

2003-04 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

OCTOBER 30, 2003

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES: No. 2
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES: No. 2
STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the University Senate, Twin Cities Campus Assembly, and Faculty Senate for 2003-04 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, October 30, 2003, at 2:36 p.m., as a joint meeting of the three bodies. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 134 voting faculty/academic professional members and 39 voting student members. President Bruininks presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Bruininks announced that the Social Concerns Committee has asked that item 14 be changed from an action item to a 20 minute discussion item. The format for the discussion will be a five-minute presentation from the committee, a five-minute presentation from the Astronomy Department, and 10 minutes of general discussion.

A senator asked why this item is being changed from action to discussion. Professor Judith Martin, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that the Social Concerns Committee presented a packet of items for this agenda. The Business and Rules Committee, which approves the Senate agenda, removed one item from the agenda because it was not properly formatted. When the Business and Rules Committee approved item 14 for action, the committee did not realize that the Social Concerns Committee had not had any consultation with the affected department. She then contacted the chair of the Social Concerns Committee, who agreed that this item needed more discussion before being brought to the Senate for action.

A senator said that there is more than one department involved in this issue and it seems to be an irregular case of changing the agenda after the agenda was printed. He said that he would vote against changing item 14 to a discussion item.

Professor Martin stated that since this resolution is directed at the work of one department and since the activities that have been taken on behalf of that department with the Native American tribes were not discussed, in a spirit of collegiality and academic freedom, every perspective should be presented for full discussion at the Senate.

The senator stated that in a recent meeting of the Research Committee, only members from the Astronomy department were invited.

A motion was then made to suspend the rules to make the change in the agenda. A vote was taken and the motion was approved.

A senator then asked why discussion time is being given to the Astronomy department and not the American Indian Studies department. Professor Martin said that the Social Concerns Committee has had discussions with the American Indian Studies department, but not the Astronomy department, which is why the later department is being given time here today.

**2. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 2, 2003
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the University Senate, Faculty Senate, and Twin Cities Campus Assembly minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URL. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/usen/031002sen.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

DISCUSSION:

This motion was withdrawn since the minutes were not available to the senators prior to the meeting.

WITHDRAWN

3. TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

FACULTY/ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS/STAFF

Egolfs V. Bakuzis
Professor
Natural Resources
1912 – 2003

Theodore M. Breu
Associate Professor
Business and Economics – Duluth
1942 – 2003

Elizabeth A. Brown
Assistant Professor
University Libraries
1924 – 2003

Charles R. Bruning
Associate Professor
Curriculum and Instruction
1927 – 2003

William G. Shepard
Professor
Electrical Engineering
1911 – 2003

Donald E. Wells
Professor

Rhetoric
1926 – 2003

STUDENTS

Matthew D. Erickson
School of Business and Economics – Duluth

Brian Heiden
College of Liberal Arts

Amanda Speckien
College of Liberal Arts

Elizabeth Wencil
College of Liberal Arts

4. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO SENATE AND ASSEMBLY ACTIONS Information

University Senate

Constitutional Amendment (University Senate eligibility)

Approved by the: University Senate October 7, 2003

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING (Response due date January 2, 2004)**

Approved by the: Board of Regents **PENDING**

Constitutional Amendment (Student Senate Chair)

Approved by the: University Senate October 7, 2003

Approved by the: Administration **PENDING (Response due date January 2, 2004)**

Approved by the: Board of Regents **PENDING**

Faculty Senate

Academic Unit Governance Policy

Approved by the: Faculty Senate February 20, 2003

Approved by the: Administration See comment*

Approved by the: Board of Regents – no action required

* Administration did not approve the policy, but returned it to FCC asking that a few revisions be made

5. ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE Award of Distinction Information for the University Senate

University of Minnesota Award of Distinction

This award recognizes those who have attained distinction in their field, profession, and/or public or volunteer service and are not an alumnus or alumna of the University of Minnesota. Awards of Distinction are not awarded to encourage or reward financial contributions to the University.

A nomination for an Award of Distinction should be submitted to the All-University Honors Committee. The following format is to be used:

Nominee – cannot be or have been a member of the faculty, staff, Board of Regents, or an alumnus or alumna of the University.

Nominator – must be an alumnus or alumna of the University or a current member of the faculty, staff, or student body. **Board of Regents policy requires that no disclosure is to be made to the nominee, or persons other than those writing supporting letters, until a decision is forthcoming on the nomination.**

Letter from nominator – should focus on personal knowledge of the nominee’s distinction in their field, profession, and/or public or volunteer service.

Dean, Chancellor or Vice President Support – As appropriate (indicated by the cover letter to the nomination.)

Nomination Summary – 50 words or less, restricted to outlining the nominee’s accomplishments.

Outstanding Accomplishments – one page summary highlighting the individual’s accomplishments.

Biographical Information – to include nominee’s address, telephone/fax number, date of birth, education, employment, professional and public and/or volunteer service.

Supporting Letters – three ideally from both from the nominee’s peers inside and outside the University; again, these are in addition to the letter from the nominator and should focus on personal knowledge as outlined above.

Number of Copies – 25 of each item, collated, stapled and clipped (no binders and folders).

Date for Submission – Recommend at least 6 months before the award is to be presented.

Submit to – honors committee of the appropriate college, if one exists, and if not, to the All-University Honors Committee, c/o Vickie Courtney, University Senate, 427 Morrill Hall, 100 Church Street SE, Minneapolis, MN, 55455.

The college honors committee forwards its recommendations to the Senate All-University Honors Committee. A nomination approved by the Senate All-University Honors Committee is submitted to the President and, finally, to the Board of Regents for approval.

NOTE: Persons writing letters of nomination should know that such letters will be legally available upon request, even to an unsuccessful candidate who becomes aware of the nomination. Nominators should also make sure that writers of supporting letters are aware that their letters, too, will be available on request.

Board of Regents policy requires that no disclosure is to be made to the nominee while his or her name is under consideration.

Units sponsoring Awards of Distinction are encouraged to provide travel support when funds are available. If this is not possible or creates a hardship for the nominating unit, it is encouraged to seek partial funding through the Office of the President. In general, award and citation costs are

borne by University Relations, award ceremony costs by the nominating unit, and travel expenses (except as described above) by the awardee.

**SHIRLEY GARNER, CHAIR
ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE**

**6. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Statement on Centrally-Scheduled Classrooms
Information for the Faculty Senate**

Capital improvements applicable to centrally-scheduled classrooms should NOT be the financial responsibility of the academic unit which houses the facility and should be exempt from the 1/6 cost-sharing principle which applies to other capital improvements that are not designated for HEAPR" [Higher Education Asset Preservation and Renewal, which appropriations are not subject to the requirement that the University pay one-third of the debt service].

Approved unanimously by FCC; also approved by the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning.

**JUDITH MARTIN, CHAIR
FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**7. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Parking Resolution
Information for the University Senate**

Whereas Parking and Transportation Services is initiating a new extra-cost Reserved Contract Parking program in selected garage and ramp facilities, effective October 1, 2004; and

Whereas this change reduces the value of a non-reserved contract without any corresponding reduction in its price; and

Whereas this change imposes severe negative effects on the educational mission of the university by substantially reducing the ability of evening students to park on campus in time to join their classes, and otherwise generally reduces the efficiency in the use of parking facilities, especially for events involving the general public; and

Whereas it is not egalitarian and sends the wrong message to students and the public; and

Whereas this change was introduced following the beginning of the academic year and without consultation with the faculty and staff; therefore

Be it resolved that the Senate Committee of Faculty Affairs requests that this proposed contract modification be prohibited unless and until appropriate consultation has been completed and the likely negative effects of its implementation studied and weighed.

Adopted unanimously September 9, 2003

Endorsed unanimously by the Academic Health Center Finance and Planning Committee
September, 2003

**JOHN FOSSUM, CHAIR
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**8. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee Review
Information for the University Senate**

**Committee on Committees Review
of the
Equity, Access and Diversity Committee**

The Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity (SCEAD) was created in 2001 to replace the Senate Equal Opportunity for Women Committee already addressing the issues of women on campus because of a perceived need to also address issues of equality and access with respect to communities of color and other under-represented groups. At the same time, the Senate was concerned that the issues of women not be submerged in the process. For that reason, and to understand whether the new structure is appropriate and effective, a review of SCEAD was scheduled after two years. As stated in the University Senate Bylaws, Article III., Section 6,

“The role and performance of the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee will be reviewed during the 2002-2003 academic year, with a special emphasis on the extent to which the work of the existing Committee on Equal Opportunity for Women has been carried forward”.

The Senate Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Consultative Committee, undertook this review. The following procedures were followed:

- a) A subcommittee was formed to outline a procedure to follow for the review. The committee membership included two members from the Faculty Committee on Committees (Dian Lopez, chair and Deon Stuthman) and two members from the Student Committee on Committees (Matt Dewerff, chair and Zeina Dajani). The subcommittee met early Spring Semester and developed draft questionnaires to send to relevant groups on campus and a set of recommendations to the Senate Committee on Committees on how the review could be conducted.
- b) The Senate Committee on Committees directed the chair to send the questionnaires (see appendix) to the following: Mary Lay, Chair of the Senate Committee on Equity, Access and Diversity; Jeanie Taylor, Director of the Office for University Women; Sally McKee, Associate Vice-Provost for Multicultural and Academic Affairs; Amy Kaminsky, Chair of Women’s Studies on the Twin Cities Campus; and Coordinate Campus women’s organizations. Two of the questionnaires were returned. One was from Mary Lay, Chair of the SCEAD, and the other from Jeanie Taylor, Director of the Office for University Women. The responses contained a list of the accomplishments the committee has made over the past two years, as well as concerns and recommendations for the committee. The Committee invited Mary Lay, Chair of the SCEAD, to a Senate Committee on Committees meeting April 30, 2003.

As a result of this review, the Committee on Committees learned of the accomplishments of the committee as well as issues that should be addressed further by the committee. The following is a summary of the accomplishments, areas of concern identified by the SCEAD, recommendations for the SCEAD, and actions to be taken by the Committee on Committees to facilitate the SCEAD.

- a) Accomplishments of SCEAD:

1. The SCEAD is addressing women's issues. Because many of the women's issues also affect other minority groups, it has been found helpful and many times more effective to have a committee that addresses these concerns simultaneously. To ensure adequate attention, however, the committee is discussing creating a subcommittee with membership from SCEAD and from other constituencies to focus particularly on women's issues.
 2. The SCEAD has invited a series of administrative and program representatives to their meetings. Carol Carrier has briefed the committee on periodic reviews of administrators and how their success and challenges in maintaining diverse units is assessed. They have met with Joel Maturi and Karen Weaver to discuss the climate in the newly merged Men's and Women's Athletic Department.
 3. The SCEAD is working on an invitation to other Senate committees and subcommittees to bring to SCEAD for review policies and procedures as they are being discussed in other committees and before they are established and implemented so that issues that might affect diversity may be addressed in a more timely manner.
 4. The SCEAD has addressed many issues including a Gender Salary Resolution, a University-wide Climate Survey of faculty, students, and staff, staff access to courses offered through the Career Enrichment Center, and how to broaden SCEAD's reach to the coordinate campuses.
 5. Jeanie Taylor, Director of the Office of University Women states: "This committee has become an important part of my efforts toward gender equity on this campus within the larger context of multiculturalism. The committee has been attentive and accessible, and members of the committee have been ready to address issues as they arise."
- b) Areas of concern identified by the SCEAD and mechanisms the SCEAD has identified to address the concerns:
1. The primary concern is the identification of an effective mechanism(s) to solicit ideas, relevant policies, and input from the campus community. The SCEAD is concerned that issues, policies and procedures are not being brought to the committee for discussion and recommendations. The SCEAD would especially like to be consulted by administrators on issues under their purview. The committee has invited administrators to SCEAD meetings to provide input. The SCEAD recommends that ex-officio members of SCEAD send an alternate representative to SCEAD meetings if they cannot attend themselves.
 2. The SCEAD is concerned about addressing the needs of the coordinate campuses. They are discussing creating a subcommittee to address these issues.
 3. The SCEAD is concerned that they are not addressing students' issues and recommends more active student members.
- c) Recommendations made by the Committee on Committees to the SCEAD Committee:
1. Form a subcommittee to continue to address identified issues of women on campus, as proposed by SCEAD.
 2. Continue to solicit administrative units and other Senate committees to bring to the SCEAD any policies and procedures within the realm of the committee's charge. The SCEAD committee should continue to invite administrators to their meetings and continue to work on making the committee's presence known to the university community. It is recommended that Professor Lay follow through with the plan to send a message to administrators and other

senate committees to invite them to bring equity/access/diversity issues to the SCEAD committee as they are formulating policy. It is also recommended that Professor Lay draft a message to all faculty in the fall inviting them to identify issues of equity/access/diversity.

3. Consider the following possible issues for next year's agenda (identified by the Committee on Committees): a) differential effects of the budget cuts on women and minorities; b) ensuring that University salary studies explore gender and race differences, when possible without revealing individual salaries; c) that a spousal hiring condition does not affect hiring decisions; d) the inadequacy of bridge funding for hiring women/minorities who are "target of opportunity" hires; and e) the hiring of women faculty especially in the science and engineering departments where there is sometimes a disparity.
- d) Actions to be taken by the Committee on Committees to facilitate the SCEAD Committee:
1. The Committee on Committees will recommend the appointment of the Director of the Office of University Women as an ex-officio member of the SCEAD Committee.
 2. The Committee on Committees will send to committee chairs the suggestion that they be mindful of equity/access/diversity issues when doing their business and to bring those issues to the SCEAD Committee.
 3. The Committee on Committees will seek the assistance of the Provost in making administrators aware of SCEAD and the need to bring relevant issues before the committee.

Appendix:

Message to the Chair of the EAD Committee:

The Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity (SCEAD) was created because of a perceived need to address issues of equality and access with respect to communities of color and other under-represented groups, and to replace the Senate Equal Opportunity for Women Committee already addressing the issues of women on campus. At the same time, the Senate was concerned that the issues of women not be submerged in the process. For that reason, and to understand whether the new structure is appropriate and effective, a review of SCEAD was scheduled after two years. To conduct that review, the Committee on Committees would appreciate your answering the following questions, in consultation with the rest of the SCEAD membership:

1. Did the charge to SCEAD effectively establish a foundation for the Committee's work? Should the charge be modified in any way to assist you in your work?
2. Have you been able to establish an effective agenda for the committee's work? What would help you be more effective? What obstacles have you found to being effective?
3. Please list the issues that the committee has addressed since it began meeting as a committee. Have you been able to focus effectively on the issues of women and also on the issues of communities of color and other underrepresented groups on campus? Has the combination of these two agendas been helpful? Problematic? Please be as specific as possible.
4. Has the ex officio membership of the committee provided the expertise and connection with the administration needed for you to perform effectively?

