

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Assembly Steering Committee
Faculty Assembly Steering Committee
Thursday, February 3, 1994
12:30 - 3:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: Judith Garrard (chair), John Adams, Mario Bognanno, Lester Drewes, Amanda Geist, Love Goel, James Gremmels, Erick Harper, Kenneth Heller, Derek Jensen, Robert Jones, Karen Seashore Louis, Geoffrey Maruyama, Toni McNaron, Harvey Peterson, Linda Pham, Sandy Pham, Irwin Rubenstein, Anne Sales, Rabun Taylor, Shirley Zimmerman

Regrets: none

Absent: Dale Vathauer

Guests: Professor Gerhard Weiss

Others: Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate)

[In these minutes: Student Academic Grievance policy; dockets; health sciences reorganization; a resignation]

1. Student Academic Grievance Policy

Professor Garrard convened the meeting at 12:30 and welcomed Professor Gerhard Weiss to introduce the Student Academic Grievance Policy. She recalled that he had been appointed by President Hasselmo and Professor Bognanno to draft a policy that would complement the new grievance policy and procedures adopted by the University Senate last year.

One decision the Committee must make, Professor Garrard said, is whether to put the policy on the Senate docket for action in February or to hold it over until April. There is a need to get it in place because it fills a void and also because there are at least two cases pending.

The charge to the committee, Professor Weiss reported, was to draw up a student academic complaint policy. The objectives were to develop a simple yet adequate procedure that is helpful to the students, that puts some order into what has been an arbitrary system of dealing with academic grievances, that is easy to understand, that does not create 25 new committees, that can deal with academic grievances quickly, that is readily available to students, and workable within the existing University structure.

*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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Professor Weiss reviewed the membership of the committee that drafted the policy as well as the steps it followed once it had a draft prepared. Reactions were sought from across the University; suggestions were incorporated in the draft which has been presented at this meeting.

The emphasis is on informal resolution and that is identified as the first recourse. The policy recognizes, however, that they may not always be possible, so a formal mechanism and an appeals process is provided for. Professor Weiss then outlined the procedures contained in the policy.

Professor Garrard turned to Professor Bognanno for a reaction, inasmuch as he had appointed the committee and had been responsible for superintending development and adoption of the new grievance procedures. Professor Bognanno commended Professor Weiss for the work of his committee and said he fully supported it. He asked whether or not the policy covered someone not a student at the University (e.g., someone who applied but was not admitted to a program). Professor Weiss said it did not; the policy applies to students who were enrolled at the time of the incident which is being grieved. The policy does cover ALL students--undergraduate, graduate, extension, and so on.

Questions were raised about the appeal process; the final authority is the vice president responsible for the college of enrollment. For graduate students and for colleges that report to him, it would be the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Comments were made that any procedures established by the Graduate School should involve the faculty.

Asked about the hearing panel, Professor Weiss said its members would be drawn from the existing committee of the college.

One Committee member, who had to depart, urged that the procedures be adopted and placed on the docket of the Senate in February--there is no reason to delay it and there are people who need it, it was said. Professor Garrard said she would interpret that as a motion for approval, whereupon it was seconded; the motion was then forthwith approved unanimously. Professor Weiss agreed to appear at the Senate meeting to speak to the policy. If the Senate were to approve the policy, it might be possible to put it on the Regents' docket in March for approval.

Professor Bognanno moved the Committee extend its appreciation to Professor Weiss and his committee for its timely work; the Committee gave him a round of applause. Professor Weiss expressed thanks for the support.

2. Senate and Assembly Dockets

Professor Garrard then drew the attention of Committee members to the draft dockets that had been distributed at the beginning of the meeting. She noted that she had asked the President to report on U2000 and on the 1994-95 budget and to provide a time for questions. Following brief discussion, it was also agreed that the President should be asked to respond to the caveats that were included in the Faculty Senate resolution that approved U2000; the Committee also concluded that it would be appropriate to include this as a docket item for the UNIVERSITY Senate rather than the Faculty Senate.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to approve the University Senate docket.

At this point Professor Garrard recessed the Senate Consultative Committee and convened the Twin Cities Assembly Steering Committee; the agenda for the Campus Assembly meeting was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved without debate. Professor Bognanno noted that the Assembly agenda includes the observation that he and Professor Zimmerman expire.

3. Resolution on Reorganization of the Health Sciences

Professor Garrard then reconvened the Senate Consultative Committee and recognized Ms. Sales to discuss a resolution that had been adopted by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly about reorganization of the health sciences. The resolution took sharp exception to the lack of consultation with the governance structure on that reorganization--as well as its focus on the Medical School rather than all of the health sciences.

The ultimate goal, Ms. Sales said, is to bring it--in some form--to the floor of the full Senate, but she wished to solicit the comments of SCC before proposing any additional action. It is too late to revisit the decisions about the health sciences, she observed, but the question remains about how to operate in the future. Committee members discussed the sequence of events that led up to the reorganization and its possible implications; the importance of consultation about reorganization of such a major element of the University was emphasized by several.

Professor Garrard reported on the actions she had taken, as FCC chair, about the reorganization and her understanding of the discussions that had, and had not, taken place. To the extent there are proposals in the reorganization that involve faculty activities, it was pointed out, the resolution will not be worth the paper it's printed on until there is consultation.

To whom is the message to be sent? inquired one Committee member. The REAL short-circuit came not at the administrative or planning level but at the level of the Board of Regents; if there is a message to be sent, it should probably go to the Board. The GAPSA resolution, however, may be a little too-strongly worded.

It was clarified, in response to a comment by one Committee member, that the reorganization "will have major effects in terms of the way [faculty] live their academic lives; it has major effects on faculty and students, teaching, research." And the relationship to the rest of the campus, added another Committee member. So the purpose of the resolution, it was then said, is to assert that when the Regents decide--for a variety of understandable reasons--to make some rapid adjustments in what goes on As observed earlier on another matter, if left up to University governance processes to address the issues, "we'd be here five or six more years while the world changed, to the disadvantage of all of us." That said, it is still appropriate that when things happen inside the University that affect everyone's welfare, some form of consultation take place--even if the action is going to occur rapidly anyway. If the purpose of the resolution is to complain that students were "left out of the loop" when the reorganization took place over a few weeks, that complaint should be registered. But what else is intended, other than to assert that appropriate constituencies should be consulted? These were extraordinary times; that can be acknowledged, but what is then to be said? Was this resolution given to anyone after GAPSA adopted it?

GAPSA would like it to go to the Senate but recognize that others must be involved, Ms. Sales

replied. Her view was that there is a point to registering a complaint about how the process was handled. There remain many of the details to be worked out in the restructuring; one question is "who will be at the table when those details are worked out?"

The appropriate group to whom the resolution should be sent is the administration, said one Committee member. The administration could have taken steps to ensure consultation before the issue ever reached the Board of Regents.

Another agreed, saying the resolution should be given directly to the President. This is not so much a governance issue as a complaint about the way something was handled several months ago that affects a lot of people. It is still unfolding. It probably would have been a good idea, last fall, to have a gathering in the health sciences at which the President could have spoken with the faculty about what was going on. There are times when the process must be short-circuited to avoid "all the political flak that piles up when you're trying to do things through channels." At that point, it is necessary to take the political steps rather than the procedural steps in order to make it easier, at a later time, to use the procedures. Otherwise there is a logjam on the procedural end. There have been opportunities subsequently for people to interact with the President, but they often do not choose to take advantage of the opportunity. It isn't clear what to do with the resolution, but it could be handed to the President, noting the impact on graduate and professional students and their need to know and discuss the changes.

There was a meeting of the health sciences faculty senators with Cherie Perlmutter and Shelley Chou to review the changes; there was also a smaller group that reviewed them. That took place last September, before the Board acted. Both were initiated by the governance structure, but that is part of its responsibility, Professor Garrard observed.

The resolution, said one Committee member, should probably be taken to the Student Senate, not the University Senate, because one senses that faculty were variously consulted along the way, and it should perhaps be addressed to the Board AND the administration.

Another problem, it was observed, is that there is no consultative structure within the health sciences--certainly nothing to parallel the CLA Assembly. That is a matter that is also being addressed; there needs to be a faculty structure as well as a student structure. The problem for students is that they are elected as Graduate School senators, not on the basis of college of academic work.

One reason the resolution is important is because of its impact on the selection of the health sciences provost and the dean of the Medical School; it is a job responsibility. Neither the resolution nor its substance have been brought up with the candidates for provost, it was said by another Committee member. It would be helpful to know, it was rejoined, if they would endorse it. Some candidates have spoken about a wish to work with the governance structure, it was reported, but the issue to which the resolution speaks has not been mentioned.

Could the resolution be transmitted, without Committee ENDORSEMENT but with a request that it be considered a concern?

There are two issues involved that should be separated, said one Committee member. First is the "slap on the wrist" which the Committee does to the administration from time to time--don't do it again.

That's appropriate and does help sensitize people. Second is the "what do we do from here?" question, which should be a separate resolution. The Committee might say that it views the health sciences as an important part of the University; that's important, because they tend to be seen as "those guys over there," as different, as not part of the University. But one gets the sense that people do not believe that and the Committee should say it. Moreover, since there is an administrative structure in place, it should get about the serious business of consultation about the establishment and implementation of policies to integrate the health sciences more into the University.

THAT kind of resolution, it was said by another Committee member, could quite logically come from SCC, because that is of equal concern to faculty and students. It would be an expression of support for faculty and students. It would also be a positive message, said another, in that it tries to reach out. Another said encouragement of governance structures in the health sciences, and their integration with the rest of the structure, should be the action of SCC, it was said. Professor Heller agreed to draft language for such a resolution.

4. Resignation

Professor Garrard then again turned to Ms. Sales for an announcement. Ms. Sales told the Committee that she was resigning from the Student Senate Consultative Committee, and thereby the Senate Consultative Committee, as the representative of GAPSAs and that the new chair would be Mr. Goel. Professor Garrard said she regretted the announcement and that she had enjoyed working with Ms. Sales; other Committee members expressed thanks to Ms. Sales for her contributions to the Committee. Professor Garrard assured the Committee that Ms. Sales had agreed to continue as chair of the task force on user-friendliness.

Committee members gave Ms. Sales a round of applause.

Professor Garrard then adjourned the meeting at 1:40. Following a short break, she convened a closed meeting of the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee to identify nominees to serve on the nominating committee to identify candidates for the Committee on Committees (which does not appoint its own members). Following identification of nominees, the meeting was adjourned at 1:55.

-- Gary Engstrand