

MBM
D65

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Thursday, Nov. 15, 1984

3:30 p.m.

25 Law Building—Twin Cities Campus
305 Selvig Hall—Crookston Campus
520 Darland Adm. Bldg.—Duluth Campus
Behmler Hall Conference Room—Morris Campus
Learning Resources Center Conference Room—Waseca Campus

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 206, including the President, 151 members of the faculty (including the Faculty Consultative Committee) and 54 students (including the Student Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (104) must be present. Advance notice is required for amendments to the constitution and 138 affirmative votes at one meeting or 104 affirmative votes at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting. Advance notice is required for amendments to the bylaws and 104 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for senators shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the Senate. Only elected members (or alternates), the Senate Consultative Committee and, in case of a tie, the Chair, shall be entitled to vote.

Representatives may designate any eligible alternates from their colleges, schools, or student constituencies as the alternates to serve in their places by written notice to the Clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the Senate.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be available at each door of the meeting room, and members are asked to sign in. A summary of attendance for the year will be included in the minutes of the last meeting of the year.

RULES

Rules are available at the door.

I. MINUTES FOR APRIL 19 AND MAY 17

Action (3 minutes)

MOTION:

That the May 17 minutes be amended to include the final, approved version of Sections III and IV of the Sexual Harassment Procedures.

INFORMATION:

The May 17 minutes contain an earlier version of two paragraphs in the appeals section of the Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures (page 7). Section III. B. should read:

Respondents may appeal a ruling by the Vice President for Academic Affairs that they have acted in violation of the University Policy on Sexual Harassment or may appeal any sanction imposed in this regard by the Vice President for Academic Affairs as follows: (1) Faculty may appeal to the Senate Judicial Committee; (2) Academic professional/administrative staff may appeal to the Appeals Committee of the Academic Staff Advisory Committee; (3) Students may appeal to the Student Behavior Committee.

Section IV. Sanctions, should read:

Violations of the University Policy on Sexual Harassment may be met with a variety of sanctions. Those could include such sanctions as a reprimand, denial of merit pay, reassignment of teaching responsibilities, or suspension without compensation for a specified period. Acts of sexual harassment of a very serious nature may warrant a recommendation of removal for cause, or may warrant criminal action.

MARILEE WARD
Clerk

II. SENATE OFFICERS

Action (3 minutes)

The chairman of the Senate has designated the following as officers for 1984-85:

Parliamentarian—John Cound
Abstractor and Clerk—Marilee Ward

III. COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, 1984-85

Action (3 minutes)

(These are in addition to those approved at the May 17, 1984 meeting.)

BUSINESS & RULES Faculty: Joel Nelson. Ex officio: John Cound.

PLANNING Faculty: Lansine Kaba, Patricia Swan.

LIBRARY Faculty: Ayers Bagley.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM & RESPONSIBILITY APPEALS Faculty: E.C. Alexander.

INFORMATION

CONSULTATIVE Faculty: Cleon Melsa (UMM). Students: Beth Emanuelson, Sue Gruenes (UMW), Bruce Williams (UMD).

ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS Faculty: Seymour Geisser, Frank Irving, Archibald Leyasmeyer, Wayland Noland, Jonathan Wirtschafter. Ex officio: Stan Kegler, V. Rama Murthy, Stephen Roszell. Alumni: D. Wayne Jimmerson, Jean Levander King, Bert Lund, Ronald Simon, Tom Swain. Students: Katherine Cheolis, Brett Chilvers, Adam Kern.

USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH Faculty: Terence Ball, James Berry, Richard Bianco, Pauline Boss, Peter Carlyle, Robert Cipolle, Bruce Dalgaard, Alfred Dees, Amos Deinard, Cindy Emblom, Gerald Erickson, Bernadine Feidman, Stanley Finkelstein, Phyllis Fleming, Robert Gibson (UMD), Thomas Green, Megan Gunnar, Dale Hammerschmidt, Vernon Hendrix, Mark Herzberg, Richard Holloway, Robert Jeffery, Candace Kurth, Judith Lambrecht, Chung K. K. Lee, Myer Leonard, Lawrence Lockman, Ruth Loewenson, David Lykken, Robert McCaa, Philip McGlave, James Mitchell, J. Ernesto Molina, Jeylan Mortimer, Robert Patterson, Riv-Ellen Prell-Foldes, Jean Quam, Thomas Rector, Leslie Robison, Robert Ross, John Sauk, John Savage, Naomi Scheman, Jacqueline Shick, Richard Sykes, Yang Wang, W. Dixon Ward, Mary Ellen Wells. Students: Wendy Adams, Peter Blaisdell, Robert Booker, Richard Danila, Julie Deming, Robert Gardetto, Anne Giese, Robin Johnson, John Lindholm, Jill Linse, Robert Miller, Karen Schultz, Katherine Soler, Sylvia Wenston. Community Representatives: James Bracke, Michael Steenson.

ANIMAL CARE Faculty: Harry Burcalow, Edwin Haller, D. M. Hoppe (UMM), Russell Johnson, Harold Messer, Richard Phillips, Kent Rees, George Ruth. Ex officio: Patrick Manning. Civil Service: Morris Mitteness, Barbara Falk. Student: Amy Rising.

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT Faculty: Bruce Burnes (UMM), Jill Gidmark, Kenneth Heller, Barbara Jessen-Klixbull (UMC), Mary Jo Maynes, James Moller. Ex officio: John Wallace. Students: Kevin Anderson, Jill Gaudette, Christopher Georgacas, Rogert Meyers, Carl Simmons.

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES Faculty: Bert Ahern (UMM), John Clark, Wendell DeBoer, Elizabeth Franklin (UMC), Thomas Hoffman, Larry Kinney, Ian Maitland, Dianne Monson, John Mowitt. Ex officio: Gretchen Kreuter, James Preus. Students: David Arkin, Julie Bates, Susan Klink, Yvonne Landrus, Christopher Miller.

SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED Faculty: Donald Asp, Lenore Burgard, Darrell Frohrib, Allen Greenbaum (UMD), Manfred Meier, Susan Olson, Richard Weatherman. Ex officio: Robert Seybold. Civil Service: Barbara Montoro, 1 to be named. Students: Lisa Anderson, Blair Forman, 1 to be named.

COMMITTEES Faculty: James Gremmels (UMM). Students: Barbara Bacheller, Sherree Bostrom (UMM), David Kendrick, Katherine Schnell.

IV. STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES COMMITTEE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID RECIPIENTS, TWIN CITIES CAMPUS MINIMUM STANDARDS OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS, 1984-85

Discussion (5 minutes)

INFORMATION:

The statement below has the unqualified approval of the Student Academic Support Services Committee (SASSC). The Senate Consultative Committee is well satisfied with the consultation process which was involved.

The SASSC consulted at length with the special task force of the Office of Financial Aid as that office developed the policy, a task that was undertaken to comply with federal requirements. The administrative officers and the committees are aware that it is impossible to anticipate the full effects of the standards. The Office of Student Affairs (OSA) has asked each campus to keep careful records on the computer. OSA will review the effects during the year and consider if any elements in the policy should be changed. Both because the policy is now in effect, and because the possibility remains of modifying it further, the statement is submitted for Senate information so there will be increased community awareness and hence opportunity to react during the first year of implementation of this policy.

Section 484 of the Higher Education Act (HEA), as amended, requires that a student be maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study he or she is pursuing according to the standards and practices of the institution in which he or she is enrolled in order to receive financial aid under the student financial assistance program authorized under Title IV of the HEA.

The Academic Progress Standards for Financial Aid Recipients may not be consistent with either academic progress or degree requirements of University colleges and schools. Nor do the standards determine a student's classification of good standing, probation, or termination within the colleges and schools.

The University of Minnesota Academic Progress Standards for Financial Aid Recipients apply to all students who want to establish or maintain financial aid eligibility. **The standards apply to a student's entire academic record at the University whether or not the student received financial aid for previous enrollment periods.**

The standards require that students complete a prescribed number of credits within a quarter academic year with a minimum grade point average (GPA). Additionally, it is expected that students will complete their educational objectives (e.g., degree, certificate) within the prescribed eligibility periods.

The standards pertain to students who are applying for aid or who are receiving financial aid from one or more of the following programs:

- Auxiliary Loan to Assist Students (ALAS)
- College Work-Study (CWS)
- Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL)
- Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL)
- Health Professions Loan (HPL)
- Minnesota State Part-Time Grant
- Minnesota State Scholarship and Grant-In-Aid
- National Direct Student Loan (NDSL)
- Nursing Scholarship and Loan
- Pell Grant
- Parent Loan for Undergraduate Students (PLUS)
- Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG)
- University Scholarship, Grant, and Loan

The following sections describe the academic progress standards in detail. Students are responsible for reading and understanding this information.

FREQUENCY OF MONITORING

Academic progress of financial aid recipients will be monitored a minimum of once per academic year, at the end of spring quarter. If a student enrolls for less than the full academic year, only those quarters for which he/she registers will be reviewed. More frequent monitoring may occur at the discretion of the Office of Student Financial Aid.

CANCELLATION OF ELIGIBILITY

Financial aid eligibility will be cancelled for one or more of the following reasons:

1. Exhausting one's eligibility period.
2. Failing to meet the minimum credit and GPA requirements.
3. Failing to meet the minimum requirements of a probationary quarter.

ELIGIBILITY PERIOD

Undergraduate students

Students who are pursuing a bachelor's degree and who have **attempted** more than 216 credits are not eligible for financial aid.

Students who are pursuing a certificate or associate degree and who have **attempted** more than 108 credits are not eligible for financial aid.

Graduate students

Students who are pursuing a master's degree are eligible for financial aid for their first nine quarters of enrollment only.

Students pursuing a doctorate are eligible for financial aid for their first fifteen quarters of enrollment only.

Exception

Students enrolled in a program that requires the completion of more than the average credit requirements (e.g., the Undergraduate Development Certificate in Electrical Engineering requires 135 rather than 108 credits) may be considered for financial aid beyond the stated eligibility period.

Non-degree seeking students

Students in this category do not have a maximum eligibility period because they do not have a defined educational objective (e.g., bachelor's degree, certificate). Non-degree seeking students are typically eligible for Guaranteed Student Loans and PLUS Loans only.

ENROLLMENT STATUS

Enrollment status (full-time versus part-time) is determined by the actual number of credits for which students register. Credits dropped but assigned a grade of "W" will be counted in determining a student's enrollment status.

Financial aid recipients must register for a minimum of 6 credits with two exceptions:

1. Recipients of only Minnesota State Part-Time Grants may register for fewer than 6 credits.
2. Graduate students may enroll as thesis only or in any program of under 6 credits per quarter for a maximum of six quarters and receive financial aid provided their departments of enrollment consider the students to be part-time or full-time students. In these instances the students are required to complete Verification of Graduate Student Status forms, which are available from the Office of Student Financial Aid, 210 Fraser Hall, Minneapolis campus, and 197 Coffey Hall, St. Paul campus. The 24 annual credit requirement would then be waived.

Undergraduate students

Full-time status is defined as registration for 12 credits or more per quarter. Part-time status is defined as registration for fewer than 12 credits.

Graduate students

Full-time status is defined as registration for 8 credits or more per quarter. Part-time status is defined as registration for fewer than 8 credits per quarter.

MINIMUM CREDIT AND GPA REQUIREMENTS

Students must complete the minimum number of credits with grades of A, B, C, D, or S within three quarters of enrollment. If enrollment is for less than three quarters, the student must satisfactorily complete one-third of the three quarter credit requirement for each quarter of attendance.

Student Classification	Educational Objective	3-Quarter Credit Requirement	Annual or Cumulative GPA
Full-time Undergraduate	bachelor's degree	first 3 quarters—24	2.00
	associate degree certificate	subsequent 3 qtr. periods—36	
Part-time Undergraduate (6-11 credits/quarter)	bachelor's degree	18	2.00
Part-time Undergraduate (fewer than 6 credits/quarter)	associate degree certificate	credits attempted	2.00
	bachelor's degree		
*Graduate	master's degree	24	2.80
†Professional	degree	varies	varies
Non-Degree Seeking	none	18	2.00

*Graduate students should refer to the "Enrollment Status" section of this publication for information about less than full-time or part-time registration. The 24 credit requirement is waived in certain instances.

†Students enrolled in the professional schools (i.e., dentistry, law, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, veterinary medicine) are expected to maintain satisfactory academic progress as defined by the individual schools.

PROBATIONARY STATUS AND APPEALS

Probationary status is not automatic. Individual circumstances will be reviewed via the Office of Student Financial Aid appeal process. Students whose requests are granted will be placed on probationary status.

During the probationary quarter(s), students are expected to complete the minimum credit and GPA requirements. Academic progress will be monitored at the end of each probationary quarter. Students are required to submit grades to OSFA at the end of each probationary quarter prior to the release of financial aid checks for subsequent quarters. Once students meet the minimum requirements they will be removed from probationary status. Credits completed while on probation count toward the student's eligibility period.

Students who believe their circumstances merit consideration may appeal the cancellation of their financial aid eligibility by submitting a written explanation and supporting documentation to the Academic Review Committee, Office of Student Financial Aid, 210 Fraser Hall, Minneapolis campus. The committee will respond to the students in writing within 15 working days of receipt of the written explanation and supporting documentation.

Extenuating circumstances (e.g., documented illness, academic difficulty that is precipitated by a verifiable disability, enrollment for only a portion of a review period, change in major or program) may be considered in requests for exceptions to the minimum requirements. Extenuating circumstances will be considered a maximum of four quarters.

REINSTATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY

Students who are ineligible for financial aid because of insufficient academic progress must complete the equivalent of one quarter of the minimum credit and GPA requirements within one quarter of enrollment at their own expense.

Example: Students typically registered as full-time undergraduate students would be required to complete, within one quarter, 12 credits with 2.00 GPAs.

Once students demonstrate that they can satisfactorily complete the minimum credit and GPA requirements for the particular enrollment period, they are once again eligible to receive financial aid for the duration of their eligibility period as long as they continue to meet the minimum requirements.

Financial aid eligibility may also be reinstated if a student has been officially out of school for one year and demonstrates evidence of the ability to make satisfactory academic progress. The student must verify academic progress made in the past year and submit, to the Office of Student Financial Aid, a program of study planned with his/her academic advisor. Verification may include:

1. The satisfactory completion of past incomplete courses.
2. Development of and acceptance to an individually designed baccalaureate program.
3. Acceptance to a certificate program or an upper division baccalaureate program.
4. Meeting a specified contract with an advisor and/or counselor, or combining several of the above mentioned areas of progress.

Financial aid granted after the reinstatement will be based on the availability of funds and University funding policies.

EXTENSION CREDITS

Extension credits cannot be automatically monitored. Day school students should have Extension credits transferred to their day-school transcripts quarterly. Extension only students will need to submit a current transcript to OSFA at the end of spring quarter (quarterly if a student is on probation) to verify credits completed.

TRANSFER CREDITS

A student's academic performance (e.g., GPA) attained at another institution will not be considered when making the initial eligibility determination for transfer students. It will be assumed that transfer students are in good standing.

Credits earned at another institution that count toward a University degree or certificate will be considered in determining a student's eligibility period.

Example: A student earned 90 credits at a community college. The student was admitted to the University as a junior. The 90 credits would count toward the 216 credit financial aid eligibility period.

SUMMER ENROLLMENT

Summer enrollment periods are included in the calculation of a student's eligibility period.

Undergraduate students enrolled in nine-month programs may use a summer session(s) as a "catch-up period" within which to meet the minimum credit and GPA requirements of their three previous quarters of attendance *only* if they enroll at their own expense.

A summer session (one or both) for a graduate student is the equivalent of one-half of one quarter. Graduate students may use a summer session as a "catch-up period" *only* if they enroll at their own expense.

Students enrolled in 12-month or year-round programs will have their summer attendance treated as an academic year quarter.

N, I, W, X, AND V GRADES

Grades of N, I, W, X, and V do not count toward fulfilling the minimum requirements. Special consideration will be given to "X" grades. This exception will be handled on an individual basis. The student will need to submit written verification from his/her instructor(s), to the Office of Student Financial Aid, verifying that the student will complete the course requirements and will receive a passing grade at the end of the following quarter.

Failing grades (i.e., N, F) will be included in the calculation of the GPA.

REPEAT AND CREDIT-BY-EXAM COURSES

A course may count only once toward fulfilling the minimum requirements and in the calculation of the eligibility period. **Exception:** If a student previously received a failing grade in a course but repeated the course with a passing grade, the credits would count toward fulfilling the minimum requirements.

Credit-by-exam credits are not included in credits attempted for a given quarter, therefore, they are not counted toward fulfilling the minimum requirements. If these credits count toward fulfilling degree or certificate requirements, however, they will be counted when determining a student's eligibility period.

ESL AND NON-CREDIT COURSES

English as a second language (ESL) and non-credit courses cannot be automatically monitored. Students must submit verification of the satisfactory completion of these courses to OSFA.

ELWOOD CALDWELL
Chair, SASSC
JACK MERWIN
Chair, SCC

V. BUSINESS & RULES COMMITTEE

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Action (3 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate Bylaws be amended to delete references to the Planning Council in the description of the Planning Committee.

INFORMATION:

Because there is no longer a Planning Council, the membership section of the Planning Committee description should be amended to delete "Six of these members (4 faculty/academic professionals and 2 students shall serve as representatives of the Senate to the president's Planning Council." The duties and responsibilities section should be amended as follows: "to advise the Consultative Committee on those Planning Council issues and concerns of relevance to Senate governance." The duties and responsibilities section should further be amended to delete "to advise the Planning Council of issues and concerns related to planning raised by the Senate or its committees."

RICHARD PURPLE
Chair

VI. BUSINESS & RULES COMMITTEE

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Action (3 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate Bylaws be amended to delete the reference to the Planning Council in the description of the Finance Committee.

INFORMATION:

Because there is no longer a Planning Council, the membership section of the Finance Committee description should be amended to delete "Participation of the committee in the biennial request and budget review processes shall be facilitated through membership of one of its members in a nonvoting capacity on the president's Planning Council."

RICHARD PURPLE
Chair

VII. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

Information and Discussion (10 minutes)

JOHN HOWE
Chair

VIII. MOTION BY FACULTY SENATOR

STUDENT GOVERNANCE, UNIVERSITY SENATE

(30 minutes)

MOTION:

In order to achieve the following objectives:

1. To encourage students to focus their efforts on those parts of the University's governance structure in which their contributions can be most fruitful—on committees at all levels of the system, in the campus assemblies, and in their own student government institutions.
2. To change the composition of the University Senate to eliminate the student representatives, except for the student body presidents of the five campuses; to abolish the Faculty Senate, whose functions will be taken over by the University Senate; and, through these reforms, to provide a governance structure (the University Senate) in which the voice of the *faculty* can be heard more clearly.

Therefore, be it resolved that the following amendments be made in the Constitution of the University Senate:

GENERAL CHANGES

Delete references to the "Faculty Senate," substituting, where appropriate, the designation "University Senate."

Substitute "Faculty Consultative Committee" for "Senate Consultative Committee."

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE (Page 1)

Section 1. Membership

line 5: Delete "and student"

lines 8-10: Delete "Medicine. The elected faculty representatives shall serve as the Faculty Senate; the elected student representatives shall serve as the Student Senate." Substitute: "Medicine; and (d) the student body presidents of the five campuses."

Section 3. Allocation of Functions and Powers

a. lines 3-4: Delete "to the Faculty Senate or"

b. lines 3-4: Delete "either the Faculty Senate or"

d. Delete: "In general, functions allocated to the Faculty Senate shall include but not be limited to accreditation, designation and granting of University honors, policies concerning faculty appointment and tenure, and matters within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Affairs and Judicial Committees." (Entire section.)

e. Delete: "In case of disagreement by the Faculty Consultative Committee or the Student Consultative Committee with a decision of the Senate Consultative Committee concerning the allocation of functions, either committee may refer the matter to the University Senate for resolution. (Entire Section)"

Section 4. Election of University Senate Members

c. (Page 2) Delete: entire section.

e. line 3: Delete: "or student"

f. lines 12-15: Delete: "All student representatives shall be elected for one-year terms and may be re-elected. No student representative may serve more than three consecutive terms."

lines 17-19: "To continue to serve, a student representative must continue to meet the requirements for election identified under 'c' hereof."

g. line 1: Delete: "and student"

lines 4-5: Delete: "and the students"

line 14: Delete: "the student board or"

line 21: Delete: "Faculty Senate, or Student Senate"

Section 5. Removal for Neglect of Meetings

b. line 3: Delete: "A member of the Student Senate shall forfeit membership by neglecting two consecutive meetings of the University Senate."

d. lines 2-3: Delete: "or a campus student assembly by virtue of holding membership in the University Senate,"

Section 7. University Senate Agenda and Minutes
lines 4-5: Delete: "the students and"

Section 8. University Senate Meetings—Call—Quorum (Pages 2-3)

lines 4-5: Delete: "and meetings of the Faculty or Student Senate"

line 6: Delete "appropriate" and add "Faculty"

line 9: Delete: "any" and add "the"

line 11: Delete: "and any student"

lines 17-27: Delete the rest of the paragraph, beginning with "All members of the faculty...."

Be it resolved that the following amendments be made in the Bylaws:

ARTICLE I. UNIVERSITY SENATE MEMBERSHIP, ELECTIONS, AND OFFICERS
(Page 5)

Section 1.

line 3: Delete: "and students"

line 4: Delete: "or students"

Section 3.

Delete entire section.

Section 4.

lines 7-9: Delete: "Student vacancies in the Senate shall be filled in accordance with procedures determined by the constituencies of the relevant voting unit."

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES (Page 6)

Section 1. Committees Reporting to the University Senate

A. CONSULTATIVE

Rewrite as follows:

"The Faculty Consultative Committee shall be composed of 11 elected members of the faculty and the vice chair of the University Senate. It shall serve as a consultative body to the president, as the executive committee of the University Senate, and as the steering committee of the Senate."

Membership

(1) lines 1-2: Delete: "and the Student Consultative Committee"

b. Student Consultative Committee: Delete entire section.

(2) lines 6-9: Delete: "Student vacancies shall be filled in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses for the balance of any unexpired term until the next regular election."

(3) Rewrite as follows:

"The chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall be elected by its members from among their number for a one-year term of office. He/she shall be eligible for re-election to that position."

(4) line 1: Delete: "Senate Consultative Committee, the"

lines 2-3: Delete: "and the Student Consultative Committee"

Duties and Responsibilities

(1) Senate Consultative Committee

b. Steering (Page 7)

Second Responsibility listed—lines 6-7: Delete: "to refer the proposal to the Faculty Senate"

c. Executive

Seventh Responsibility listed—line 3: Substitute "chair" for "chairs"

line 4: Delete: "and Student Consultative"

line 5: Delete: "and one student"

(3) Student Consultative Committee

Delete entire section.

ARTICLE IV. STANDING COMMITTEES

1. Committees Reporting to the University Senate through the Consultative Committee

A. BUSINESS AND RULES

Membership (Page 8)

line 2: Delete: "2 students"

Be it further resolved that:

1. These changes go into effect on July 1, 1985.

2. The necessary editorial changes and renumbering of clauses be made in the Constitution and the Bylaws in order to bring these documents into conformity with the requirements of this motion.

Patricia B. Swan
Senator, College of Agriculture

COMMENT:

Until 1969, the main governance structures at the University were the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee. In 1969, two additional structures were grafted on—the University Senate and the Senate Consultative Committee—so that students would be represented. At that time, too, a special effort was made to give the students representation on the campus assemblies, on task forces, and on most committees at all levels of governance.

Student participation in governance may be justified on two grounds: (1) to provide them with experience in leadership, and (2) to enable them to make useful contributions in those areas in which they have had experience and have developed some competence. In an effective system of governance, students should be encouraged to focus on activities that help them to develop leadership qualities and enable them to inject their viewpoints on those subjects in which they are most qualified and hence can make the most significant contributions. This can best be done in those forums that deal with such matters as curriculum development, student fees, the calendar, and similar issues. The appropriate forums for such discussions are departmental and college committees, some Senate committees, campus assemblies and committees, task forces, and the institutions of student governance. For the students to perform adequately in these areas requires a great many people who are expected to spend considerable time on this work. (Last year there were more than 180 student committee positions on Senate and Assembly committees alone.) The students have usually encountered difficulty in recruiting people to serve in positions where their contributions can be the most fruitful; they should be encouraged to concentrate their efforts in these forums, where their performance is greatly needed and deserves improvement. At a time when we are emphasizing the improvement of quality at the University, we ought also to sahpe up the operation of our governance structures.

It should be noted that this motion does not deprive the students of the representation they presently have on the campus assemblies, on task forces, or on various committees (except for the "Senate Consultative Committee"). Nor does it say anything about the students' right of access to the Regents which they currently enjoy—rights that are denied to the faculty.

One of the purposes of this motion is to abolish the Senate Consultative Committee (the body composed of both faculty and students), leaving only the Faculty Consultative Committee. Under the existing arrangement, the faculty meet as the Faculty Consultative Committee, and then subsequently the faculty meet with the students as the Senate Consultative Committee. Administrators attend both meetings. Having to hold the two meetings consumes the time of both faculty and administrators. Most, if not all, members of the Faculty Consultative Committee during the past two years would agree that the FCC meetings are much more valuable to the University than are the meetings of the Senate Consultative Committee. The work of the latter tends to be "added on" or duplicative. Furthermore, one of the former chairs of the Committee recently appraised the students' contributions to the SCC discussions as "at best modest." This was a generous appraisal.

For a good number of years, faculty members have been criticizing the present form for student representation in the Senate. Lacking the background needed to deal with issues that appear on its agenda, the students do not participate very much in the debates: they offer very few "inputs" and gain little leadership experience. They encounter great difficulty in filling their seat allotments, their attendance record is poor, and they tend to vote as a bloc. When the Senate acts, we are not entitled to say that it is the voice of the faculty because more than one-third of the seats are given to students. This motion, however, permits the student body presidents of the five campuses to be members of the Senate and to participate and vote even on matters that were hitherto reserved for the Faculty Senate. This is an effort to improve student governance by upgrading the position of student body president. It is important for us to get the modified and strengthened governance structure in place before the new president of the University takes office.

PATRICIA SWAN
Senator

IX. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-1984

In carrying out its three-part responsibility of consulting with the president, steering Senate business, and serving as the Senate's consultative committee, the full SCC held 19 meetings of which 12 included a discussion with the president, the academic vice president, or both. In addition, the president called SCC into a brief executive session, once to provide information on a personnel search item and on the status of collective bargaining talks with UEA.

In the interests of collegial communication, SCC published two newsletters: the winter issue largely described the year's agenda for a number of Senate committees, and the spring issue reported a number of actions and positions taken by the committees.

PLANNING TASK FORCES. SCC members studied the reports of each of the task forces and met with the task force chairs and/or the president and academic vice president to discuss the reports on Higher Education and the Economy of the State, Information Processing and Management, Graduate Education and Research, The International Character of the University, and The Student Experience. SCC met twice with Assistant Vice President Wallace as the Student Experience Task Force was being organized, and offered a number of suggestions regarding its composition and charge. SCC again met with Dr. Wallace in the spring to discuss the task force's draft report. SCC discussed with the president and academic vice president the process and schedule by which recommendations would be selected from all the task force reports for implementation. SCC promoted distribution of the task force reports to each of the relevant Senate committees for their comments and reactions.

The committee adopted and submitted to the president a "Policy Statement Concerning Administrative Task Forces and the Senate Committee Structure." The statement reiterates SCC's advocacy of the use of special committees of the Senate in place of administrative task forces whenever possible.

UNIVERSITY BUDGETS AND PLANNING. SCC discussed the administration's proposed budget principles for 1984-85 and recommended modifications. The committee asked for continued attention to the size of uncommitted central reserves and the process by which they are allocated. It discussed with the president and academic vice president the administration's operations and maintenance budget plan proposal to the Regents. SCC raised a number of questions concerning Graduate School tuition, particularly the formula for calculating the cost of graduate education and the degree of central discretion in allocating resources to the colleges. (See also annual report of the Faculty Consultative Committee.)

The committee met with the president and planning officers to review the draft of the revised institutional planning statement and to offer suggestions. Together with the chairperson of the Senate Planning Committee, SCC discussed the overall processes and mechanisms for University planning.

The committee also held several discussions with central administrators on the super-computer institute, its place in University planning, and the prospects for increased faculty accessibility to it.

LINKS WITH OTHER SENATE COMMITTEES. The chairperson twice convened the Facilitative Committee of the Senate, comprised of the vice chairperson of the Senate and the chairpersons of about a dozen Senate committees, to discuss and coordinate the work of Senate committees.

SCC discussed and recommended modifications in the Faculty Affairs Committee's proposed revision of the Senate's Sexual Harassment Code. In the spring, the committee met with the chair-elect of the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation (PPSA) on policy proposals PPSA had developed. SCC recommended delaying their submission to the Senate pending further discussions with the administrative offices involved.

SCC did not support a request from the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women to enlarge its membership, but recommended instead informal means of securing the broader participation the EEOWC believes important.

OTHER BUSINESS. In June, 1983, the SCC chairperson-elect addressed the Anderson Commission on the Future of Post-Secondary Education in Minnesota. SCC later discussed the report and its bearing on the University.

The committee requested progress reports from the administration on the development of a University-industry relations policy.

SCC agreed to look at the question of modifying the relationship between faculty and student governance and put it on the 1984-85 agenda for deeper exploration.

ROUTINE DUTIES. The committee carried out its fixed assignments of appointing faculty and student members to such committees as Business and Rules, Planning, Finance, and All-University Honors. It also named faculty and student members to the Student Legal Services Board, the Student Services Fees Committee, the Recreational Sports Board of Governors, and recommended new members to the President's Student Behavior Review Panel.

SCC's Senate Budget Subcommittee acted on the budget requests of the Senate committees. SCC previewed the docket for each Senate meeting.

The faculty members for 1983-84 were Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, John Howe (Chr.), Marvin Mattson (UMC), Jack Merwin, Irwin Rubenstein, W. Donald Spring (UMM), Deon Stuthman, Wesley B. Sundquist, and John Turner, vice chairperson of the Senate, *ex officio*. The student members were Charles Farrell (UMM), Van Hayden, Susan Hunstiger (UMC), Julie Iverson, Lisa McDonell, Mitchell Richter (UMD), Paul Schulte (Co-chr.), Scott Singer (Co-chr.), and Colleen Traxler (UMW).

JOHN HOWE
Chairperson

X. PHYSICAL PLANT & SPACE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-84

The committee met nine times during the academic year, one of which was a special meeting with Vice President Keller. Details of the meeting, committee membership, and attendance are contained in the committee minutes. Minutes have been deposited with the secretary of the Senate Consultative Committee and maintained in committee files.

As a consequence of our discussions over the year, the committee developed and adopted a document (attached) with sections covering A. Physical Space; B. Space Allocation; and C. Maintenance and Remodeling.

The document incorporates committee recommendations and proposed policies on a number of topics which were put before the committee by the Vice President, the former committee, and current committee members. Items which have been approved by the committee are annotated with the date of action. Other items have been discussed but specific committee action has not been taken. Items considered and reflected in the document include:

- Two documents which were discussed by the previous Committee and carried over for early action this year: "University Ownership of Facilities" and "Administration of Academic Space."
- "Decision Criteria for Ranking Capital Improvement Projects" (distributed by Clint Hewitt). Vice President Keller's preference is to introduce capital items only in the Fi-

nance Committee. This position is difficult to reconcile with the committee's charge. Our resolution (reflected in the policy statement above) was to orient the committee's review toward the "Master Plan," which would help provide the administration and the Finance Committee with a framework for assessing any particular capital request and provide a means by which the committee could take considered, policy action outside the constraints of preparation of a particular capital request.

- c) "Space Renting" and "Space Reallocation" concepts as potential solutions to expressed problems of redistribution of unneeded space were discussed and the committee's recommended policy against these systems is incorporated in our policy statement.
 - d) The "Minnesota Facilities Model" was reviewed and discussed.
 - e) Maintenance and remodeling costs and procedures. Examples of problems which were provided to the committee helped in the formulation of proposed policy statements.
 - f) The committee's routine information needs.
 - g) Suitability and quality assessment of facilities for program purposes was discussed. This needs to be incorporated into planning. Relevant policies were framed and incorporated in our policy document.
 - h) Responsibility for maintenance of space, a topic proposed by the Vice President, is addressed in policies.
 - i) Control of classrooms was addressed in the policy statement.
 - j) Classroom quality and need for student non-classroom space. This was not resolved and is recommended as an action item to next year's committee.
 - k) Review and discussion of the Master Plan should be an early item on next year's agenda.
- We recommend that the proposed policy statements be seriously reviewed and adopted.

DONALD McTAVISH
Chair

XI. SERVICES FOR THE HANDICAPPED COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-84

The Senate Operations Committee on Services for the Handicapped met periodically during the 1983-84 academic year. The committee adopted two goals for the year. The first was to facilitate the implementation of the policy and procedural guidelines which the committee had formulated over the past several years and which had been adopted by the University Senate in May of 1983. The second goal was to review potential problems in accommodation to handicapping conditions of faculty and staff.

The committee worked closely with Donald Zander, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, to facilitate the implementation of the college-coordinator department-contact network recommended by the Senate-endorsed procedural guidelines. An orientation program for college coordinators and departmental contact persons, jointly planned by the committee and Vice President Zander's staff, was accomplished in spring quarter.

The Program Access Committee, established by Senate-approved guidelines, will be comprised of representatives from the college-coordinator department-contact group and will function to implement and extend program and instructional accommodations for students who are handicapped. The Program Access Committee should become fully operational next year. Representation from the Program Access Committee and from the Physical Access Committee to the Senate Operations Committee for Services to the Handicapped will ensure better coordination of efforts to accommodate handicapped students and employees. Accommodation of handicapped persons within the University community requires an extensive and coordinated structure to assure that programs are accessible and instructional methods adaptable to the diverse needs of handicapped persons.

The second major goal of the committee was to review potential problems in the accommodation of faculty and staff who have handicapping conditions. The institution's responsibility for reasonable accommodation extends no less to faculty and staff than to students. The committee therefore undertook a review of potential problems in this area. It solicited opinions and reports from the University Personnel Office, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and the Office of the University Attorney. This review revealed relatively few instances of complaints from persons alleging that they have handicapping conditions that are not accommodated in a reasonable manner. The committee attributes the small number of complaints to the sensitivity of University supervisors to the need for accommodation and their willingness to make reasonable accommodations. However, the committee suggests that the lack of complaints should not be solely attributed to exemplary compliance by all University departments and offices. It also appears to be the case that very few requests for accommodation of a handicapping condition or complaints of discrimination because of a handicapping condition have been filed by University faculty or staff. The low frequency of complaints may also be attributed to a lack of awareness by faculty and staff of the obligation of the University to make reasonable accommodations to handicapping conditions. It seems prudent to consider the potential number of complaints that might be filed with markedly increased awareness of the University's responsibility for reasonable accommodation of handicapping conditions. The committee recommends that the paucity of recent complaints should not lull the community into a sense of complacency about accommodations to handicapped individuals. Our recent institutional history suggests that practices which create vulnerability to litigation may ultimately be very expensive.

The committee has identified two areas that do seem to be problematical and recommends further careful review and appropriate action. The first is the problem of providing suitable parking for handicapped persons who require accommodation. The lack of adequate parking for handicapped persons receives recurring complaints. The second problem is the requirement of physical examinations for employees. The committee notes that several past reviews of the University's compliance to the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Code of 1973 have called into question University policy on physical examinations for employees. The rationale for and the benefits of the physical examination seem to be obscure. The committee recommends a formal review of this policy by the Senate Operations Committee for Services to the Handicapped and the Office of the University Attorney.

RICHARD P. McDERMOTT
Chair

XII. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Annual Report, 1983-84

The Committee met 7 times during the year to nominate new committee members and to consider changes in the present committee structure. The following tasks were accomplished.