Thank you very much for your input,

the Senate Committee on Committees

Sent to the Office of University Women, Office of Multicultural Affairs, Office of Women's Studies and like offices on the coordinate campuses:

The Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity (SCEAD) was created because of a perceived need to address issues of equality and access with respect to communities of color and other under-represented groups, and to replace the Senate Equal Opportunity for Women Committee already addressing the issues of women on campus. At the same time, the Senate was concerned that the issues of women not be submerged in the process. For that reason, and to understand whether the new structure is appropriate and effective, a review of SCEAD was scheduled after two years. To conduct that review, the Committee on Committees would appreciate your answering the following questions:

1. From your perspective, has SCEAD been able to focus effectively on the issues of women as it also addresses the issues of communities of color and other underrepresented groups on campus? Has the combination of these two agendas been helpful? Problematic? Please be as specific as possible.
2. Have you developed an effective working relationship with SCEAD?
3. Do you see a Senate Committee as having an effective role to play in reviewing and supporting the efforts of your office and other initiatives related to the issues of women on campus?

Thank you very much for your input,

the Senate Committee on Committees

**CATHERINE FRENCH, CHAIR
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

**9. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS
Revised Athletics' Policies
Information for the Twin Cities Campus Assembly**

The packet of athletics' policies approved by the Assembly Steering Committee will be available at the meeting.

**ARTHUR ERDMAN, CHAIR
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS**

**10. CLERK OF THE SENATE/ASSEMBLY REPORT
Electronic Vote Results
Information for the University Senate**

FOR INFORMATION:

Following the October 2, 2003, University Senate/Twin Cities Campus Assembly meeting, an electronic vote was taken to pass two constitutional amendments. At the end of the three working day voting period, 161 votes in favor of and 1 vote against were recorded for the Senate eligibility item and 160 votes in favor of, 1 vote against, and 1 abstention were recorded for the

Student Senate Chair item. The amendments needed 121 votes in favor, therefore these amendments were approved.

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE**

11. SENATE/FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Judith Martin, Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC), said that the committee is continuing to monitor the Senate reorganization discussion, which is a topic for later on today's agenda. A statement has been developed to send to the Minnesota Congressional Delegation that deals with the impact of the Patriot Act on foreign students and faculty and the freedom to publish certain kinds of research. The full text of the statement will be in the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) minutes from today. An anti-discrimination statement has been approved for the Twin Cities Campus. Vice President Gardebring has reported on the University's branding campaign and listened to concerns. FCC is working on a process to devise events for new and newly-promoted faculty on the University's governance structure. FCC is also looking for faculty advisors to help colleagues with issues with respect to the grievance process. A report was received on salaries at other Big Ten institutions, and have forwarded it for further discussion to the Finance and Planning Committee. Lastly, an intellectual future discussion was held on the topic of land-grant institutions at the beginning of the 21st century.

12. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE

Recycling Paper Resolution Action by the University Senate

Recycling Resolution

Whereas, the University of Minnesota is a large institution that puts a substantial demand on resources and,

Whereas, the University of Minnesota is a world-class institution of higher learning that needs to be a leader in sustainable practices in the community and,

Whereas, over 2,000 students and faculty have given signatures of support for a policy of using *only* post-consumer waste (pcw) recycled paper and,

Whereas, some departments of the University of Minnesota currently purchase 30% pcw recycled paper at a cheaper price than paper with zero recycled content.

Whereas, the U of M community demonstrates strong support for this change in policy and this policy is a simple and economical step to lessen our impact on our natural environment.

Therefore, the University Senate recommends that the University of Minnesota adopt a policy that all departments, computer labs and libraries on its campuses purchase paper that is a minimum of 30% pcw recycled paper. Exceptions to this policy may be made in instances where a paper requirement must be met. Even under these conditions, the University of Minnesota should try to use recycled paper whenever possible. In this way, the University of Minnesota will set an example for other schools and institutions to follow.

Approved by the Social Concerns Committee, May 2003.

COMMENT:

In 1996-97, the University Senate passed an Energy and Environment Conservation Policy for the University (<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/socconengres.html>). Affirming the principles of that resolution, the Social Concerns Committee suggests a specific action that the University can take towards creation of a more sustainable campus: establishing a minimum post-consumer waste (pcw) content standard for the majority of paper used by the institution. Currently, the University promotes office paper recycling, but in order to have strong markets for this paper, we must also help create demand for recycled products. Paper with a minimum of 30% pcw content is currently priced at or below 0% pcw paper. Thus, we foresee no negative financial consequences of this policy.

**MARGARET KUCHENREUTHER, CHAIR
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A senator objected to consideration of the amendments as they were not printed in the Social Concerns Committee minutes. The Parliamentarian noted that resolutions are not required to be printed in minutes prior to consideration by the University Senate, and as such the motion is out of order.

Brian Wachutka, member of the Social Concerns Committee, then introduced the motion by saying that the committee is concerned with the inter-relationship between the University and the broader community, as well as the University's response to social problems. The resolution asks that all University departments purchase paper with a minimum of 30 percent recycled materials. This follows the Regents policy on pollution and waste abatement. Paper purchasing is a simple way to make a large change.

Q: What is the percent of departments purchasing 30 percent recycled paper at the current time?

A: 60 percent of departments are already using 30 percent recycled paper and one percent of departments are using 100 percent recycled paper.

Q: Why was 30 percent recycled paper chosen for the resolution?

A: The University is currently offered non-recycled paper, 30 percent recycled paper, and 100 percent recycled paper. It is a reasonable step for the University to take and the cost of such paper is the same as for non-recycled paper.

Q: Does this resolution apply to all paper used by the University, including letterhead and stationery?

A: This resolution is just for computer printer paper in departments and labs. An exception is also built into the policy for special-use paper.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved by a majority.

APPROVED

**13. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE
Printer Resolution
Action by the University Senate**

Printer Resolution

Whereas, paper conservation saves the University of Minnesota money and

Whereas, paper conservation lessens our demand on resources.

Therefore, the University Senate recommends that every department, computer lab and library on its campuses purchase at least one duplex printer to be phased in as current printers are replaced. This policy makes paper conservation a more accessible option for students and faculty.

Approved by the Social Concerns Committee, May 2003.

COMMENT:

This resolution suggests a second action the University may take to reduce its use of natural resources. Though duplex printers will require an initial investment on the part of the University, in the long run they will reduce paper use (and expense) by a significant amount.

**MARGARET KUCHENREUTHER, CHAIR
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

Brian Wachutka, member of the Social Concerns Committee, said that this resolution deals with printers in departments, computer labs, and libraries, and is another step to make paper conservation more accessible for students, faculty, and staff who choose to conserve paper.

Q: Why does the resolution not ask for all printers to be duplex capable?

A: The concept for the resolution was accessibility to duplex printing, which can be accomplished with one printer. The committee would not be opposed to a department purchasing all duplex printers.

Q: What is the cost for duplex printers?

A: Whatever initial cost increase there is for a duplex printer, the savings from paper conservation will outweigh it.

A senators commented that his department has had many problems with their duplex printer, and now use it almost exclusively to print on just one side of the paper.

With no further comments, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 82 in favor, 61 opposed, and one abstention.

APPROVED

14. SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE Mount Graham Resolution Discussion by the University Senate

Resolution Of The Senate Social Concerns Committee On Mount Graham Telescopes

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Mount Graham telescope project has elicited over fourteen years of great controversy as a result of the project's exemption from the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the National Forest Management Act; and

WHEREAS, Mount Graham (known as *Dzil Nchaa Si An*), located in southeastern Arizona is a holy place and sacred mountain to the San Carlos Apache and the White Mountain Apache, and is considered a living locus of spiritual energy, central to the religious practices and history of the Apache people; and

WHEREAS, any permanent modification of the present form of Mount Graham constitutes a display of profound disrespect for the San Carlos Apache and White Mountain Apache as well as a serious threat to the survival of a number of endangered species; and

WHEREAS, the University of Minnesota's involvement in this project tarnishes the image of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis and St. Paul, and the surrounding communities,

WHEREAS, the Senate Social Concerns Committee stands behind its previous statement that "On ethical, material, political and cultural grounds, we cannot afford to join the MGIO [Mount Graham International Observatory] project," and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate Social Concerns Committee at the University of Minnesota hereby still strongly opposes any involvement by the University of Minnesota in the Mount Graham telescope project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate Social Concerns Committee opposes the University of Arizona's request to the U.S. Forest Service in 2002 that they be allowed to place additional telescopes on Mount Graham; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate Social Concerns Committee seeks to have the University of Minnesota withdraw its participation in the Mount Graham telescope project, break its affiliation with the University of Arizona Department of Astronomy and the Research Corporation that controls the telescopes on Mount Graham, and find a more suitable place to conduct astronomy;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Senate Social Concerns Committee that a copy of this resolution will be presented to the University Senate, the Faculty Senate, and the Student Senate, as well as the President and Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota.

Approved by the Social Concerns Committee, May 2003.

COMMENT:

In the Fall of 2001 the Social Concerns Committee began examination of issues surrounding the University of Minnesota's intentions to join the Mt. Graham International Observatory / Large Binocular Telescope project (MGIO). The Committee devoted several months to careful study of this issue, including testimony from Professor Leonard Kuhi, Chair of the Department of Astronomy, members of the University's American Indian Affairs Committee, local activists, members of the Mt. Graham Coalition, two native elders from the Apache Survival Coalition, and through affidavit from Anthropologist Keith Basso, a leading authority on Apache culture.

After considering all available information, the Committee drafted a position report expressing serious reservations about the University's involvement in the project. This document is available at: <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/socon/mountgraham.html>). Quoting from that report are the most important of the committee's concerns, "Significantly, what is at stake here is **not** historical, economic, scientific, or legal 'reality'; rather, this is a question of how we are to be *seen*, of the symbolic power and violence of *actions*, and of the *relationships* we wish to set with our communities in this particular moment in history.... On ethical, material, political and cultural grounds, we cannot afford to join the MGIO project."

The University of Minnesota has since decided to join the Mt. Graham project (see minutes of the Board of Regents Finance & Operations Committee, October 10, 2002, <http://www1.umn.edu/regents/minutes/2002/october/finance.html>). Continuing concerns about the ethical ramifications of this action prompted the Social Concerns Committee, in keeping with its charge to be concerned with the "interrelationship between the University and the broader social community," to draft the current resolution, and to forward it for approval by the University Senate. (Passed by a vote of 14-1-1.)

**MARGARET KUCHENREUTHER, CHAIR
SOCIAL CONCERNS COMMITTEE**

DISCUSSION:

A senator asked that the rules be suspended to allow the agenda for this item to be amended to permit five minutes of discussion from the American Indian Studies department since the Social Concerns Committee did not hear from this department either.

The motion to suspend the rules was seconded and a vote was taken. The motion to suspend the rules was approved by a majority.

The senator then made a motion to order the agenda to allow five minutes from the Social Concerns Committee, five minutes from the Astronomy department, five minutes from the American Indian Studies department, and 10 minutes for general discussion. This motion was seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was approved by a majority.

Joel Helfrich, a member of the Social Concerns Committee, said that in 2001, then-President Mark Yudof asked the Social Concerns Committee and the American Indian Advisory Board to research and offer advice regarding the University's investment in the Mount Graham International Observatory (MGIO). Sidestepping advice from the committee, the American Indian Studies department, the Metro Urban Indian Affairs Council, the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council, the Center for Biological Diversity, the Defenders of Wildlife, Earth Justice, the Endangered Species Coalition, the National Audubon Society, the National Resources Defense Council, and the Sierra Club, the University joined MGIO on October 10-11, 2002.

At that point, the Social Concerns Committee knew that its advice had not been given credence and noted that the University's part ownership in the MGIO was an act of violence against indigenous culture. The committee then proposed this resolution as a way to speak with a stronger voice on this issue. The committee did not solicit the opinions from any departments as it has the year before. Instead, the committee wrote a resolution to strengthen its own voice. It is possible that this item might return to the Senate for action in the future.

He then yielded his remaining time to Michael Nixon, an attorney for the Apache Survival Coalition and the Mount Graham Coalition. He stated that the October 20, 2003, letter from the American Indian Studies department faculty eloquently, succinctly, and accurately states the facts and presents the crux of the matter. This is a fundamental, moral issue, and one which

requires serious deliberation by this University, something that has not yet truly, ever happened. The substance and the merits of the Apache case has never been heard in any U.S. court. They have been denied this opportunity through technical, legal barriers in each of three cases. There has also been misinformation disseminated by the University of Arizona. For more information, he urged senators to go to: <http://www.mountgraham.org>.

Professor Lawrence Rudnick, from the Astronomy department, next stated that his department has been working for 20 years to become part of a large telescope project. Participation in the consortium of telescope operations run by Stewart Observatory, including the Large Binocular Telescope (LBT) on Mount Graham, is vital to the department's research now and in the next 10-15 years when there will be a large turnover in the faculty. The University will need to be in a strong position to recruit people.

In 2001-02, many groups raised their voices for and against the project. The Regents listened to issues on both sides, approved the University's participation in the project, and directed the University to establish a partnership with the San Carlos Apache. That last directive has been fulfilled, despite what might be stated by other organizations, and the first quarterly report was distributed today for information.

In May 2003, the Social Concerns Committee decided to revisit this issue. They received information from sources unknown, did not inform the department of their deliberations, did not ask for a presentation, did not inform the department of the resolution, and did not ask for responses to the resolution. Their motion threatens the vital interests of the department, and the committee had a clear responsibility to fully consult with the department. The Social Concerns Committee has been derelict in this matter as well as completely irresponsible in bringing this matter to the University Senate without exercising due diligence.

Had the committee contacted the Astronomy department, they would have been told that the department, as directed by the Regents, has worked with the University of Arizona and the University of Virginia to establish a three-year educational outreach program with the San Carlos Apache. The department would also have told the committee that it is contributing \$40,000 per year to this project, and could extend its programs to this campus. The department would have said that it has the support of the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council as evidenced by the following letter which was read into the record:

October 28, 2003

Professor Leonard V. Kuhi
University of Minnesota
Astronomy Department
116 Church St. SE
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Dr. Kuhi:

I am writing to you to express our appreciation for the support of the University of Minnesota, University of Virginia, and University of Arizona (Tri-University Partners) for working with the tribal members of the San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation. Your support has permitted us to enhance resources in the areas of education, self-government and economic development.

As you know, the Tri-University Partners is a new outreach initiative with the San Carlos Apache Tribe. Although we have only been working together for a few months, significant initiatives, economic development outreach, tribal college initiatives and cultural advisory committees.

We look forward to working with you to continue this new beginning and to develop a long-term relationship that will benefit members of our San Carlos Apache tribal community.

Sincerely

SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE

Kathleen Wesley-Kitcheyan
Tribal Chairwoman

Professor Rudnick said that the choices here are simple. One choice is for the University to make a symbolic gesture to the legitimate concerns of traditionalist Apaches and withdraw from the project, which will have no effect on what happens on Mount Graham and will do vital harm to the research program of the Astronomy department. Or, the University can continue to partner with the San Carlos Apache and build a relationship that will support the many needs and aspirations of the tribe. In the spirit of that partnership, the department once again extends its hands to those in the University community who have much to teach the Astronomy department about the Apache and other peoples.

