Committee on Committees presumably will have to consult with each of the committees regarding its definition and role in the new structure. The hope is that the completed plan can be brought before the Senate in time to make the proposed changes operable a year from now, coinciding with the Handbook revision and Senate elections.

Professor Spring then detailed the modifications the subcommittee has suggested to the latest draft. He distributed a new diagram to replace the one on page 3.

Committee membership. Student and faculty members of the subcommittee are concerned about the present opportunity for a very small number of students to control the student Committee on Committees and abuse the appointment procedures. They have recommended that the student Committee on Committees and the faculty Committee on Committees meet jointly for the ratification of appointments. A separate recommendation is that membership on two committees at one time be the maximum for both faculty and students and that membership on one be the norm. It was asked whether having both safeguards was not redundant. Professor Purple supported the plan of having two screens, given the concern, voiced also among the Regents, that with current low student participation in student government, irresponsible students can and sometimes do get elected.

Professor Purple inquired how committee chairs are to be designated. Professor Spring replied that the Committee on Committees will have to address itself to this.

Considering Recommendation 10, the selection process for members of the Judiciary Committee, Professor Purple cautioned that in certain departments the heads would unilaterally pick the nominees if there were no specific guard against that. Professor Wolfram suggested the Committee on Committees use an expanded list from which it can choose, including lists compiled by the Senate. There was also sentiment for requiring faculty participation in nominating departmental members.

Professor Grambsch voiced his desire for some guarantee of staff support for Senate committees. Some committees presently have no staff assigned. Only the SCC and Judicial, in fact, have regular staff support presently. The committees need to have records kept, and kept well. He hopes for a modest budgetary commitment to provide staff. Professor Purple suggested increasing Marilee Ward's Senate office staff. (She now has one part-time secretary.) Professors Grambsch and Spring endorsed the usefulness of staff also in providing continuity, a carry-over person familiar with committee operations. Professor Grambsch further recommended a manual for new committee chairs. Professor Terwilliger commented that SCEP receives many reports with orders to respond. Moreover, SCEP's first two secretaries in the current academic year have already been drawn off. When SCEP has ideas of its own to pursue, it has no resources to follow them through. As a case in point, he cited the assignment on Outreach. SCEP is charged with overseeing the pilot studies mandated by the Senate. SCEP has no resources to develop such studies, and the Office of Academic Affairs has not been able to initiate them yet either. It appears they will not get done this year.

Professor Spring commented on some things the subcommittee has not done. It has not responded favorably to the recommendation for a council on undergraduate education. The group studied the Brasted memo and agree that there are concerns, but they regard the concerns as substantive and not structural. The Select Committee (Watson Committee) addressed the issue in its report of a year ago, and the subcommittee agrees it deserves attention. One consequence they foresee resulting from a C.U.E. would be a proliferation of similar councils for other areas of the University. The subcommittee will ask the SCC to take the issue under advisement in its steering capacity, with the suggestion it be forwarded for SCEP's consideration.

A suggestion from Robert Hexter on improving the flow of information between the Senate and the C.A.O. is not currently being pursued by the subcommittee.

Assembly Committee Structure. The charge to the subcommittee was to address Senate structure. Changes in the Senate may have repercussions in the paralleling structure of the Assembly. The subcommittee suggests referring the question to the Assembly Consultative Committee which may want to appoint its own subcommittee to modify in appropriate ways the Assembly committee structure.

There is still a strong inclination within the reorganization subcommittee to move some committees, whose concern is exclusively or nearly exclusively

with Twin Cities campus affairs, to the rubric of Assembly committees, leaving open some possibility of liaison when all-University matters do arise. The committees in question are ROTC, Library and Summer Sessions. In all cases the committee chair or the committee membership vigorously disagree.

Mr. Kottke said that the Assembly presently performs no substantial functions. Professor Altholz stated that while both Morris and Duluth have genuine governing assemblies, the Twin Cities does not. It makes sense for the Twin Cities campus to have an Assembly voice of its own. Professor Spring said it needs to be recognized that opposition will come from the committees themselves if it is recommended they become assembly committees. In the recommended restructuring, no committees have been eliminated. Professor Altholz summarized the two substantial differences in the actual recommendation from the Watson Report which stimulated it: the subcommittee (1) did not cut down the number of committees and (2) did not incorporate the task force approach.

Professor Purple acknowledged the general consensus within the Facilitative Committee for the proposal. He anticipates that the SCC will also approve in principle and put the plan before the Senate. He further acknowledged the perceived need for staff support. Professor Spring indicated the subcommittee might ask the SCC to address this need.

Professor Purple rhetorically raised the question of whether the University community is much aware of the amount of committee business, ongoing functions of the collegial governance system, that is carried out autonomously and does not come before the Senate. Judiciary, SCC, UCBRR and SCEP are particularly active. Considerable work and consultation goes on between the committees and a vice president's office or the President's office.

Professor Purple reminded the Chairs that the annual reports of their committees come before the May 15 meeting of the Senate and must meet the docket deadline of two weeks in advance of that.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Meredith B. Poppele*

Meredith B. Poppele, Secretary,  
SCC