

Minutes

Senate Consultative Committee Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee April 2, 1992

Present: Thomas Scott (chair), James Arcand, Mario Bognanno, Denise Eloundou, Jamie Hodgson, Paul Holm, Norman Kerr, David Lee, Stanford Lehmberg, Karen Seashore Louis, Lois Regnier, Burton Shapiro, Denise Tolbert, James VanAlstine, Christine VeLure, Jeff Winker, Shirley Zimmerman

Guests: John Felipe (Office of Equal Opportunity), Geoff Gorvin (Footnote), Elizabeth Grundner (Office of the Registrar), President Nils Hasselmo, Rob Hogg, Ted Labuza (Chair, Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics), Aric Nissen, Maureen Smith (Brief), Garrett Webber (Daily), other students

1. SCEP Policies

Professor Scott convened the meeting at 12:40, welcomed Jamie Hodgson, the new student representative from the Crookston campus, and then turned to Professor Lehmberg for discussion of the SCEP policies.

Both policies are being brought to repair earlier concerns or mistakes; both were unanimously approved for placement on the Senate docket.

2. Rules Changes

The Committee approved for the Senate docket without dissent rules changes which provide for an additional ex-officio member of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and which bar anyone from holding an administrative appointment of 50% time or greater from serving on Senate and Assembly committees except in an ex-officio capacity. [The vote on the Assembly by-law was by the Assembly Steering Committee.]

3. Energy and Environmental Policy

Professor Scott then welcomed Aric Nissen to the meeting to discuss the draft Energy and Environmental Policy developed by MSA. Mr. Nissen began his comments by reporting on the volume of energy, waste, and pollution associated with the University and the money to be saved, and the reduction in the impact on the environment, if a comprehensive policy were to be adopted. He also explained the events which led to the drafting of the present version of the policy.

Committee members discussed with Mr. Nissen the units and groups being contacted to review the draft policy; they also raised with him questions about how some of the specific numbers and recommendations were selected. He and Mr. Hogg explained that some were taken from existing public policy decisions and literature; others were selected because they seemed reasonable and a way to start the discussion. In the instance of heat and electricity, they noted, the University's energy policy will be determined for the next 25 years by the outcome of the steam negotiations, so in some sense the document parallels those discussions.

One Committee member noted two problems with the draft. First, it is almost exclusively Twin

Cities based, and should also address agriculturally-related environmental problems such as soil erosion and degradation of surface water. Second, an energy policy at the University in many ways preaches to the converted; it should include outreach and reliance upon University expertise to get the message out to those who are NOT converted. Mr. Nissen agreed to incorporate agricultural concerns, that the policy should apply to the entire University, and that the University should reach out to share its policies and expertise.

Another Committee member commended Mr. Nissen for the work MSA has done and suggested that only the more general policy be presented to the Senate; any document with too many specifics is less likely to pass. Decoupling the policy from the more specific recommendations may mean the policy could move more quickly; if they are not separated, MSA should plan on at least another six months of intensive work if it hopes to have the document pass--and even then many of the provisions will have to be deleted. Mr. Nissen said that they wished to have something more than a "warm and fuzzy" document, as has been adopted elsewhere, that will make people feel good but that will not accomplish anything. He agreed, however, that it would be appropriate to separate the policy recommendations from the specific numbers and goals.

Committee members expressed concern about a number of provisions in the policy, such as reliance on student fees, hiring of additional administrators, establishment of committees, the limits of University responsibility, and implementation questions. Mr. Nissen responded to each of the concerns, acknowledging that they need to be addressed in some way.

The Committee urged that Mr. Nissen NOT seek to bring the document to the Senate at this point, because there is too much risk that it might be voted down. Mr. Nissen agreed to delay presentation to the Senate until the policy could be further amended.

4. Discussion with President Hasselmo

Professor Scott welcomed the President to the meeting, who then touched upon a number of issues:

- The status of the University's budget at the legislature; the basic science building is in the bonding bill in both houses, although the House carves \$900,000 out of the total for planning money for a basic sciences building at Morris; it is still possible that the building will not be funded because it is so large and not susceptible to subdivision.
- Units have been given instructions on cuts based on the projected budget reduction of \$25 million proposed by the Governor; if the cut is smaller, the cuts will be re-evaluated. It may not be that all cuts would be reduced across-the-board; some units might be excused entirely from cuts while others would not.
- Asked about student participation in setting priorities in bonding, the President explained that the current priorities of the University were set several years ago. It may now appear that students have had no voice in determining those priorities, but they were developed after discussion with the Consultative and Finance and Planning committees, both of which have students on them. There is huge backlog of requests, he told the Committee, and the University has not requested planning money for new facilities; it has decided to seek only construction funds rather than build up the backlog

of projects. He agreed, however, that student participation in setting building priorities should be examined.

- Revision of the merger plan will probably not be reconsidered this year; it may, however, not be a dead issue. The University has not been invited to participate in any discussions.
- The "Waldorf" bill is also apparently dead for this session, but it is a national issue and will likely recur. The 1/3 - 2/3 ratio, he pointed out, is itself arbitrary, and the actual numbers demonstrate that there has been movement in the direction of requiring students to pay 40% of instructional costs. What has happened is a gradual slipping upwards in the amount paid by students--with no corresponding increase in financial aid.

Discussion then turned to the resolution on ROTC. The President began by reporting that his efforts, and those of the Big Ten presidents, continue, especially by the general counsels of Minnesota, Illinois, and Wisconsin. The Department of Defense has promised to continue the dialogue, on a serious level, and there appears to be increasing national momentum to engage the issue. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (the chief executive of which is now C. Peter Magrath) and the ACLU are both exploring possible legal action. It is his understanding--although this is sheer speculation--that it is unlikely anything will happen before the elections in November; after that, irrespective of which party wins, there may be a small window of opportunity to make a change.

It is his judgment, the President told the Committee, that to set a timetable to sever connections with ROTC is not a productive step; it would take the University out of effective participation in the discussion. The military is already looking for ROTC programs to close, but want to retain the programs at the major universities; if the University wants to continue ROTC, there is a good chance it will be able to do so. If, however, the University were to say it wishes to close it, the military might very well comply promptly. There are those in high places who want to see the policy changed, and most major universities in the country are pushing hard on the issue.

The President acknowledged that patience is running short, including his own, but reiterated that only by continuing the debate is national change possible. There may come a point when universities will need to take unilateral action, but that point, he said, has not yet arrived.

When the Senate adopted its first resolution, including a timetable, the Board of Regents held an open forum and deliberated about the ROTC program but decided not to consider the resolution. The President said he would put the resolution before the Board again, and will also recommend continuing the strategy that he has been pursuing. The President said he did not know if the Board would take action, but he will not recommend adopting a timetable. Only the Regents, he also cautioned the Committee, decide what the Regents will take up; neither the Senate nor the Consultative Committee can obligate or force the Board to address any issue.

Committee members debated the discussion briefly. It was argued that the President should be supported and that the timetable should not be pushed. Another commented that while favoring the abolition of ROTC on personal grounds, pressing this resolution with the Senate could result in it being defeated--and it would appear, in the national press, that the University no longer supports the right of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals to serve in the military. It was also pointed out that if the Senate

adopts the new resolution (reaffirming the timetable), the Board might turn it down. It also might approve it. In either event, the President's negotiating position could be undermined.

Other Committee members argued that the University should take action and that it can accomplish very little, if anything, at the national level--but it can act locally.

It was moved and seconded that the resolution be placed on the docket of the Senate; the resolution was defeated with 2 in favor, 7 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

Meeting of the Assembly Steering Committee

1. Mission and Philosophy Statements and Operating Principles for Intercollegiate Athletics

The Senate Consultative Committee adjourned at 2:30; Professor Scott then convened a meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee and welcomed Professor Labuza to discuss the mission and philosophy statements and operating principles for the intercollegiate athletic programs.

Professor Labuza reviewed the history of the documents which have been drafted for consideration by the Board of Regents. He said that the impetus for the revisions of the 1986 documents came from the institutional self-study of athletics required by the NCAA and from the recent infractions experiences. Both nationally and at the Big Ten level, moreover, there have been discussions of which sports should be supported and which should not; such decisions, he said, should be based on a mission statement, not the popularity of particular sports.

The President expressed his appreciation to ACIA for developing the documents and commented that he had asked it to evaluate the principles of the Knight Commission report (a national study of the governance of athletics recently completed under the auspices of the Knight Foundation); those principles have been incorporated in the documents being considered today.

Asked if other institutions are reconsidering their statements along these lines, Professor Labuza said they are. This one has stronger academic, moral, and ethical elements than most, he said, and many do not include a philosophy statement. Many also include entertainment as a mission; that has been removed from this mission statement. The issue of faculty control remains a critical one, he said, and is something that Professor Shapiro's ad hoc committee is examining.

Discussion turned to the budgets of athletics; the revenues are to be separated from the budgets. Asked how that would work, President Hasselmo noted that there are basically three sources of funds for men's and women's athletics: The State Special (for women's athletics), revenues from football, basketball, and hockey, and privately-raised funds. At present the men's department is operating at a deficit, but the budgeting for the department has been structured so that it is expected those deficits will be covered in a reasonable time. Thereafter, excess funds would go into a fund to cover shortfalls in the future. The University is trying to ensure that the programs can live within those three sources of revenue, with the understanding that there will be fluctuations over time. The goal is that athletics will be revenue-neutral with respect to the University.

Committee members touched briefly on points related to academic standards and equal opportunity; it was then agreed that the three documents should be placed on the docket of the

Assembly for information.

2. 1994-95 Twin Cities Campus Calendar

Professor Scott next turned to Professor Lehmborg to introduce the proposed 1994-95 calendar. Professor Lehmborg began by extending thanks to Elizabeth Grundner in the Registrar's Office for drafting the several alternative calendars that the Committee on Educational Policy had considered. SCEP was originally concerned about Winter Quarter, with holidays that fall on Mondays reducing the number of Monday classes; it is necessary to have at least 9 Mondays, and 10 is preferable. The only way to achieve that goal in Winter Quarter, 1995, is to eliminate Study Day and compress finals into 5 days. SCEP approved this calendar with some reluctance, Professor Lehmborg reported, but it was even more reluctant to approve a calendar which would have had an abbreviated Spring break.

It would be much more desirable to schedule Finals Weeks so that finals do not fall on Saturday, one Committee member noted with some irritation; he had a final scheduled on a Saturday and the building was not open, so they had to spend considerable time finding someone who could open it. Once open, they used the school-kid trick of putting a shoe in the door so it would remain open for students to enter the building to take their final. The other drawback to Saturday finals is that there is no secretarial help.

Professor Lehmborg also related that he had heard from a number of civil service staff who were angry about having to work on President's Day--when no one else did.

The Committee voted with approval to place the calendar on the docket of the Assembly.

The Committee adjourned at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand