

Minutes

Senate Consultative Committee June 1, 1989

Present: Mark Brenner (chair), W. Andrew Collins, Martin Conroy, Steve Ebel, Eric Huang, Warren Ibele, Norman Kerr, Matthew Kirkwood, Lynnette Mullins, Ronald Phillips, W. Phillips Shively, Burton Shapiro, Charlotte Striebel, Mark Turner, Walter Weyhmann, Tim Wolf

Guests: Douglas Biggs (COGS), John Bradford (Student Body President), Miriam Cameron (COGS), Suzanne Fust (COGS), President Nils Hasselmo, June Perkins (SODC), Maureen Smith (Brief)

1. Reports of the Chairs

Professor Ibele reported for the Senate Finance Committee that it had held a joint meeting with SCC to discuss the 1989-90 budget proposal and noted that there have been changes in those proposals since the meeting was held on May 25. The last meeting of the year, following this SCC meeting, would be devoted to a review of ICR principles, the 1990 budget, and a discussion of the budget process.

Mr. Huang reported for the Student Senate Consultative Committee that it had discussed the COGS proposal for separate graduate student representation in governance, that it wished to ask the President about retaining sports on the campus; it also wished to inquire about student and coordinate campus representation on the Tuition Task Force. SSCC also examined the question of students serving on search committees (on which it will report back to SCC in the Fall) and the ROTC policy on gays and lesbians.

Professor Brenner reported for FCC that it had discussed the role of the Committees in the Provost search and recommended to the President that the faculty and students meet separately with the candidates. He warned that there will be minimal flexibility in scheduling the meetings and suggested that the FCC and SSCC chairs be given the authority to supplement the membership if there were not enough Committee members available for an interview.

2. Clarification of Status, Council of Graduate Students

Professor Brenner welcomed Mr. Biggs, Ms. Cameron, and Ms. Fust to the meeting; all three are officers in the Council of Graduate Students (COGS). He informed the Committee that he had had a meeting with COGS representatives earlier and had asked them to prepare a statement. He emphasized that no action would be taken today; the purpose of this discussion was to identify the issues and determine whether or not a proposal should be brought to the Senate. He then asked the COGS representatives to explain their proposal.

Ms. Fust began by explaining the genesis of graduate student discontent with being obligated to participate in MSA as well as COGS; graduate senators are members of COGS and should be required to attend its meetings because COGS is a representative organization. She informed the Committee that the idea of separate graduate student representation on the Consultative Committee and on other Senate

committees was supported by the Dean of the Graduate School as well as all the Policy and Review Councils of the Graduate School. One point of the proposal is to ensure that graduate senators, by belonging to COGS, will represent the views of graduate students; at present they need not belong to COGS and can make whatever representations or take whatever positions they wish.

Graduate students, she maintained, have different perspectives from those of undergraduates; MSA, however, is made up almost exclusively of undergraduates. Graduate students also have different concerns, different needs, and different views on some issues. COGS and graduate students can better represent the interests of graduate students, although COGS would be willing to work together with MSA on items of common concern.

It was pointed out, in response, that graduate and professional students have occupied leadership positions in MSA, but the fact that there had been communication problems between COGS and MSA was acknowledged. MSA should be responsible for addressing University-wide issues whereas COGS should respond to those issues of concern exclusively to graduate students. Graduate students have the same opportunity to participate in MSA as all other students, and the Graduate School, with eight student seats, is the second-largest block of senators after CLA. There are, in addition, other groups represented in COGS whose seats are open to graduate students. If graduate students are granted separate representation, it was asked, why then should not minorities or the separate colleges ask for separate representation on committees?

Mr. Biggs pointed out that COGS is unlike any other college board in that it recognized by the University as the only governing body for graduate students and has the authority to place students on committees; only MSA has equivalent authority and recognition.

Committee members debated with each other and the COGS representatives on whether or not there had been sufficient and serious attempts to resolve the disagreements between the students as well as how best to proceed from this point.

It was agreed that COGS and MSA would set up a joint committee to work this summer to try to develop a proposal acceptable to both groups; the results are to be reported back to SCC in the Fall. The composition and appointment of the committee would be left up to COGS and MSA. Faculty would be willing to be involved, if needed, although they are neutral on the question.

3. Discussion with President Hasselmo

Athletic facilities Professor Brenner welcomed the President to the meeting. President Hasselmo was asked about the status of sports staying on the campus and what was in front of the legislature. He replied that there is nothing in front of the legislature; there is, however, a committee being chaired by Vice President Donhowe which is examining the need for facilities on the campus--not only for basketball and hockey but also for women's sports, the men's non-revenue sports, and Recreational Sports. The President expressed hope that there would be a way to construct the needed facilities because it would be desirable to keep the teams on campus. It would, he concluded, be premature to say anything more.

The President was cautioned about the politics and wisdom of any effort to seek funds from the

legislature for athletic facilities. One Committee member suggested this might be done; others noted the history of division between between the interests of students and of intercollegiate athletics as well as the long list of University capital items which needed funding. The President acknowledged that there would be \$170 million in capital items ahead of athletics. In the words of one Committee member, "I am sympathetic to keeping intercollegiate athletics on campus, but if it would mean \$20 - \$30 million for athletics rather than a library, I would not be willing to give up the library."

Tuition task force The President was asked about student and coordinate campus membership on the tuition task force; he told the Committee that he has asked Vice President Donhowe to ensure that there are sufficient representatives, and thought there should be 4 or 5 students on it.

Provost search Professor Brenner told the student members of the Committee that the faculty had been informed that they must be flexible and so should they.

Hotline The President was informed that a hotline for obtaining assistance in solving problems might be a useful addition to the University (assuming that there is a solution to all the problems, which is doubtful). It would, however, serve as a means to simplify the finding of answers.

Promise of funds to the School of Journalism The President was asked about the large infusion of funds that has been promised to Journalism and the relationship of that commitment to the CLA planning documents; is the accreditation process driving the planning? While important, is it causing an imbalance in the University's procedures and actions? There are departments in CLA which are underfunded but which do not have an accrediting agency to review them and call for improvements; how can the departments at the core be protected?

The President acknowledged that accreditation does influence funding, or at least the timing of that funding. The academic vice presidents have discussed accreditation; some agencies are more willing to engage in "blackmail" than others. Accreditation seems to develop a life of its own, he said; it is a problem and he confessed to not knowing how to control it.

Asked about the vitality of the Graduate School reviews, Vice President Clark assured the Committee that the reviews are alive and well, although they are concerned with graduate programs. The response to the Journalism accreditation report, she added, was not generous; there are problems with the physical environment as well as faculty and staff numbers and the University will have to be prepared to do more for the School. She agreed that there were other departments with similar needs, and conceded the existence of the leverage of professional school reviews.

Vice President Clark was asked if there are programs at the University which do not undergo external reviews; she said she was unsure. Colleges do reviews as they wish, and often do so in conjunction with planning, but there may be programs which are not reviewed.

Professor Brenner thanked the President for his time.

4. Task Force on Liberal Education

Professor Brenner reviewed for the student members of the Committee the appointment of and general charge that would be given to the task force. It will, he said, examine the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum, and will be composed primarily of individuals from the arts, sciences, and engineering but with representation from the professional schools. The task force will be a relatively large body. Asked, Vice President Clark said she thought most of the students on the task force should be undergraduates, although there should be graduate student representation. It was agreed that the students would develop a list of nominees to be ready at the beginning of Fall Quarter.

5. Grievance Procedure: Next Steps

At the request of Professor Brenner, Professor Striebel (who served on the ad hoc committee which developed the new grievance procedures) reviewed for the Committee the steps which needed to

be taken now that the Senate had approved the new procedures.

Most of the work must be done by the Committee on Committees: It must appoint the University Grievance Committee as well as the college grievance committees. The sooner the institution-wide committee can be appointed the better because the chair has administrative responsibilities.

The President must also designate the University Grievance Officer. There is at present someone who holds the position, but the responsibilities are considerably expanded under the new procedures; it is not clear if that individual's responsibilities will be reshuffled or if a different individual is to be named. There is considerable central clerical/bookkeeping/recording/monitoring work to be done under the new procedures.

Vice President Clark, responding to a question, said she was unsure if the new procedures should go to the Board of Regents for action or for information. One question which needs to be answered is whether or not the new procedures replace any existing Regents' policies.

Professor Striebel explained, in answer to a query, that sexual harassment claims will be dealt with in the same manner they are now, with intake through the University EEO officer, but they could thereafter be dropped into a number of different tracks for resolution.

6. Thanks

Professor Phillips expressed his thanks to Professor Brenner for his service as chair of the Committee; other Committee members joined in the acclaim.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30.

-- Gary Engstrand