In closing, he asked that the University Senate give the Social Concerns Committee resolution no further consideration, but set up a mechanism for updates on the research and partnership efforts with the representatives of the San Carlos Apache.

Professor Patricia Albers, Chair of the American Indian Studies department, read the following statement, prepared and approved by the faculty in the department:

“We are writing this letter in support of the Senate Social Concerns Committee’s resolution opposing the University of Minnesota’s involvement in a telescope project on Mount Graham on the basis of several ethical grounds.”

“First, the religious rights of the Apache people in Arizona are being trampled upon as a result of the University’s decision. The second pertains to the ethics of a process by which a duly constituted body of this university community was not afforded an official and meaningful public forum in which to communicate their concerns on a matter of profound concern.”

“In the development of the Mount Graham telescope site, the University of Arizona was exempted, through a midnight rider attached to a larger piece of pro-environmental legislation, from all U.S. laws intended to protect tribal religious practice and traditional cultural properties. We find it troubling that the stewards of the University of Minnesota would use this cover as protection to engage in actions that evade the spirit of laws aimed at protecting the traditional religious beliefs and practices of American Indians and that undermine the free exercise clause of the First Amendment. We are also concerned that the University is operating under a double standard. Would this institution support the building of a telescope on a site that is sacred to politically-influential members of a mainstream religion.”

“Second, we object to the University’s efforts to pit itself against the legal rights and sovereign interests of several American Indian nations. There are at least three Apache nations which have concerns about the site. Many of these tribes have passed resolutions. The department is particularly troubled by the University’s efforts to assuage its ethically problematic stance by offering scholarships, jobs, and development funds to the Apache people. The manner in which these gratuities are being offered is reminiscent of the treaty era when the United States pressured, coaxed, and bribed tribal leaders to sign documents under which huge tracts of territory were lost.”

“We are especially offended because the University is asking some Apache people to enter into a trade on matters of their religion. Would the University offer Catholic scholarships in exchange for building a research structure on the dome at St. Peters? Would we expect Jewish people to accept jobs in exchange for letting us conduct research on the wailing wall? Would we in good conscience offer Mormons monies for economic development projects to allow us to excavate their temple grounds in Salt Lake City? These examples are no less unsavory than the gestures that the University is making to some Apache people.”

She asked the University Senate to support the resolution of the Social Concerns Committee in order to return a measure of dignity and honor to an institution the department has been proud of. The department encourages the University to re-evaluate its hasty decision on the telescope project and to do so in a way that brings openness to a deliberative process that not only affects the department of American Indian Studies, but the entire University community. She then deferred the remaining time to Ola Casidore Davis, the religious leader from the White Mountain Apache Tribe.

Ms. Davis said that she is a descendent of Chief Casidore of the San Carlos Apache Tribe. Chief Casidore fought for survival of his people, and she is here today as a representative of those who want to preserve the sacred mountain known as Mount Graham. What she has heard and seen in her fight to preserve Mount Graham has brought much sadness to her heart. The Apache people strongly believe in upholding their religion and their Apache culture. The scholarship money, to be given to the University of Arizona for Apaches, is, in her opinion, a pay-off in return for the telescope project to continue. The tribal chairwoman, Kathleen Wesley-Kitcheyan, does not have executive power to talk on behalf of the San Carlos Apache Tribe unless so directed by the tribal council. Therefore, any communications or offers should be done through the people of the San Carlos Apache Tribe with a public notice being given so a mass meeting can be held. The San Carlos Apache Tribe will never be in favor of the telescope project which is destroying their religion and culture on Mount Graham.

A senator said that she is concerned that the balance of scientific research and cultural integrity and religion has not been considered carefully enough in making this decision. She then ceded the rest of her time to anthropologist John Welch.

John Welch, anthropologist and board member of the White Mountain Conservation League and the National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, said that he is the duly designated representative of the tribe in matters affecting Mount Graham. There is more than one tribe involved in this matter. The White Mountain Apache Tribe is on record in having grave concerns associated with this telescope project. Some of the factors he urged the Senate to consider are evidence that the telescope project is having a significant, adverse and escalating impacts on Apache cultural systems and individuals, as well as on the fragile eco-system.

A senator then asked that there time be yielded to Chick Woodward of the Astronomy department.

Chick Woodward, Associate Professor of Astronomy, started by thanking the distinguished guests from the tribe, as well as Professor Albers for reading part of her letter that was published in the Indian Times. He then noted that in a resolution from the San Carlos Tribal Apache Council, Ms. Davis does not represent the San Carlos Apache Tribe governing body, but instead represents the Apache Survival Coalition. Through the University’s involvement, it has attempted to recognize the sovereign rights of the San Carlos Apache and deal with the duly-elected representatives throughout this process. The Astronomy department would like a full discussion of the process as it impacts this department enormously. While the department has been sensitive to the cultural issues that have been raised, many materials that are being

distributed are erroneous and the department would welcome the opportunity to debate these issues point by point.

A senator then asked that there time be yielded to Keith Basso, who has studied the Western Apache for 40 years.

Keith Basso, distinguished Regents Professor of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico, said that Mount Graham is a profoundly sacred place. The University of Arizona has dismissed Apache attitudes as mere chaff. They have taken numerous steps to discredit the validity of such statements, although on three separate occasions, the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council ratified the sacredness of Mount Graham and its importance to continuing the Apache way of life. The telescopes are a desecration, as understood by Apaches, and so is the activity that occurs there. In the Apache view, this is unholy activity in a very holy place. This view will not change whether scholarships are awarded, as long as there are Apache people to gaze at the mountain and observe what they take to be its deterioration.

With time expired for debate, a motion was made to extend debate for another ten minutes. The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and the motion was approved by a majority.

Q: Is Mount Graham located on a federal park or reservation area?

A: Mount Graham is located on federally-administrated land in the Coronado National Forest.

Q: What size is the telescope structure?

A: The observatory site occupies eight acres.

Q: What is the religious impact on Mount Graham?

A: One view to this question can be answered by a quote from an ethnographic review of politics of Indian land, *Killing the White Man's Indian*, page 237, "I've lived here all my life and I've never heard anyone say that Mount Graham was sacred until Frank Sandling began saying it two or three years ago. We are still trying to figure out exactly what he believes. What he says, it may be true for him, but he does not speak for anyone else."

On the other side of the issue, it is important to remember that the land in question is within the aboriginal land base of the Western Apache people and it was formally part of the reservation until it was removed in 1873. The keeper of the National Register of Historic Places has formally endorsed Mount Graham, in its entirety, as a place of recognized importance in the history and culture of the Western Apache.

Q: What was the process that the University undertook prior to Regents approval of participation in this project?

A: The University discussed this issue for over a year, and had site visits to Arizona. The Social Concerns Committee and the Research Committee reviewed these issues, as well as central administration. The Regents first discussed this issue in committee before discussion and action by the full board. The Regents process took two months, and acted on the recommendation of the President.

A senator then commented that if this returns to the Senate for action, the question to consider is not the idea itself, but if the idea is worth a change. From the University point of view, the Astronomy department will be at a disadvantage in the future. The concept of 'sacred' has not

been explained in enough detail to warrant voting for a change at this time. More information is needed besides the back and forth banter.

Q: The letter from Kathleen Wesley-Kitcheyan was dated October 23. If work has been in process over a longer period of time, why was there not an earlier letter? Besides working with the University of Arizona, did the University have discussions with people authorized to speak for the tribe?