1. Faculty and student members met separately to prepare slates of nominations to fill 1984-85 committee vacancies and then jointly to ratify the nominations and to recommend chairs. All positions were filled and nominations were approved at the spring quarter meetings of the Senate and Assembly.
2. A request was considered to add the Assistant Director of Athletics for Academic Counseling as an ex officio member of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee. Committee recommended that, rather than add another ex officio member, creating an imbalance, one of the current ex officio members should designate the Assistant Director of Athletics for Academic Counseling to attend in his/her place.
3. After nearly a year of debate a motion was submitted to the Assembly, along with the Student Affairs and Business & Rules Committees, proposing to amend its Bylaws by eliminating the Recreational Sports Committee and approving the establishment of a Recreational Sports Governing Board (approved Nov 17, 1983).
4. In response to a request that many retired persons have a continuing interest in the University Health Service, the Committee on Committees and Business & Rules Committee submitted to the Assembly for approval a motion to add as an ex officio member of the University Health Services Committee the chair or his/her designee of Retired University Faculty (approved Nov. 17, 1983).
5. In response to a motion passed at the May 19, 1983, Twin Cities Campus Assembly meeting recommending the establishment of a Bookstore Advisory Committee under

the Assembly structure, the Committee on Committees and Business & Rules Committee drew up appropriate language for addition of the Bookstore Advisory Committee as Section 9 under Article IV of the Assembly Rules (approved Nov. 17, 1983).

6. Conducted annual survey of senators' interest in committee service as well as soliciting nominations through BRIEF and by letters to Deans, Directors, and Department Heads, and Chairs of all Senate and Assembly Committees. Members voted to include academic staff members in all future surveys and solicitations for committee nominations. (Senators and academic staff members are encouraged to respond to the next survey.)
7. Nominated for approval by the Assembly a nominating committee to prepare a slate of candidates for the Assembly Steering Committee election.
8. Appointed the at-large faculty and alternate members to the Board of Student Publications as specified in the Board's Constitution.
9. Began discussion of Article X in the Board of Student Publications Constitution which relates to the process by which the Constitution is approved and amended. Discussion will continue into next year.
10. Met with Anne Munro, Administrative Assistant to the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, to discuss recent changes in federal regulations and how they might affect the structure of the University committee. A new set of policies and procedures are being drafted and if/when they are approved the committee will again review the need for revising the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee's description in the Senate Rules.
11. Reviewed the appointment and reporting processes, duties and responsibilities, and possible inclusion in the Assembly committee structure, of the newly formed Review Committee on Advertising, Promotions, and Sponsorships.
12. Approved a motion to appoint in the fall subcommittees composed of faculty and students to review the activities, duties and responsibilities, and continued need of the Placement Services, Extension & Community Programs, Summer Sessions, Housing, Health Services, and Academic Freedom & Responsibility Appeals Committees and to report their findings and recommendations to the full committee.

Shown on the chart below are proportions of new faculty appointments to Senate and Assembly committees* by rank and sex, with comparable all-University figures:

*includes appointments made by the President, Committee on Committees, and Consultative Committee.

Rank	Distribution by Rank		Distribution by Sex	
	Percent of New Committee Members of this Rank	Percent of Faculty of this Rank	Percent of New Committee Members Who are Women	Percent of Faculty Members Who are Women
Professor	66%	35%	5%	6%
Associate Professor	24	25	32	19
Assistant Professor	10	31	67	32
Instructor	0	9	0	37
Total	100%	100%		

MAHMOOD A. ZAIDI
Chair

XIII. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-84

Among the issues that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy addressed during 1983-84 were two issues that concern the responsibility of the Senate and its committees. First, there was the issue of administrative task forces. During the last two years, central administration has appointed a number of task forces to develop policy on matters that properly fall within the responsibilities of a Senate committee. In most of these cases, the Senate committee did not participate in any way in the work of the task force, and, in some cases, the committee did not receive a copy of the report. No effort was made by central administration to link a task force to a Senate committee either by drawing members from the Senate committee or by requiring that the task force report through the committee. This practice conflicts with Senate policy, for the Senate moved a few years ago that the administration work through Senate committees and not around them. SCEP spoke to President Magrath, Vice President Keller, and SCC about this problem, but no promises were won that the administration would abide by Senate policy and work more often through the Senate in the future. SCEP suggested to Vice President Keller that if, in the future, central administration appoints a task force and charges it with the business of a Senate committee, the Senate committee should at least receive a copy of that charge and a list of the task force members, but no agreement was reached on this matter and the problem still stands.

The second issue of all-Senate concern that SCEP addressed arises out of the first. Actions of the Senate often go unnoticed, albeit unheeded, by officers of the University and its colleges. A case in point is the action that the Senate took in 1981 on regularization and inloading. The Senate passed a motion on how central administration and deans should proceed to develop and implement policy in this area. However, nothing in the Senate's procedures or in the administration's procedures requires that any official notice be given of this or any other Senate action and none was. In 1974, the Senate adopted a policy on the evaluation of instruction. No college in the University has fully complied with this policy and there is reason to believe that deans are not fully informed of the policy. There is no one, at present, in the administration who has responsibility to see that these Senate policies are noticed or heeded or to explain to the Senate why they are not or should not be University policy. In short, often when the Senate takes action there is no follow-up on the action and the Senate's initiatives become lost in the Senate's minutes. SCEP has asked SCC to address this problem and offered some recommendations for doing so. In particular, SCEP recommends that the Senate adopt a policy a) that would require, where appropriate, some official response from central administration to motions passed by the Senate, b) that would promote support for the motions, c) that would provide for periodic reviews of progress in implementing Senate legislation and d) that, in some cases, would require periodic reports to the Senate on this progress.

SCEP addressed issues of academic policy in a number of areas in 1983-84 by formally responding to a series of task force or committee reports: 1) the Report of the Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy of the State, 2) the Report of the Task Force Concerning the Support and Development of Academic Skills, 3) the Report of the Task Force on International Education, and 4) the Report of the Subcommittee on the Future of the Summer Session. Copies of our comments on each of these reports are available from Carol Buskovich, 105 Walter Library. However, what follows is a brief summary of SCEP's position on the issues raised by these reports.

1. The University should maintain its commitment to undergraduate education at both the lower and upper division and should not allow present efforts to strengthen the University's graduate programs and research programs to lessen that commitment.
2. The University should continue to offer remedial instruction to students who do not come with the skills that the University expects them to have. However, the University should set goals to increase the percentage of entering students who meet the University's expectations over the next ten years, and thereby to decrease the percentage of entering students who require remedial instruction. The University should work to realize these goals not by raising admissions requirements but by developing programs for working with the high schools in the state to help these schools better prepare more of their students for the University. This will require a partnership between the University and the high schools for which at the present there is no precedent, and it will require that the University spell out the expectations it has of its entering student more precisely and in more detail than it has before and that it communicate these expectations more effectively than it ever has before.
3. The University should not support international education at the cost of lessening its support for or its emphasis on other laudable educational objectives and problems.

4. Neither the University nor its colleges should inload Summer Session or Extension if that substantially reduces the income of its faculty unless such action has been fully discussed by the Senate or by some collegiate body that is representative of the faculty.

Along with many others this last year, SCEP discussed the new tuition and policies of the Graduate School. In a letter to the Dean of the Graduate School, SCEP made one point that bears special notice: some departments find their best graduate students among those students who do not enter with aid, and any tuition or aid policy of the Graduate School that discourages students who enter without aid from entering the programs in these departments will substantially weaken these departments and threaten their graduate programs.

Finally, SCEP completed action on two issues that had been carried over from the previous year. In particular, it decided to oppose the recommendation of the Registrar's Advisory Committee to change Twin-Cities Assembly policy on the calculation of grade point averages on official University transcripts and on the designation of the no credit grade. The present policy is that the no credit grade be designated by 'N' (rather than 'F' as had been done prior to 1972) and that the 'N' grade not count in the calculation of the GPA. SCEP decided that the present policy should not be changed.

The second ancient issue that SCEP acted on is the issue of the evaluation of instruction. SCEP reviewed present policy and practices within colleges and a few selected departments and made three principal recommendations to the Office of Academic Vice President. First, SCEP recommended that more emphasis be placed on and more support provided for evaluation of instruction for the purpose of course improvement and curriculum development (the contrast here is with evaluation for the purpose of personnel decisions). The aim is to direct attention to the goals of a course and the means designed for realizing them and away from the instructor as a lecturer or a mere purveyor of information. Here peer evaluation is most appropriate, and here peer evaluation does not require classroom visits. Second, SCEP recommended that the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education be responsible for supporting and encouraging efforts to evaluate and improve the quality of instruction in the colleges of the University and report annually to SCEP of his work in this area. Third, SCEP recommended that there be summer teaching improvement grants to match the grants by the Graduate School for summer research.

In 1982-83, SCEP took over the responsibilities of the Council on Liberal Education (CLE was eliminated as a result of Senate reorganization). During 1982-83 and 1983-84, SCEP reviewed the All-University Liberal Education requirements and found them lacking in a number of respects but took no action to amend them. However, the committee did decide that it should be the responsibility of the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education to see that the present requirements are being met by students in every University college. There is reason for thinking that in some colleges they are sometimes not being met. The Assistant Vice President was asked to report annually to SCEP on compliance within the colleges with the liberal education requirements.

MICHAEL ROOT
Chair

XIV. SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-84

The Senate Library Committee met seven times: October 28, November 30, February 24, March 26, April 16, May 1 (jointly with the University Library Planning Committee), and May 24. Among the topics discussed were: (1) retrenchment, (2) automation, (3) long-range planning, (4) collection development, (5) proposals for renovation of the Walter Library, (6) organization of the library archival units, (7) future reporting lines to central administration, (8) organization of government documents, and (9) concerns of the coordinate campuses. A joint meeting was held with the University Library Planning Committee to discuss automation needs and the current plans to implement automation.

Action was taken with regard to a number of these matters:

1. A memorandum was sent to Vice President Keller and Deans Holt, Lukermann, and Foster recommending that in future university planning, when this planning had implications for the libraries, the University Libraries should be brought into the discussions. A copy of the memorandum, Appendix A, is on file with the Senate Clerk.

2. Following discussion at two meetings, the second with Vice President Keller, concerning the proposal that in the future the University Libraries report to the newly-established Vice Presidency for Planning and Academic Support Activities, the committee recommended to Vice President Keller that, if such a move were to take place, the Computer Center and related information activities should also be moved. It was also recommended that the Libraries have higher priority than the Office of International Programs. A copy of the letter to Vice President Keller, Appendix B, is on file with the Senate Clerk.

3. A recommendation was made to Vice President Keller that a task force be set up on University Library Archival Units. The recommendation is set forth in a letter from Professor Brian Job to Vice President Keller, Appendix C, which is on file with the Senate Clerk.

4. A motion was made to the University Librarian that an outside evaluator assess University Libraries operations and services with regard to government documents and make recommendations with regard to improvements.

JOHN CHIPMAN
Chair

XV. SUMMER SESSIONS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-84

Discussions of the committee throughout 1983-84 centered largely on the role of the Summer Session in the future, and proposals to inload summer instruction as an ongoing responsibility of academic units.

Dean Harold A. Miller appeared before the committee early in the year to report that, inasmuch as the present Director of the Summer Session will be retiring at the end of the academic year, central administration has recommended that responsibility for the Summer Session should be moved to the Division of Continuing Education and Extension. The Summer Session will retain its identity within the Division, with the appointment of a person to serve as Assistant Dean. A search committee has been appointed to recommend candidates for the position with the hope that the search can be completed by the end of the summer.

In subsequent meetings, discussions centered on proposals for inloading Summer Session instruction with Dean Miller outlining proposals that were under consideration and reporting on progress being made.

DAN DAHLBERG
Chair

XVI. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

(15 minutes)

Questions shall be submitted in writing to the Clerk eight calendar days before the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall review them. Because a limited time is allotted to answering questions, it may be necessary for the committee to combine similar questions and to withhold others. The committee will also be guided by the breadth of interest in the issue. All questions received, together with the names of the questioners, shall be distributed at the meeting. The Consultative Committee shall group questions by general topic and shall indicate those which have been forwarded for answers. The person answering a question may if he/she chooses, entertain additional questions from the floor which extend the original question.

XVII. OLD BUSINESS

XVIII. NEW BUSINESS

(15 minutes)

Please feel free to use this agenda item to comment on a topic you believe is of general interest to the Senate. The Senate is reminded that this entry in the agenda (not to be confused with the Senate's "Questions to the President") may be used to raise specific issues, concerns and/or ideas of general interest. A motion is not required. As much as anything, the Business and Rules Committee wishes to remind the Senate that all ideas presented to the body need not flow from a committee.

XIX. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED FACULTY MEMBERS

FRIEDRICH ACHBERGER

1948-1984

WALLACE D. ARMSTRONG

1905-1984

STEVEN BLOCK

1951-1984

MARCIA EDWARDS

1901-1984

STARKE HATHAWAY

1903-1984

JOHN H. KUHLMANN

1894-1984

LUTHER J. PICKREL

1917-1984

WILLIAM T. S. THORP

1914-1984

HENRY M. TSUCHIYA

1914-1984

DOLORIS WILLMORE

1929-1984

XX. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE
Thursday, Nov. 15, 1984
(immediately following the University Senate meeting)

The Senate constitution provides that all members of the faculty who hold regular appointment as defined in the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure* may be present at Faculty Senate meetings and shall be entitled to speak and to offer motions for Faculty Senate action. Only elected faculty members (or their designated alternates) shall be entitled to vote.

I. MINUTES, TENURE CODE MEETINGS, FEB. 9-JUNE 7, 1984

MINUTES, APRIL 19 and MAY 17, 1984

Action (3 minutes)

II. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE, 1984-85

Action (3 minutes)

(These are in addition to those approved at the May 17, 1984, meeting.)

FACULTY AFFAIRS Faculty: Harvey Keynes, Jooinn Lee (UMM).

Ex officio: Burton Paulu. Student: Eugene Ronning.

TENURE Student: John King.

III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-84

The FCC held 21 meetings in 1983-84, of which nine included a discussion with the president, academic vice president, or both. FCC closed portions of three meetings to address personnel questions (one concerning honors, one concerning a grievance, and one concerning a hiring decision). In addition, FCC met twice with the Regents to discuss background and development of the tenure code revision.

TENURE CODE. No business required more careful and sustained attention than the work on the revised tenure code. FCC was among the groups which examined the draft and forwarded suggestions to the Tenure Committee in the fall of 1983. The FCC's objective was to facilitate the work of the Faculty Senate so that it could complete its work within the academic year and approve a text to forward to the administration and the Board of Regents. The faculty Senate completed its business on June 7, 1984.

SPECIAL SALARY MONIES. In the summer of 1983 the FCC constituted from among the membership of the Consultative, Faculty Affairs, and Finance Committees, an *ad hoc* committee to consult with the academic vice president on the use of special faculty salary monies for the 1983-84 year. The committee's charge was to offer advice on the criteria and principles of distribution of funds for three targets: to especially meritorious departments, to departments impacted by market factors, and to individual retention cases.

A similar group was constituted for consultation in the spring of 1984 on distribution of discretionary salary monies for 1984-85, largely for the purpose of meeting market competition. A portion of the reserved funds was to be held for use in retention cases.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS. FCC organized faculty input into the review of President Magrath's administration by the following means: the Regents' office, via a notice in the *Daily*, solicited letters from the faculty; FCC invited current and recent members of Senate committees which have substantial interaction with central administration to meet with FCC members; and FCC met twice with the evaluator, Dr. Josef Kaufman.

GRIEVANCE SYSTEMS. Jointly with the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity for Women and the general counsel's office, the FCC appointed a special committee to address a Rajender decree petition challenging the University's internal tribunals. That special committee's May 30 report is being reviewed by counsel for the plaintiffs and counsel for the University, and by the Senate committees concerned.

FCC urged the Regents to reconsider their granting of a probationary year to Professor George King and uphold faculty and administrative decisions that Professor King should be terminated.

FCC's Grievance subcommittee continued development work on a proposal for a comprehensive revision of University grievance procedures.

PLANNING TASK FORCES. FCC submitted to the president its endorsement of the report on Enhancing the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty, including FCC's prioritization of the report's recommendations.

Members discussed at length and with the Graduate School dean the proposals for a new structure for Graduate School tuition. FCC urged reexamination of the data on which cost of instruction is calculated. FCC also questioned the wisdom of assigning a uniform percentage of costs to all students.

The committee discussed with the president the reports of the other planning task forces and urged that the appropriate Senate committees be given ample opportunity to comment on recommendations central administration proposes to implement.

FCC discussed with the president and submitted written suggestions for modifications in the revised institutional planning statement.

FACING TRANSITIONS. FCC's last two meetings of the year addressed the transition in central administration, the search process for an associate vice president for academic affairs, and ways in which the SCC and FCC could assist the Regents in the presidential search process.

Membership: Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, John Howe (Chr.), Marvin Mattson (UMC), Jack Merwin, Irwin Rubenstein, W. Donald Spring (UMM), Deon Stuthman, Wesley B. Sundquist, and John Turner, vice chair of the Senate, *ex officio*.

JOHN HOWE
Chairperson

IV. ADJOURNMENT

MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY STUDENT SENATE
Thursday, Nov. 15, 1984
(immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting)

The voting membership of the University Student Senate totals 54, including the Student Consultative Committee.

I. MINUTES FOR MAY 17

Action (2 minutes)

II. COMMITTEES OF THE STUDENT SENATE

INFORMATION:

STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE: Cathy Birk, Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell (UMM), Sue Gruenes (UMW), Doug Melby, Paul Schulte, David Shope, Bruce Williams (UMD), and one to be appointed from UMC.

III. STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

INFORMATION:

Final Report on the Existence, Structure, and Mission of the University Student Senate

The extended subcommittee on the Student Senate continued its work throughout the summer. The remaining, unresolved issues as of the May 17 Student Senate meeting, appear to be completed or will be through University Senate or Student Senate action this November 15. One note of loss—Scott Singer, who co-chaired both Student Consultative and the extended subcommittee through the close of the 1983-84 academic year, has since graduated and gone on to Carnegie-Mellon University for his graduate degree. Student Consultative wishes to thank Scott for all of his aid in this process. Student Consultative also wishes to extend its heartfelt thanks to the remaining co-chair of the Extended Subcommittee, Alice Edwards, for all of her invaluable aid and assistance throughout this sometimes-difficult process.

Following is the final report of the Extended Subcommittee.

DOUG MELBY
Chair

As of the May 17 Student Senate meeting, the tasks assigned to two of the four working groups of the extended subcommittee appeared to be completed—the Structure and Principles, Objectives, and Policies Statement working groups. Due to the postponement of the constitutional amendments from the Structure working group at the University Senate meeting on May 17, more work needed to be done.

To best facilitate the workings of the extended subcommittee in the summer, a second retreat was planned for the Morris campus in late July. This weekend produced results to many of the unresolved issues.

The issues relating to the postponement of the complete slate of constitutional amendments dealt with a last-minute substitution to the officers of the Student Senate amendment by student senators Julie Bates, Dave Lenander, and Bill Meyer. In order to work out a compromise between Student Consultative, which fully supported the Structure working group's original, and the Bates/Lenander/Meyer substitute, the complete slate of constitutional amendments postponed to ease the consideration of each alternative.

At the Morris retreat, a compromise amendment was agreed to by principals of both parties to the dispute, which provided for election of the Student Senate chair from among all student senators and eliminated the position of Student Senate vice-chair entirely. It was also agreed that this officer arrangement would be periodically evaluated.

Also due to the Morris retreat, and with the considerable assistance of Professor Don Spring from Morris, the two Structure amendments relating to the Student Committee on Committees and the Principles, Objectives, and Policies Statement were redrafted, hopefully to the satisfaction of the Senate's Business and Rules Committee.

(Due to an unfortunate delay relating to the re-submission of the complete slate of previously proposed amendments and those aforementioned suggestions for change, Business and Rules was unable to conclude its reconsideration of all of the proposals in time for the November 15 University Student Senate meeting. These amendments, it is hoped, shall appear on the February 14 University Senate's docket.)

The Lobbying working group's remaining task was largely completed at the Morris retreat, thanks in large part to the efforts of Paul Schulte. It was decided to create a permanent extended subcommittee of Student Consultative to handle the lobbying of the Student Senate. Two motions concerning the composition of this new extended subcommittee and its standard operating procedures will be up for approval at the November 15 Student Senate meeting. The initial composition of this extended subcommittee for 1984-85 should be available at the door of the Student Senate meeting.

With the workings of the Lobbying working group completed, the Funding working group was able to present its final recommendations, both on interim funding for the 1984-85 academic year and for future funding. For the interim, 1984-85 funding from the student associations of the several campuses will provide the initial assessments, with the balance of the old SLAC funds. The notion of an equal per-student assessment, or a student service fee, was approved by Student Consultative for the future.

Lastly, the Principles, Objectives, and Policies Statement was recommended to be amended to reinstate the provision dealing with lobbying, which had been struck by Student Consultative since the Lobbying working group had not completed its work. This amendment will appear on the Student Senate docket on Number 15.

The extended subcommittee on the Student Senate would like to extend its thanks to the following for their aid throughout the process: Dave Lenander, who originally chaired the extended subcommittee's predecessor, Julie Iverson, who came up with the idea of the original well-attended retreat at Mary Jane Plunkett's cabin near Rice Lake, Wisconsin, Mary Jane Plunkett, Paul Schulte, who co-chaired Student Consultative through most of the life of the extended subcommittee, and Professor John Howe and the 1983-84 Senate Consultative committee, and Professor Richard Purple and the Senate Business and Rules Committee, for their support of the process. The chair of the extended subcommittee on the Student Senate would like to express her personal gratitude to the members of the extended subcommittee: Charles Farrell, chair of the Funding working group, Susan Hunstiger, Mitch Richter, chair of the lobbying working group, Scott Singer, original co-chair and chair of the Structure working group, Professor Don Spring, Colleen Traxler, chair of the Principles, Objectives, and Policies Statement working group, and Wade Wilde.

ALICE EDWARDS
Chair

IV. STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

SYSTEMWIDE LOBBYING

(5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Student Consultative Committee establish a permanent extended subcommittee on Student Lobbying to lobby on behalf of the Student Senate. The membership of this extended subcommittee shall include at least one member from the Student Consultative Committee, one member from the Student Representatives to the Board of Regents,

one member from every campus, and one member from the St. Paul campus. The Student Consultative Committee shall appoint the chair.

MOTION:

That the Student Senate endorse the following standard operating procedures for the extended subcommittee on Student Lobbying:

1. All items to be lobbied on must have the unanimous agreement of all campuses.
2. Exceptions to this rule, except those outlines in point three, shall go through the procedures outlined in the Principles, Objectives, and Policy Statement.
3. Items on the University's capital request, as these items are by nature campus-specific, need not be sent through the Executive Committee.
4. The chair of the extended subcommittee shall serve as the student legislative liaison (lobbyist). S/he shall take all actions necessary to implement the Student Senate's lobbying objectives, including when necessary seeking assistance from the MSA legislative director.
5. Any campus can lobby on its own for any campus-specific proposals.

INFORMATION:

The Student Consultative Committee endorsed both motions at its September 20, 1984, meeting. The committee has been busy trying to fill the initial extended subcommittee called for in the two motions. The initial committee makeup will be available at the door.

The Student Consultative Committee considered this arrangement the best one for reorganizing the University Student Senate's lobbying structure. This proposal allows for tighter control of the lobbying, as well as a mechanism by which the extended subcommittee can operate on a regular basis. This recognizes that in order to lobby as a University Student Senate requires the unanimous agreement of all campuses student associations. It will also allow for the reestablishment of this systemwide lobbying on a timely basis in time for the 1985 legislative session.

V. STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE STUDENT SENATE PRINCIPLES, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES (5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Student Senate amend the policies section of this statement as follows:

C. The Student Senate shall develop and lobby for a legislative agenda in which a standing operating procedure would be followed and reports made to the Executive Committee.
(The existing section C would be renumbered D.)

INFORMATION:

This amendment would restore the Principles, Objectives, and Policies Statement to its original form. It simply would take care of the lobbying structure that has since been devised.

VI. ELECTION OF 1984-1985 STUDENT SENATE OFFICERS

INFORMATION:

Due to the unfortunate delay in the consideration of the University Senate constitutional amendment revising the relationships of all the Student Senate officer positions, the Student Consultative Committee recommends that the election for Student Senate chair be postponed until *final* University Senate action has been completed on the constitutional amendments. For the interim, the Student Consultative Committee is pleased to recommend the continuance of Charles Farrell as Interim Student Senate chair.

VII. STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT, 1983-84

The 1983-84 Student Consultative Committee consisted of Charles Farrell (UMM), Van Hayden, Susan Hunstiger (UMC), Julie Iverson, Lisa McDonell, Mitch Richter (UMD), Paul Schulte, Scott Singer, and Colleen Traxler (UMW). Only one member returned from the previous year, and so considerable time was spent filling all positions. Attendance from all members was good, not only at full SCC meetings, but at Student Consultative meetings as well. Student Consultative was thus able to pursue many important and diverse agenda items.

At the committee orientation held in conjunction with the July Regents' meetings, the committee decided, after much lengthy deliberation, to elect Paul Schulte and Scott Singer as Co-Chairs of the committee, thus yielding to the eloquent urgings of the former chair, Dave Lenander.

A major task befalling this year's committee was to continue the revision work of the Student Senate Constitution. As the committee labored through several attendant issues such as SLAC (systemwide lobbying), Mr. Lenander pointed out that when the University Senate Constitution was revised in 1981, the Student Senate was fully incorporated. In order to promote some initial solutions to the problems we were facing, a retreat was held at Mary Jane Plunkett's cabin in Wisconsin at which 16 student leaders from most campuses attended. Substantial progress was made. This led to a reformulation of the previously Lenander-chaired Task Force to a larger extended subcommittee on the Student Senate. Alice Edwards who by this time had almost become a member of the committee through her good Student Consultative attendance, and Scott Singer co-chaired the Extended Subcommittee. The other members are Charles Farrell, Susan Hunstiger, Mitch Richter, Colleen Traxler, Wade Wilde and Professor Don Spring (UMM).

The extended subcommittee divided itself into four major working groups: Structure chaired by Scott Singer; Funding chaired by Charles Farrell; Lobbying chaired by Mitch Richter; and Principles, Objectives and Policies Statement chaired by Colleen Traxler. The second and last working groups had for the most part completed their assigned tasks by the end of the year.

Structure was charged with examining the University Senate constitution, bylaws, and rules and recommending any amendments necessary to revitalize the University Student Senate. The fruit of this effort was placed on the May 17 University Senate docket and was postponed until fall quarter 1985 due to a last minute substitution on the constitutional amendment dealing with the University Student Senate officers.

The Principles, Objectives and Policies Statement, in its nearly final form, was passed at the May 17 University Student Senate meeting. The statement delineates a set of "standard operating procedures" that are to guide the Student Senate. In the opinion of the extended subcommittee these "procedures" were best left out of the other formal University Senate documents.

Funding was determined that in the interim, 1984-85, the various Student Associations will provide the base of the support. Student service fees appeared as the most viable future funding option. The exact interim level of funding will depend on the lobbying structure agreed upon.

Lobbying remained the stickler. The notion of systemwide lobbying has wide support but the details of where to house it (within the Student Senate or not?) and the like have bogged final resolution on this item down.

(At the time of preparation of this report, planning was under way for another mini-retreat in an effort to complete the work of the extended subcommittee during the summer in plenty of time for the fall quarter Senate meetings.)

As an offshoot of the extended subcommittee process of the Student Senate, several members of Student Consultative made an effort to travel to all four of the other campuses. At the end of January, Morris and then Crookston were visited, during which visits the SSCC members gained a better understanding of these two campuses and met and helped to improve working relations with the student leaders on these campuses. Waseca was visited in February, with the same benefits. Finally in May, Duluth was visited in conjunction with the Regents' meetings.

Student Consultative has had to face a large number of diverse and important issues throughout the year, besides the Student Senate. A major amount of time and effort was devoted to tracking the five task forces appointed by President Magrath that came out of the planning process. The first task force to report was on the University and the Economy of the State (chaired by David Lilly). The task force on the Student Experience (chaired by John Wallace) absorbed quite an amount of Student Consultative's attention during the year. First of all in the fall, Student Consultative worked to increase the number of students on this highly important task force from two to six. This effort was successful. Also, Student Consultative tracked the task force throughout the entire year, at first in order to ensure that the focus of the task force did not exclude extra-curricular student activities, for instance. The task force on the International Character of the University (also chaired by John Wallace) began its life as a small "steering" committee. This "steering" committee submitted a compilation of the numerous reports concerning various facets of international education at this University. The task force will now turn its attention to making concrete recommendations from all of the other reports that they combined. The task force on the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty (chaired by Jack Merwin) was primarily discussed at Faculty Consultative Committee meetings. The last task force, which is on the Quality of Graduate Research and Education, finally completed and released its report. SCC took up this report at one of its last meetings of the year. Student Consultative eagerly awaits the discussion of all the task force Reports as compiled and evaluated by the President and his administration.

In conjunction with Student Consultative's work on the Student Senate, which has led to a remarkable level of increased cooperation between student government leaders of all five campuses, several members of Student Consultative have regularly attended several Regents' meetings. In particular at the February Regents' meetings, Student Consultative as well as the student body presidents and the student representatives to the Board of Regents engaged in a maelstrom of activities related to the current student pay rates system. Student consultative did continue to discuss student pay rates quite often all alone. This exposure to the Regents has been particularly helpful to Student Consultative, and in the future it would be helpful for Student Consultative and the student representatives to the Board of Regents to meet more often together.

At the May 17th SCC meeting, Regents Professor and Vice Chair of the Senate John Turner introduced a motion to study the separation of student and faculty governance structures. Student Consultative welcomes such a periodic reevaluation of the current governance structure. It is these co-chair's fond hope that such a discussion will lead to the strengthening of *both* faculty and student governance here at the University of Minnesota.

In addition to these major areas of concern, Student Consultative has discussed several issues at great length: the revised tenure code; the new graduate tuition plan; the revisions to the University's Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures; and the University's recruitment of high ability students.

Lastly, on May 31, the Student Consultative Committee transitioned. Professor Marvin Mattson was the featured guest speaker. Mike Olmstead was elected to the chair for 1984-85.

(Subsequently, Mr. Olmstead resigned due to other time commitments including service on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Doug Melby was elected to succeed Mr. Olmstead as Chair.)

**PAUL SCHULTE
SCOTT SINGER
Co-Chairs**

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Question to the President -- November 15, 1984

Is there any intention of moving Engineering Library
to Walter Library prior to the renovation of Walter
Library?

Lawrence Goodman
IT Senator

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION OFFERED BY PAT SWAN

IN THE FORM OF A SUBSTITUTE

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

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

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

OVER

Handouts
11/15/84

November 14, 1984

Fellow members of the University Senate:

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

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

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

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

wsn

An attempt to disenfranchise students

By Douglas Melby,
Jacqueline Jodi
and David Shope

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

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

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

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

Tuesday, November 13, 1984

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Apology

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

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
THE SENATE
MINUTES

February 6, 1969

**X. OLD BUSINESS
REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON STUDENT REPRESENTATION**

Reported for Action

I. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A Response to the Motion

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

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

MSA



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

#66411

~~3~~

11-2-84

Nov. 2, 1984

To: University Senators

From: Marilee Ward, Clerk

Attached is a motion that will be introduced by Faculty Senator Patricia Swan at the November 15 meeting of the University Senate. It is being sent to you in compliance with the Senate requirement for advance written notice of any proposed amendment to the Senate constitution.

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

encl.

cc: Professor Richard Purple, Chr., Business & Rules Committee
cc: Professor Jack Merwin, Chr., Consultative Committee

MOTION:

In order to achieve the following objectives:

1. To encourage students to focus their efforts on those parts of the University's governance structure in which their contributions can be most fruitful -- on committees at all levels of the system, in the campus assemblies, and in their own student government institutions.
2. To change the composition of the University Senate to eliminate the student representatives, except for the student body presidents of the five campuses; to abolish the Faculty Senate, whose functions will be taken over by the University Senate; and, through these reforms, to provide a governance structure (the University Senate) in which the voice of the faculty can be heard more clearly.

Therefore, be it resolved that the following amendments be made in the Constitution of the University Senate:

GENERAL CHANGES

Delete references to the "Faculty Senate," substituting, where appropriate, the designation "University Senate."

Substitute "Faculty Consultative Committee" for "Senate Consultative Committee."

ARTICLE III. UNIVERSITY SENATE (Page 1)

Section 1. Membership

line 5: Delete "and student"

lines 8-10: Delete "Medicine. The elected faculty representatives shall serve as the Faculty Senate; the elected students representatives shall serve as the Student Senate." Substitute: "Medicine; and (d) the student body presidents of the five campuses."

Section 3. Allocation of Functions and Powers

a. lines 3-4: Delete "to the Faculty Senate or"

b. lines 3-4: Delete "either the Faculty Senate or"

d. Delete: "In general, functions allocated to the Faculty Senate shall include but not be limited to accreditation,

line 9: Delete: "any" and add "the"

line 11: Delete: "and any student"

lines 17-27: Delete the rest of the paragraph, beginning with "All members of the faculty...."

Be it resolved that the following amendments be made in the Bylaws:

ARTICLE I. UNIVERSITY SENATE MEMBERSHIP, ELECTIONS, AND OFFICERS (Page 5)

Section 1.

line 3: Delete: "and students"

line 4: Delete: "or students"

Section 3.

Delete entire section.

Section 4.

lines 7-9: Delete: "Student vacancies in the Senate shall be filled in accordance with procedures determined by the constituencies of the relevant voting unit."

ARTICLE III. SENATE COMMITTEES (Page 6)

Section 1. Committees Reporting to the University Senate

A. CONSULTATIVE

Rewrite as follows:

"The Faculty Consultative Committee shall be composed of 11 elected members of the faculty and the vice chair of the University Senate. It shall serve as a consultative body to the president, as the executive committee of the University Senate, and as the steering committee of the Senate."

Membership

(1) lines 1-2: Delete: "and the Student Consultative Committee"

b. Student Consultative Committee: Delete entire section.

Be it further resolved that:

1. These changes go into effect on July 1, 1985.
2. The necessary editorial changes and renumbering of clauses be made in the Constitution and the Bylaws in order to bring these documents into conformity with the requirements of this motion.

Patricia B. Swan
Senator, College of Agriculture

Until 1969, the main governance structures at the University were the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Consultative Committee. In 1969, two additional structures were grafted on -- the University Senate and the Senate Consultative Committee -- so that students would be represented. At that time, too, a special effort was made to give the students representation on the campus assemblies, on task forces, and on most committees at all levels of governance.

Student participation in governance may be justified on two grounds: (1) to provide them with experience in leadership, and (2) to enable them to make useful contributions in those areas in which they have had experience and have developed some competence. In an effective system of governance, students should be encouraged to focus on activities that help them to develop leadership qualities and enable them to inject their viewpoints on those subjects in which they are most qualified and hence can make the most significant contributions. This can best be done in those forums that deal with such matters as curriculum development, student fees, the calendar, and similar issues. The appropriate forums for such discussions are departmental and college committees, some Senate committees, campus assemblies and committees, task forces, and the institutions of student governance. For the students to perform adequately in these areas requires a great many people who are expected to spend considerable time on this work. (Last year there were more the 180 student committee positions on Senate and Assembly committees alone.) The students have usually encountered difficulty in recruiting people to serve in positions where their contributions can be the most fruitful; they should be encouraged to concentrate their efforts in these forums, where their performance is greatly needed and

vote even on matters that were hitherto reserved for the Faculty Senate. This is an effort to improve student governance by upgrading the position of student body president.

It is important for us to get the modified and strengthened governance structure in place before the new president of the University takes office.