

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 18, 1993
2:30 - 3:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

- Present: Mario Bognanno (chair), Amos Deinard, Lester Drewes, Judith Garrard, Paul Holm, Benjamin Liu, Karen Seashore Louis, Anne Sales, James Tracy, Shirley Zimmerman
- Regrets: John Adams, Paul Carrier, David Dahlgren, Love Goel, Sonja Hoheisel, Tom Lopez, Malaika McKee, Toni McNaron, Irwin Rubenstein, Tess Sheir, Dan Sinclair, Denise Tolbert, James VanAlstine [Note: Because the meeting was held during Finals Week, students were excused from the meeting without prejudice.]
- Absent: None

[In these minutes: Teaching Evaluation implementation protocol; supercomputing; planning]

Professor Bognanno convened the meeting at 2:30 and explained that the only purpose was to approve for the Senate docket of April 1 the revised teaching evaluation protocol prepared by SCEP. The revised protocol incorporated comments received by SCEP during open hearings and from calls and notes from the faculty.

Professor Tracy suggested three minor additional revisions:

- Departments that offer only a course or two with multiple instructors will not be asked to develop a means to evaluate them; the provision calling for a separate evaluation procedure for multiple-instructor courses is intended to apply only to departments which feature and routinely offer such courses.
- The protocol applies only to courses, not to such one-on-one instruction as may be offered by a physician to a resident during hospital rounds.
- Clarification of the language about teaching evaluation expectations.

The Committee unanimously approved the protocol and unanimously voted to place it on the docket of the April 1 Senate meeting.

Discussion then turned to supercomputing and the continued attention it is receiving. It is to be hoped that the recently appointed task force on supercomputing will provide all those with an interest, complaint, or point of view to express their opinions. The use of external groups to vent frustration is

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes are binding on the Board of Regents, the Administration, or the Senate or Assembly.

sometimes necessary, it was said, but in this case it is not clear that everyone is acting with good will.

Professor Bognanno then reported that the planning process has taken on new life and that a joint governance-administration effort will spend time considering the process that should go into producing outcomes--but not the outcomes themselves. This will carry through the summer, and will set the framework for the next 18 months of planning.

The question of the role of students in the planning process was raised; it appears that FCC has had a number of discussions about planning whereas the Student Senate Consultative Committee has had no opportunity to discuss the process. It would be useful and helpful to have student views included at the beginning, it was said, because they can contribute to the process. Professor Bognanno concurred and said the issues would be brought to the Senate Consultative Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10.

-- Gary Engstrand