A: The quarterly report dates from July, following negotiations over the past year. The letter from the chairperson was in response to accusations that the University has not been working with the tribe.

15. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Proposed Amendments to the University Senate Discussion by the University Senate

Professor Dan Feeney, Chair of the Senate Reorganization Working Group, said that he informed the Senate last spring of a movement to change the structure of the Senate. This is a proposal that deserves some consideration, yet it is not ready to be presented for action. It is being presented for information and input. Standards questions are what is happening, why is this happening, and how is it being accomplished? He then thanked the faculty, staff, and students who have worked hard and negotiated to arrive at this proposal.

This proposal started with a comment to the University Senate from Bill Tierney, a scholar of higher education governance, who visited the University last year. His point was that the University has an active governance system but it only involves student and faculty, not staff. His proposal was considered since the University Senate have never been asked to weigh in on a proposal for a campus-wide body that was inclusive of all employee groups, except for bargaining unit employees.

A working group then developed a proposal that would have representatives from the Council of Academic Professionals and Administrators (CAPA) and Civil Service Committee (CSC) added to the structure. In order to keep the size manageable, a decrease in faculty and student seats was also proposed.

The proposal still leaves the Faculty Senate and Student Senate intact, as they currently exist, as well as CAPA and CSC. The proposal is that all four bodies intersect in the University Senate only. The proposal is also that Senate committees be re-aligned under the body that it affects.

The draft also proposes the elimination of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly as separate body since most of its business is redundant constitutional amendments to mirror changes in the University Senate. Twin Cities agendas would just be handled through a segmented agenda.

Professor Feeney stated that the proposal is not meant to diminish independence, authority, or credibility of CAPA or CSC. There have also been questions as to this proposal's impact on the coordinate campuses. The answer is none. It would have no effect on their reporting lines and the status of their assemblies.

From the numbers being proposed, the largest decrease would be in the faculty representatives, from roughly 175 to 125. Student representatives would decrease from 59 to 50. These decreases would allow for 25 seats to be allocated each to CAPA and CSC. All members of the University Senate would be elected.

This plan is meant to give the University an opportunity to have an open discussion with all employment groups who are eligible to participate. It would also allow members from CAPA and CSC to participate in discussions without being yielded time by a senator.

Professor Feeney concluded by noting that this is a work in progress. Further comments and concerns can be forwarded to him to be addressed, or to working group members. The working group is comprised of two representatives each from CAPA, CSC, Student Senate, and Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). The hope is that at a spring semester meeting the proposal would be brought for a vote. With that date of approval, the earliest changes could be implemented would be July 1, 2005, because of the timing of elections.

Q: How would motions from the Faculty Senate be handled? Would they need to be sent through the University Senate to be binding?

A: The Faculty Senate would still be able to approve motions, as it currently does, on items that relate only to faculty. The University Senate would be able to deal with issues that affect all groups, such as disabilities and information technology. The proposal also includes primary and secondary reporting lines for committees, so that motions from Finance and Planning, which reports primarily to the Faculty Senate, could also be sent to the University Senate for all groups to vote on.

Teri Wallace, Chair of CAPA, said that CAPA is generally in favor of this proposal. It is a positive plan that represents innovative thinking on the part of the University. CAPA will spend more time looking at implications for its own organization.

A senator said that most of the work appears to have been done by Twin Cities members, and while the results are positive, coordinate campus members should have a more active voice in the process.

Another senator said that some senators have concerns with the decreasing number of student representative seats from the coordinate campuses.

Q: What discussions have taken place with coordinate campus members?

A: If this is an issue, coordinate campus members can be added to the working group for input.

16. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Bruininks said that this is a difficult time for the University in light of the strike, and it is being felt in all areas. The people on strike are valued workers at the University, many of whom have been here for many years. The situation is difficult for departments, as well as the employees on strike, but it is his hope that issues will be resolved and they will be back to work soon. No one wins in a strike.

As an academic community, some people are worried that the two sides will not find a way to resolve this issue. He does not accept that outcome and feels that everyone is obligated to work together once the strike has ended. A mediator is currently working with both parties and will call them back once there is movement towards resolution. The University has been in constant contact with the mediator, and he agrees with students that the University needs to return to the table. He urged senators to be careful of what they read, but to check the University website for important data and listen to all points of views.

When he was asked to take on this responsibility, he knew that it would be a difficult period, although he could not predict that it would be this tough. He did not expect the type of cut that it received, which was a 15 percent reduction in the University's base budget. This amount was unprecedented in the University's history, and might be the largest single cut to any institution in the country.

The University fought hard to minimize these cuts and its impact on the long-term interests. The University fought hard for its case. That advocacy was successful in keeping this cut less severe, and in keeping flexibility for how the cut will be made.

Last March, a set of core principles was made, which were then used to frame and adopt the two-year budget strategy. That plan called for a shared sacrifice to keep the University strong. The impact on students has been minimized, and they have tried to protect the quality of student services and investments, but it has not been easy. Students are paying a big part of this cut, 44 percent, but they are also receiving an investment in return. In each of the next two years, the University will place money into need-based aid programs.

33 percent of the cut came from reducing budgets, as well as targeted reductions in some areas. These reductions led to 500 layoffs across the system as well as a retrenchment of 150 open positions. An additional 17 percent was shouldered by faculty and staff, in the form of a wage freeze during the first year. To help employees, \$2.5 million was allocated to lessen the impact of health care increases for lower-income employees. The last six percent was covered by increased University revenues.

The approach taken was carefully balanced, as the University still has \$20 million of reductions and other cost increases to be dealt with in the second year. He does not believe that it is an adequate tradeoff to layoff more people or institute a mid-year tuition increase for students.

The University must convince the state to maintain, or more importantly increase, its investment. All the University's campuses experiment and research stations are critical to this state's future. If the University is weak, the state will not have a promising future. He asked for senators' help in framing this issue for legislators and the public to preserve what the University has and what it needs.

In his State of the University Address, President Bruininks addressed academic priorities and investments that are important to the University. Investment needs to continue in interdisciplinary work and conferences, both from public and private funding. This work can connect the University research to important issues in the world.

Time will be spent talking about students and student investments. The doors of opportunity need to remain open as currently 85 percent of the increased access to higher education is being provided by public institutions in the country. The University also returns \$16 dollars for every dollar invested by the state, not counting the benefits of research. In closing, he noted that the University is the state's best investment

17. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

A senator noted that the Morris Campus Student Association, on Monday, passed a resolution urging a resolution to the strike and the University to begin to communicate with students on this issue. He also noted that student services are being negatively impacted by the strike, and therefore urged both sides to return to the bargaining table.

Q: The New York Times reported on a House bill by Representative McKeon in a recent article. What is the University's reaction to the bill?

A: The bill is terrible legislation in that it attempts to regulate the higher education market. The University knows that it needs to work hard to restrain tuition growth and keep higher education affordable. Legislating this at the federal level, after the federal and state governments have riddled higher education budgets at public institutions, is not a constructive exercise. The University has a better idea of how to price its own education. The plan is a recipe for mediocrity in higher education and should be resisted at all costs.

Q: It is true that the pain being inflicted from the budget cut is being felt disproportionately by some groups on campus. A concern leading up to and during the strike is that the she has not felt in most statements from the administration the real value of the workers who are on strike. However, in a statement from Duluth, a line was added stating that, "Potential striking employees are talented members of the UMD community." Is the same acknowledgement being made by central administration?

A: In every statement to the media, the same comments are being expressed, however, this sentiment is being ignored by the media. There are honest differences of opinion, but the President has an obligation to the entire University community to balance the budget. The University will do its best to resolve the strike, but people should not assume that because there is a strike, these employees are not valued by central administration or the Regents. Senators can spread this message to the departments.

Q: Why will the University not negotiate with the union on job security issues unless they first accept the financial terms?

A: Nothing in the proposals is conditional and each will be addressed separately.

Q: Why did the University take back the two percent automatic step increases which have been a feature of every other contract?

A: Step increases are a form of compensation increase and the University has said that no employees will receive compensation increases in the first year of the budget. The unions have been told that they can structure the proposed increase any way they wish during the second year.

Q: Will police be engaged to remove the students from Morrill Hall tonight?

A: The University has been working hard with the students in the building. They have been respectful and left the building other nights. He is not sure what will happen tonight if they do not voluntarily leave.

Q: Is the University willing to build on the Mount Graham debate that occurred earlier today in a series of public discussions that would allow both sides more time to present their arguments and rationale?

A: The first step should be for colleagues to talk with one another. This is a difficult issue and is painful for those involved. The University does not want to mislead people that with more debate the University is likely to withdraw from Mount Graham. He encouraged both departments to meet with Senate committees and bring their thoughts back.

18. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

19. NEW BUSINESS

A senator made a motion to suspend the rules to consider the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Faculty Senate represents all of the teaching faculty at the University of Minnesota and

Whereas all teaching faculty depend on the services of our loyal and hard working clerical staff and

Whereas the administration, facing a difficult financial period, has failed to come to agreement with representatives of the clerical staff, precipitating an unprecedented strike and,

Whereas it is unbecoming and contrary to the ideals of a great academic institution to deny its less privileged staff members aid with such fundamentals as adequate health care,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate encourages and urges the administration to take a flexible, generous and humane approach to negotiating an early end to the strike, bearing in mind that the employees involved, many of whom have selflessly served the University for decades, are among our least generously compensated.

The motion was seconded and a vote was taken. The motion failed due to lack of members present. The resolution was then automatically referred to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

NOT APPROVED

20. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor**

2003-04 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

OCTOBER 30, 2003

STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 2

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 2003-04 was convened in 25 Law School, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, October 30, 2003, at 11:34 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 32 voting student members. Chair Dan Weiske presided.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dan Weiske reminded senators of the University Senate meeting today at 2:30 p.m.

**2. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 2, 2003
Action**

MOTION:

To approve the Student Senate minutes, which are available on the Web at the following URLs. A simple majority is required for approval.

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/031002stu.html>

**STUART GOLDSTEIN, CLERK
UNIVERSITY SENATE/
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion a vote was taken and the motion was approved.

APPROVED

3. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT

Dan Weiske, Student Senate Chair, said that following the recent request for names to fill student committee positions, 470 applications were received and all student committees positions have been filled.

4. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

Scott LeBlanc, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that the committee has decided on its projects for the year, while sending a few items to other committees. SSCC has also spent time discussing the constitutional changes. In closing, he reminded senators that some colleges require senators to attend college board meetings, so every senator should fulfill this obligation.

5. ASSEMBLY/ASSOCIATION UPDATES

Crookston – No report.

Duluth – Sean Bell said that a credit-based dining plan has been approved on campus. UMDSA is also working to encourage all faculty to use a standardized on-line syllabus, to increase student parking on campus, to increase funding for student groups, and to resolve some differences between the role of senators at the University Senate and within UMDSA. A concert was recently held on campus, for the first time in many years.

Morris – Reggie Davis stated that MCSA has been discussing the strike and its effect on campus. A resolution on this topic was passed, urging both sides to resolve the issue. Also, MCSA is discussing the academic progress of students.

Graduate and Professional Student Association – No report.

Minnesota Student Association – Eric Dyer said that MSA has approved principles regarding an on-campus stadium, finance, and parking. A packet of housing principles was also approved.

6. STUDENT HOUSING Discussion

Adam VanWagner, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee (SCSA), said that the October 1 SCSA meeting was spent discussing the issue of student housing. Guests from housing, residential life, student legal services, and the city council participated in the discussion. While this discussion started because of the tragedy on the Twin Cities campus, the committee would like to generate discussion across the campuses as to what housing issues might be, what changes have been successful, and how the Senate might address concerns.

He stated that at the meeting, housing and residential life said that they will be changing its policy for listing landlords and will review its educational programs. MSA and student legal services will be creating a survey next month. Student legal services is also developing a database. The city is currently conducting inspections.

Q: Are there other issues besides the fire for the Twin Cities campus? Will the Senate be issuing a response to housing in general on all campuses?

A: SCSA would like to bring a document on housing for approval to the Student Senate. Besides the fire, other issues are affordability and safety, both on and off campus housing.

A senator said that Morris has been dealing with off-campus housing. MCSA was active in working with the city council to enact a housing inspection code. The inspection code has been rigorously followed by the city, but strongly opposed by landlords.

Q: Is there a University-wide policy on housing or are policies just campus-specific?

A: A University-wide policy for housing does not exist, but it might be needed. It could deal with general topics such as cost and meal plans. The Senate could also discuss city ordinances being considered to limit student housing around campuses.

A senator commented that another institution had let a hotel chain manage their student housing and it worked well. This might be an option to consider.

Q: Is all student housing full on the Twin Cities campus?

A: No.

A senator commented that it is cheaper to live off-campus at Crookston, rather than on-campus.

Another senator expressed concern about what the Student Senate can actually do to affect off-campus housing since each city has its own specific problems and own administration to work through.

A senator suggested that SCSA should ask its members about housing issues on each campus and then bring an idea or policy back to the Student Senate.

7. PROPOSED UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSTITUTION AMENDMENTS AND STUDENT SENATE NUMBERS Discussion

Dan Weiske noted that the purpose of the reorganization was to have all University voices, faculty, student, academic professionals, and civil service staff, together at one meeting. The process was a task force established last spring with representatives from each affected group. The faculty will see this proposal for the first time later today, but the proposal is still in the draft stage. The general theme of the proposal is a dispersal of powers among the four groups, with each still retaining direct reporting lines to the president. The number of senators for faculty and students will also be reduced to allocate seats to the academic professional and civil service members.

From the proposal, SSCC identified five major concerns: 1) student numbers on SCC have been reduced from nine to six - SSCC will be asking for a minimum of seven seats on SCC, with other SSCC members serving as ex officio members; 2) jurisdiction of each Senate – several committees will have secondary reporting lines to the University Senate; 3) composition of committees – the decision on committee membership would still be retained by the Senate Committee on Committees; 4) total number of senators from each group; and 5) allocation of Student Senate seats.

Q: Are the University Senate Bylaws finished yet?

A: No. The task force is still working on revisions to the Bylaws.

Q: Where are the representative numbers for GAPSAs and COGS in the revision?

A: GAPSAs only elects members to SSCC, while each college, including COGS, elects senators. The same constituent groups would still elect members, but this process is not represented on the diagram.

A senator stated that the issue of main concern is the total membership numbers for each group. Under the proposal, faculty will still maintain the majorities in nearly every committee and the University Senate. It is very important that students have seven seats on SCC, if not more. Students should have an equal say in University Senate business, and therefore push to retain the 59 Senate seats, if not ask for more.

Another senator said that faculty are worried about students seats being increased and these senators having poor attendance at meetings. For students, the cause of poor attendance might be that meetings are not interesting enough to attend. A goal of the reorganization should be to make meetings more engaging so that all senators want to attend. To increase student seats, and

as a way to increase coordination of efforts, the Student Senate should consider making Student Representatives to the Regents voting members of the body.

A senator then commented that Morris students and faculty are not supportive of the restructuring proposal. Problems include the decrease in representatives from the campus and the role of the coordinate campuses in this body. Concern was also expressed about the decrease in the student voice with less seats.

Q: What group is rewriting the language?

A: A group of eight people, two representatives from each affected group, is working on a draft of the language changes.

Q: What is the rationale behind dissolution of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly (TCCA)?

A: While the proposal would dissolve the TCCA, it would not affect any of the student associations or assemblies on the other campuses. For Twin Cities issues brought before the University Senate, only the Twin Cities senators would vote.

A senator then commented that any concerns that senators have should be relayed to Dan Weiske and Scott LeBlanc, the two student representatives on the working group. In terms of the Senate membership, under the current system it is 75 percent faculty and 25 percent students. Under the proposed membership, it will be 55 percent faculty and 22 percent students, with the other two groups making up the rest. Also important to note is that this Senate has the more student participation than any other body at a peer institution.

Another senator responded that students need to push for everything. He questioned why senators would want to attend a meeting when they only represent one-fifth of the voice of the body. Attendance is not the root of the problem; it is that students are a near voiceless minority in the University Senate.

A senator then addressed a concern about TCCA business, noting that University Senate meetings will be scheduled so that all TCCA business takes place at the end so coordinate campus members can leave early. From a logistical standpoint, it is almost impossible to find another time for Twin Cities senators to meet.

Another senator then said coordinate campuses should have a greater presence on the working group.

Dan Weiske noted that any proposals will be brought back to SSCC and the Student Senate before being finalized, at which point coordinate campus members can participate.

A senator stated that the students' power does not lie in the number of votes it holds, but instead it lies in the power to deal effectively with faculty and administrators.

Another senator then said that coordinate campuses are being treated like colleges rather than a University. To be fair, each division at Morris should be allocated a Senate seat, just as is done for each college on the Twin Cities campus.

Dan Weiske said that allocation of Student Senate seats will be dealt with by the Student Senate and SSCC.

Q: Why are collective bargaining employees not being included in the revised structure?

A: The collective bargaining agreement does not allow them to participate in the University Senate.

A senator then made a motion to have the student task force members report to the Student Senate at its December meeting. The motion was seconded.

A senator then made an amendment to the motion that each coordinate campus be allowed to have a physical presence at the task force meetings. The amendment was seconded.

A senator said that the two students on the task force do not represent a campus, but were elected by the Student Senate to represent the best interests of the body. Senators should take some responsibility to communicate needs and concerns to these representatives.

Another senator responded that coordinate campuses have serious concerns about the proposal and therefore need to be present at the task force meetings.

A senator then ask the chair to rule on whether the amendment is pertinent to the original motion, and whether it should be struck from the motion. The chair ruled that the amendment was not pertinent, should be struck from the motion, but can be introduced as a separate motion.

The decision of the chair was challenged, and a vote of the Student Senate was requested. A vote was taken and the count was 18 in favor of the chair's decision and 11 opposed to the chair's decision, therefore the decision is upheld.

A senator then proposed to amend the motion that a report be provided at the next SSCC meeting.

With time for debate expired, a motion was made to call the question on the proposed amendment to the motion. The motion was seconded and a vote was taken. The motion to call the question was approved with 19 in favor and 10 abstentions.

A vote was then taken on the proposed amendment and with a majority in favor it was approved.

A motion was then made and seconded to call the question on the main motion as amended. A vote was taken, and with 26 in favor and 4 opposed the motion to call the question was approved.

A vote was then taken on the main motion as amended, and with a majority in favor it was approved.

8. OLD BUSINESS

Q: When will the Student Senate Orientation and Workshop be held?

A: The orientation was held at the start of the October 2 meeting. A workshop was scheduled, but cancelled due to a poor response rate. SSCC was not in favor of identifying an alternate date for this activity without high attendance from senators.

9. NEW BUSINESS

A senator made a motion to introduce the following motion to the Student Senate for approval, with one change that Morris Campus Student Association be changed to Student Senate wherever it appears in the text:

Resolution on University of Minnesota AFSCME Local 3800 Clerical Workers Strike

Whereas, the state of Minnesota cut its support of the University of Minnesota by 15% which totaled \$185 million, and

Whereas, the University of Minnesota in response to the largest decline in state support in its history dramatically increased student tuition and fees, made cuts to University programs and services, and

Whereas, University recommended and instituted several cuts and changes to its employee contracts including wage freezes and reductions to University assistance for employees health plans, and other items, and

Whereas, the University negotiated contract agreements with its bargaining units, and

Whereas, the AFSCME Local 3800, representing the University's clerical workers rejected the University proposed contract and authorized a strike if no agreement was reached with the University, and

Whereas, the University and Local 3800 attempted to resolve their contractual disagreement, but no settlement was reached, and

Whereas, on October 21, 2003, the clerical workers commenced their strike, and

Whereas, the University and AFSCME have suspended negotiations, and

Whereas, the strike has negatively impacted University services system-wide, including the Morris Campus.

Be it Therefore resolved that the Morris Campus Student Association urges the University of Minnesota and AFSCME Local 3800 clerical workers to reconvene negotiations, and

Be it Further resolved that the Morris Campus Student Association urges the University of Minnesota and AFSCME Local 3800 to seek an immediate resolution to the current strike, and

Be it Further resolved that the University of Minnesota administration communicate with students on all four campuses on the status of the current strike and its affect on student services.

Be it Further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the University central administration, Morris Campus senior administration, AFSCME Local 3800, and the University of Minnesota Student Senate.

A motion was then made and seconded to suspend the rules to consider the motion. A vote was taken, and with 20 in favor and 9 opposed the rules were suspended to consider the motion.

The main motion was then seconded and the floor was opened for discussion.

A senator commented that this resolution does not support either side, but demonstrates that student services are being affected, and therefore both sides need to return to the bargaining table. The resolution also states that students need to be informed about what is taking place.

Another senator said that while he is in support of the resolution, there are many superfluous whereas clauses. He made a motion to strike the first six whereas clauses from the motion. The motion was seconded and the floor was opened for discussion.

A senator encouraged senators to support the resolution as it was originally presented since it details the impact that the state cut had on the strike.

A motion was then made and seconded to call the question. A vote was taken and with a 25 in favor and 4 opposed the motion to call the question was approved.

A vote was then taken on the amendment to the resolution, and with 19 in favor, 8 opposed, and 5 abstentions the motion to amend the resolution was approved.

A motion was then made and seconded to call the question. A vote was taken and with a 15 in favor, 10 opposed, and 2 abstentions the motion to call the question was not approved.

A friendly amendment was then made to the last resolved clause to strike 'Morris Campus senior administration' and 'University of Minnesota Student Senate' and replace it with 'University Senate.' This motion was accepted as friendly.

A vote was then taken on the main motion as amended, and with 22 in favor and 7 opposed the motion was approved.

APPROVED

Scott LeBlanc, SSCC Chair, asked that any items for discussion or action at the Student Senate should be sent to SSCC two weeks prior to a meeting.

A senator then challenged each senator to bring one discussion issue to the Student Senate for later this year.

Another senator commented that 15 students are currently sitting in Morrill Hall to protest the strike. They have been told that they need to leave by 6 pm, but there is a possibility that they will be arrested if they do not leave by that deadline. While he does not advocate for the strike, he felt that it was important to be present for the students, since he represents them as a senator.

A senator then commented that some Morris students are also protesting today.

Q: When will the Regents be voting on the constitutional change to merge the two student chair positions?

A: At their December meeting.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

Rebecca Hippert
Abstractor

