

Minutes

Senate Consultative Committee May 2, 1991

Present: Warren Ibele (chair), Mike Bognanno, W. Andrew Collins, Bonnie Dittel, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, K. Darby Laing, Stanford Lehmberg, J. Kim Munholland, Aric Nissen, Burton Shapiro, Tina Tidrick, Shawn Towle, James VanAlstine, Christine VeLure, Shirley Zimmerman

Guests: Associate Dean Mark Brenner, Rich Broderick (University Relations), President Nils Hasselmo, Ken Janzen (Regents' Office), Senior Vice President Leonard Kuhi, June Nobbe (SODC), John Sullivan (Senate Research Committee)

[Summary: Action on Senate and Assembly docket items; discussion of the budget situation with the President.]

1. Discussion of Senate and Assembly Docket Items

a) Disclosure of Conflict of Interest Professor Ibele opened the meeting by welcoming Associate Dean Brenner and Professor Sullivan and drawing the attention of Committee members to the Conflict of Interest policy. FCC, he noted, has discussed the policy earlier.

Dr. Brenner noted for the Committee that there has been a disclosure policy and that the University has been a national leader in this area. The policy is based on the premise that the best way to address the problems is appropriate disclosure. The changes being proposed are intended to cover situations that the previous policy did not address. He explained to the Committee the changes that are proposed.

If appropriate disclosure were not made, Dr. Brenner said, the individual might be subject to appropriate disciplinary action and would also be asked to correct the record, where possible.

There was brief discussion of the threshold amount required to trigger the requirement for disclosure; some expressed the view that \$1,000 was much too low to require disclosure.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to forward the proposal to the University Senate for action.

b) Resolution on the Task Force on Liberal Education The next item, for the Assembly Steering Committee, is a resolution for the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. Committee members discussed whether or not it is appropriate to act on the draft resolution (calling for adoption of the report) when it had not seen the final report of the Task Force. It was finally agreed, after considerable discussion, that the resolution would be placed on the docket of the Assembly as a vehicle for initiating the discussion and to put the report in front of the Assembly; a vote to approve it as a docket item would not constitute a vote to endorse the report. Professor Shapiro reported that it is understood by everyone--the administration, the Task Force, the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning--that implementation of the report will occur as funds become available and that the process will be incremental.

It was moved, seconded, and voted, with one abstention, to place the resolution on the docket of the Assembly, with the understandings noted by Professor Shapiro and with the notation

that it was not a vote of approval or disapproval of the report itself.

Asked how it would be interpreted if the Assembly voted down the report, Professor Munholland responded that "we've just wasted a year" and that there would be sufficient reservations about the recommendations that a majority of the Assembly would feel that the report would need to be redrafted. By a different task force, he agreed.

c) By-law establishing the Council on Liberal Education Following notation of a few editorial amendments, the Committee discussed the proposed by-law amendment. **On vote taken, it was agreed that the student representation should be changed from three undergraduate students to five undergraduate students and two graduate teaching assistants.**

It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to place the proposed by-law amendment, as amended, on the docket of the Assembly.

d) Rule on Administrators Serving on Senate and Assembly Committees This proposal, from the Committee on Committees, was not intended to be presented to the Senate for action; it represents a practice that has been used by the Committee on Committees and is presented to the Senate Consultative Committee for approval. It clarifies who constitutes an administrator, for the purposes of Senate and Assembly Committees, and determines when such individuals will be eligible for committee membership. There was some question about whether or not the proposal would require an amendment to the Senate Rules; it was agreed that Professors Ibele and Collins would check and either present it to the Senate for action or for information, depending on what is needed.

It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to approve the change in principle and to permit the appropriate steps to be taken with respect to placing the item on the Senate docket.

e) Eligibility of P&A Appointees for Senate Membership This proposal also came from the Committee on Committees and is intended to expand the membership of P&A appointees in collegiate units who have faculty-like responsibilities. Those appointees must meet certain longevity and appointment status requirements. The total number of individuals who would be included would be about 200, which would add about 8 - 10 members to the Senate. The Committee on Committees noted that this proposal raises questions about the ratio of various groups in the Senate, its overall membership, and the goals and objectives of the Senate and Assembly; it suggested that either the Consultative Committee or another group consider these larger questions because they were beyond the scope of the charge to the Committee on Committees.

The student members of the Committee objected to expanding the number of faculty/academic professional positions in the Senate, thereby reducing the ratio of students to faculty/academic professionals. The Committee deliberated the proposal at length.

Motion was made to table the amendment; the motion failed on a 5 - 3 vote.

One student member asked that the issue be presented to the President, because he is directed by the Senate constitution to resolve difficulties that arise among constituencies of the Senate. Professor Ibele ruled the request out of order.

It was moved and seconded to approve the amendment; the motion failed on a 4 - 5 vote.

f) Amendment to Permit Appointment of Non-Collegiate P&A Personnel to Senate and Assembly Committees The proposed by-law amendment would permit, upon approval by the Senate Consultative Committee, individuals in units not represented in the Senate to be appointed to Senate and Assembly committees. These would be individuals who, because of their particular expertise, could contribute to the conduct of a committee's business. Those individuals would be appointed to one year terms on the committees, and with vote. This is not a novel concept, Professor Bognanno pointed out; although there is no civil service or alumni representation in the Senate, individuals from those groups do at present serve on Senate and Assembly committees.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to place the proposed by-law amendment on the Senate docket.

2. Discussion with President Hasselmo

The Budget Situation Professor Ibele interrupted the discussion of docket items to welcome the President to the meeting. The President began by commenting again on the situation in the legislature [see the FCC minutes of this same date]. He told the Committee that the University has tried to address specific issues rather than respond to the many different proposals which are making their way through the various committees of the legislature. Given that the legislature may not make decisions until very late in the session, and given that the Board of Regents will not be acting on the budget principles until final legislative action is known, the President observed that there will be a time bind in getting the 1991-92 University budget approved. The administration is now considering what additional adjustments can be made in the budget, is weighing very carefully what program cuts can be made to meet a possible cut in the base budget, is considering the impact on tuition, and trying to balance all these factors in the best way possible. Whatever solutions are devised will be brought to the Finance and Planning Committee and the SCC for review and discussion.

There was brief discussion of the (United States) Senate hearings on reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the future activities of the University in Washington, and the role of the to-be-appointed Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. The President commented on several of the issues which confront Congress with respect to higher education. On the role of the new Vice President, there appeared to be agreement, on the part of both the President and the Committee, that the appointee would not have primary responsibilities for representing University interests in Washington except on issues and policy in research.

On the question of faculty representation on the Committee, the President said he believed the question of faculty representation in the governance system is singularly a faculty question. If there is a role for him to intercede, he commented, he will have to review the circumstances and the language of the Senate constitution. He said he would be glad review the matter with the Committee if it wished. Professor Ibele explained that there is also a need for more in-depth legal consideration of the issues. The President agreed.

Professor Ibele thanked the President for his time.

3. 1991-92 SCC Meeting Schedule

It was agreed to postpone consideration of the schedule until all Committee members contacted Professor Ibele about possible conflicts.

4. Docket Items, Continued

g) By-law Amendment to Relocate the Duluth FCC Seat to the Twin Cities Professor Ibele distributed to the Committee copies of the proposal that had been approved earlier in the day at the FCC meeting. He explained the history of the problem and the reason that the amendment had been brought to the Committee.

After a lengthy and somewhat rancorous discussion, Professor Collins moved to table the amendment until an opinion could be obtained from the General Counsel about seating an individual from Duluth who had also received the endorsement of the collective bargaining agent.

Professor Collins' motion was adopted unanimously.

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand