

February 16, 1995

The second meeting of the Student Senate for 1994-95 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, February 16, 1995, at 11:30 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 34 voting student members. Mr. Joel Bergstrom, Student Senate Chair, presided.

I. MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 3, 1994

Action

APPROVED

II. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Action

MOTION:

To approve the following amendments to the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules: [language to be deleted is [bracketed]; new language is in CAPS]

(Senate Constitution, Article III, Section 6b (p. 5))

6. University Senate and Student Senate Officers

a.

b. The officers of the Student Senate shall be a chair AND a vice chair[, a clerk, and a treasurer].

[The chair and vice chair shall be elected by the Student Senate at its last regularly scheduled spring quarter meeting from the members of the Student Senate.] THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR SHALL BE ELECTED AT A SPECIAL SPRING QUARTER SESSION OF THE STUDENT SENATE ATTENDED ONLY BY STUDENT SENATORS ELECTED FOR THE FOLLOWING YEAR. THE OUTGOING CHAIR SHALL PRESIDE OVER THE ELECTION. NON-SENATORS AND OUTGOING STUDENT SENATORS MAY NOT BE CANDIDATES FOR THESE POSITIONS. The chair and vice chair shall not be from the same campus. In the event that no one is nominated for the vice chair position from a separate campus, the position will be open to all

qualified members of the Student Senate. Term of office shall be July 1 to June 30, and the personS holding office [is] ARE eligible for re-election. The duties of the chair are (1) to be the official spokesperson of the Student Senate; (2) to set the Student Senate agenda, to be approved by the Student Consultative Committee; (3) [to organize and chair the Student Lobbying Advisory Committee;] TO SERVE ON THE BOARD OF THE COALITION/UMCHE, THE UNIVERSITY'S STUDENT LOBBYING ORGANIZATION; (4) to serve as the University's representative on the Student Advisory Committee; (5) TO SERVE ON ONE CENTRAL UNIVERSITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND TO DELEGATE STUDENT MEMBERS FOR OTHER ADVISORY COMMITTEES; (6) TO SERVE AS THE CHAIR OF THE STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.

The duties of the vice chair are (1) to assume the duties of the chair in the event of an absence or incapacity of the chair; [and] (2) to assume responsibilities delegated by the chair; (3) TO SUBMIT TO THE SENATE OFFICE AN ANNUAL BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE STUDENT SENATE AND STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, TO BE APPROVED BY THE STUDENT SENATE DURING ITS FALL QUARTER MEETING; (4) TO ORGANIZE AN ANNUAL ORIENTATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE STUDENT SENATE; (5) TO MONITOR STUDENT SENATE ATTENDANCE AND ENSURE THAT THE STUDENT SENATE HANDBOOK IS UPDATED AND DISTRIBUTED; (6) TO SERVE ON A CENTRAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE THAT IS NOT ATTENDED BY THE STUDENT SENATE CHAIR IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE SUCH COMMITTEE ACTIVE; (7) TO SERVE AS THE VICE CHAIR OF THE STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.

[The clerk and treasurer shall be appointed by the chair subject to the approval of the Student Senate. The duties of the clerk and treasurer shall be prescribed in the Senate Bylaws. The Student Consultative Committee shall periodically review these officer positions.]

C.

(Senate Bylaws Article I, Section 8 (p. 11))

Article I. University Senate Membership, Elections, and Officers

.

[8. Treasurer of the Student Senate: The treasurer of the Student Senate shall be the chief budget officer of the Student Senate. The treasurer shall chair the budget subcommittee of the Student Senate.]

(Senate Bylaws, Article III, Section 4 (p. 16-20))

4. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

The Senate Consultative Committee shall be composed of 10 elected members of the faculty, 9 elected students, and the vice chair of the University Senate. The faculty representatives shall serve as the Faculty Consultative Committee; the 8 elected student representatives and the chair and vice chair of the Student Senate shall serve as the Student Consultative Committee; the 8 elected student representatives and the [vice] chair of the Student Senate shall [comprise] CONSTITUTE the 9 voting student members of the Senate Consultative Committee.

....

Student Consultative Committee

Membership

The Student Consultative Committee shall be composed of:

- one student from the Crookston campus
- one student from the Duluth campus
- one student from the Morris campus
- five students from the Twin Cities campus, as follows:
 - 1993-94 4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional
 - 1994-95 3 undergraduates, 2 graduate/professional
 - 1995-96 4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional
 - 1996-97 3 undergraduates, 2 graduate/professional
 - 1997-98 4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional
- the chair and vice chair of the Student Senate

THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR SHALL HOLD NO MORE THAN TWO CONSECUTIVE TERMS.

Student members EXCEPT FOR THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR shall be elected in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses' student constituencies, subject to the following provisions:

- At the time of their election, students shall be members of the University Senate (except for Crookston).
- Students shall serve a one-year term, and are eligible for re-election. No student member is eligible to serve more than three consecutive terms.

Student vacancies shall be filled in accordance with procedures determined by the respective campuses for the balance of any unexpired term until the next regular election.

THE CHAIR OF THE STUDENT SENATE SHALL ALSO SERVE AS THE CHAIR OF THE STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE. THE VICE CHAIR OF THE STUDENT SENATE SHALL ALSO SERVE AS THE VICE CHAIR OF THE STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE. IF EITHER THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR HAS ALREADY BEEN ELECTED TO THE STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE AS A REGULAR MEMBER, HE OR SHE MUST CONCEDE HIS OR HER PRIOR POSITION TO ANOTHER STUDENT, TO BE CHOSEN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE BY THE APPROPRIATE STUDENT CONSTITUENCY. The VICE chair of the Student Senate shall serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Senate Consultative Committee [if not otherwise elected in his or her own right]. The vice chair of the Student Senate shall serve as a voting member of the Senate Consultative Committee.

Duties and Responsibilities (of SSCC)

- a. To meet separately, when necessary, to discuss with the president, or others, matters of concern to the student body.
- b. To serve as [the nucleus of an] THE executive and steering committee of the Student Senate.
- [c. To provide for a budget subcommittee of the Student Senate. The budget subcommittee shall be chaired by the treasurer of the Student Senate. Three members shall be appointed by the chair of the Student Senate with one member from each of the following committees: Student Senate Consultative Committee, Student Committee on Committees, Student Lobbying Advisory Committee. These appointments are subject to the approval of the Student Senate.]

Chairs: The chairs of the Faculty Consultative Committee [and of the Student Consultative Committee] shall be elected by [their] HIS OR HER respective members from among their number for a one-year term of office. [Chairs] THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE shall be eligible for re-election to that position. THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF THE STUDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE SHALL BE ELECTED BY THE STUDENT SENATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE III, SECTION 6B, OF THE SENATE CONSTITUTION. The chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee shall serve as chair of the Senate Consultative Committee.

[The Student Consultative Committee shall have a chair and a vice chair who shall be from separate campuses. The vice chair shall assume the duties of the chair in the event of an absence or incapacity of the chair and shall assume responsibilities delegated by the chair.]

(Senate Rules, Article III, Section 2 (p. 34))

2. Ex Officio Members of Senate Committees

Ex officio members shall be appointed from each of the offices listed below and are non-voting positions unless otherwise noted.

...

Senate Consultative--Vice chair of the University Senate (voting); Chairs of the Finance and Planning and Educational Policy Committees; elected representative from the Duluth faculty eligible to vote in Senate elections; VICE chair of the Student Senate

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Rabun Taylor presented the motion to amend the Senate Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules to merge the vice chair and chair positions of the Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee. He said the main reason for merging the positions is to simplify the structure and alleviate some of the problems that have occurred in the past because of disagreement, dissent, or just a lack of communication. Many believe that merging the positions will strengthen the student governance structure, said Mr. Taylor.

One senator expressed concern that there would be less opportunity for input from a broad range of students if the positions are merged. Others argued that the process would be more streamlined with more efficient channels for communication.

Without further discussion, the motion was approved by a majority of members present and voting. The amendments will be forwarded to the Senate Consultative Committee for consideration and hopefully to the University Senate for action spring quarter.

APPROVED

III. ELECTION OF STUDENT SENATE VICE CHAIR

Action

Mr. Corey Kopacek from the Duluth campus was elected to fill the vacant Student Senate vice chair position.

IV. STUDENT LOBBY DAY Information

Ms. Kim Isenberg, the Executive Director of the U of M Coalition for Higher Education (UMCHE), reminded senators that February 22 is Student Lobby Day at the State Capitol and encouraged everyone to attend to talk with legislators and show support for the University. Mr. Cecil Smith, President of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, said a motion to approve the legislative agenda will be brought up under New Business. If approved, it will be presented to the Legislature on February 22.

The current schedule for Lobby Day is:

- Town meeting at 9:00
- Press conference at 10:00 in Room 181 of the State Office Building
- Rotunda at 12:00 with remarks by Senator Stumpf and various student leaders
- University of Minnesota Division meeting in the afternoon, at which time each of the student body presidents will testify

Mr. Smith also encouraged students to attend this event to emphasize what is happening at the University, particularly the erosion of quality in programs. The Lobby Day agenda this year is focused on the U2000 Partnership Proposal, he said. It shows UMCHÉ's perspective and what they want to see emphasized. It also responds to issues concerning the budget. Governor Carlson has recommended giving the University \$61 million of the \$87 million that was requested, although only \$8 million would be recurring funds. The University understands that it needs to make reductions but that must be done strategically. The UMCHÉ document also shows that tuition increases at the University are directly linked to reduced state funding. If time permits, UMCHÉ would like to hold a Division meeting on campus in order for students and faculty to express their concerns.

Ms. Debbie Burchinal, Legislative Affairs Director for the UMCHÉ, told senators a workshop is scheduled for Friday (2/18), from 12:00-1:00 p.m. to brief students on issues being discussed at the Legislature in preparation for Lobby Day.

Students were asked to wear maroon and gold to distinguish themselves as University of Minnesota students.

Two other events students should be aware of are: March 15, the UMCHÉ will be joining with all other state institutions for the "march in March." On April 5, the U of M will again be lobbying at the State Capitol.

V. BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUEST Information

Mr. Cecil Smith reported that the Council on Graduate Students has been active in distributing material about the removal of the student interest loan subsidy. This is a federal level issue that will affect Minnesota and which has forced the Governor to amend his budget. Another important budget component is tuition, he said. The University has responded to the Governor's budget and how it would affect tuition. If the University must reallocate \$28 million, it would mean a 10.5% tuition increase for next year and a 7.75% increase the following year.

One student asked what the Coalition's position is on the Governor's 3% tuition cap. Mr. Smith responded that the Governor realizes there needs to be a cap on tuition increases, however, he leaves the door open for allowing institutions to raise tuition. Increases over 3% have to be subsidized by the State Grant Program so that low income students still have access. The problem with this plan is that it drives up tuition for everyone and only the most needy qualify for state aid. Middle income families generally are not eligible for this money. Mr. Smith argued that low tuition increases are the best form of financial aid. Ms. Isenberg added that the issue needs to be discussed among the students. Several questions asked were:

- What happens in the next biennial budget?
- Where does the money go?
- Does each institution have its own financial aid program?

Mr. Smith also noted that if there is a tuition increase, the potential for attendance in the Graduate and Professional programs might decrease because there is no state grant for these areas. Another student asked if the community colleges are also experiencing a lack of funding from the state. "Yes," said Mr. Smith. In fact, they are experiencing even more problems because they are also contending with the merger of the three other systems of public higher education on July 1, 1995. That project will cost approximately \$150 million for which the Governor has provided only \$10 million. The project was passed, said Mr. Smith, because it was supposed to save the state money but in actuality it will cost the state more.

Mr. Smith said students should also be aware that the Legislature has been looking more closely at campus closings.

VI. REGENTS TUITION POLICY Information

Mr. Rabun Taylor reported that the Board of Regents passed a new tuition policy and outlined some of the primary changes:

- it calls for single upper and lower division rates on each campus
- at the graduate and professional levels the tuition rates will

- continue to vary according to the level of the program
- the University is asking the colleges to provide a guaranteed tuition plan to entering students
- new language has been added concerning course program and college fees

Provost Infante, Mr. Taylor said, has envisioned the fee process as quite restrictive. He has expressed his opinion to students that fees should be independent of tuition, and that the costs related to each should be kept distinct. We are encouraged by the provost's comments, but at the same time we recognize that the boundaries between operations and maintenance instructional costs and "special" instructional costs can be very elastic. The students, therefore, exhort the Regents to oppose the assessment of fees that recover costs currently being recovered by tuition. If in fact the University were to implement such a policy, it would further subvert the state tuition formula, in which tuition ideally recovers all instructional costs not accounted for by state appropriation.

Mr. Taylor went on to say that it is the students hope that the new guaranteed tuition plans will be accompanied by guaranteed (or at least estimated) fee plans. Significant assessments like the IT and Crookston computer fees should be included in the guarantee, as well as other predictable course- and program-related fees.

An issue on which there is some confusion is the "base tuition" for each campus. If this is genuinely tuition, and not simply a registration fee, then should it be justified as such to the University community? What costs does it recover, and are they related to instruction? What limitations will there be on its size?

Students are unsure whether tuition rates on low-cost campuses will continue to subsidize high-cost campuses. This issue is of concern to students at the Morris campus, for example, who at present pay tuition that is higher than their own instructional costs. How will the University recover losses in income incurred from students who change campuses?

In conclusion, Mr. Taylor said students must ask again that the Regents ponder a philosophy of tuition. To what end is tuition assessed, and what costs should it recover? The lack of such a philosophy is perhaps convenient, as it allows (for example) the recovery of waivers, which can hardly be termed an instructional cost, from the tuition pool, or the assessment of fees toward instructional costs. Such flexibility may seem desirable in light of the state's flagging commitment to the University, but in the long run it encourages the kind of reactivity that undermines the confidence of students and the general public in the University's educational commitments.

VII. REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PARTICIPATION Information

Ms. Barbara Thompson updated the Student Senate on the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee on Participation. The committee was formed last spring to investigate the responsiveness of student senators and committee members in the Senate structure and to review how the Student Senate interacts with the University as a whole. During the summer the committee prepared a set of recommendations that were approved by the Student Senate in the fall.

At that time, a resolution was also passed to form a committee to develop a handbook for student senators. The chair of the committee has recently resigned and development of the handbook has been assigned to the Student Senate Consultative Committee. The primary focus, Ms. Thompson said, should be to keep the Ad Hoc committee going, pursue its recommendations, and to complete the handbook. An outline of the proposed handbook has been developed and is available for review. It is divided into four parts: 1) general information, 2) introduction to the Student Senate, 3) senators responsibilities, and 4) questions and answers.

VIII. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT Discussion

Mr. Rabun Taylor drew senators attention to the proposed Academic Freedom and Responsibility Statement that appears under Item X on the University Senate agenda. He explained that the University currently has three academic freedom statements (1938, 1963, and 1971) and the Board of Regents has recommended development of a single policy statement. The proposed policy will be discussed by the University Senate at the meeting later in the day and will be presented for action at the April Senate meeting. Students will note that the policy is very brief, which some feel is an advantage. Others are not as comfortable with that.

One senator expressed concern that the document uses terms it doesn't define, such as "... duties of membership in the University community..." Are students comfortable with that?

Mr. Taylor asked senators to review the document from a student perspective to see if it meets the needs of students and to come prepared to the Senate meeting at 2:00 p.m. to discuss it.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

X. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Cecil Smith called for a suspension of the rules in order to entertain two items of new business: 1) a motion to approve the document "U2000: Renewing the Partnership between the State and Students," and 2) a resolution concerning restructuring of governance, both of which were distributed. The motion was seconded and approved.

"U2000: RENEWING THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE STATE AND STUDENTS" [document available in the Senate Office]

One senator speaking in opposition to the document said she believes it represents buying into a process that has been imposed on the students by the administration without consultation and without discussion. By approving it, it sends the message that students support U2000 without knowing enough about it. It puts students in a position that is not defensible, she said, and it asks the state to defend something that students cannot even defend themselves. She referred students to page three of the document in which the University commits itself to certain goals. "Where does this commitment come from?" she asked.

Another student inquired about the statement, "The students of the University of Minnesota broadly endorse this plan..." Mr. Smith responded that four of the five student campus assemblies formally approved the U2000 proposal, which is where that statement comes from. He said he shared some of the concerns that the first senator mentioned, but the reality is that the Board of Regents have adopted and have committed the University to the first five critical measures and are working on the next eight. This agenda was developed through extensive work and input from all representative groups. The strategy that has been adopted is to emphasize and call attention to the areas under U2000 that best respond to the needs and the interests of students and to make these a priority in the Legislature.

If student senators endorse this document, said one person, they better understand that they are endorsing a tuition increase of up to 19% if the University does not receive full funding from the Legislature. Students just do not have enough information on this item to vote on it at this time, she said.

A student from the Morris campus, speaking in favor of the document, proposed a friendly amendment pertaining to the Morris section of the document. He recommended striking the second item under the U2000 investments, "innovative education, offering Masters degrees in Twin Cities College of Education by distance learning" and the fourth item, "cornerstone outreach activity through the West Central Experiment Station" and replacing

them with, "88% of entering freshman recruited from the top 25% of the High School graduating class" and "improve research facilities in providing for more funding for student and faculty collaborative research" because they were more pertinent to the Morris campus. The amendments were accepted as friendly and, therefore, required no action.

Another student speaking in favor of the proposal said he did not feel the legislative agenda reflects any scenario besides the best case scenario. He did not see anything in the document that reflects student endorsement of the worse case scenario, such as a 19% tuition increase. Students are trying to emphasize the positive. The negative implications have and will continue to come up in the process of preparing the University budget, which is very different from preparing the budget request.

Citing from page 2, another senator said, "Students have clearly carried the brunt of the real cuts in state appropriation to the University, both through tuition increases and dangerous erosion in quality of internationally competitive programs. We can now move forward with a strategic plan that guides an equitable distribution of responsibility for the future of our University." This suggests that the responsibility is also placed on the administration and the state, which is the key point to the Partnership Proposal.

At this time a senator called for the question and the motion to approve the document, as amended, was approved by a majority of members present and voting.

APPROVED

"RESOLUTION ON RESTRUCTURING GOVERNANCE"

Resolution

NOTING that the Transition Advisory Committee issued its final report to President Hasselmo on December 28, 1994;

FURTHER NOTING that the report recommends the appointment of a "reconstituted Governance Task Force to design a consultative and governance framework to be proposed, adopted, and implemented during the 1995-96 academic year;"

FURTHER NOTING that students are full partners in the issues, concerns, and conduct of consultative governance at the University of Minnesota;

BE IT RESOLVED that the membership of the Governance Task Force should include representation from students, appropriately selected by the existing student governance structures;

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that consultation on the membership of the final Task Force should be between the full Senate Consultative Committee and the President.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Taylor explained that the Transition Advisory Committee, which was comprised of faculty, students, civil service, and academic professionals, had been formed to "look at how existing governance structures should interface with the new administrative organization, and to serve in an advisory capacity to the Transition Task Force." A final report was submitted to the president at the end of December 1994. One of the committee's recommendations was that the Faculty Consultative Committee, in consultation with the President, should appoint by the end of January 1995 a "reconstituted Governance Task Force to design a consultative and governance framework to be proposed, adopted, and implemented during the 1995-96 academic year." The Student Consultative Committee believes the full Senate Consultative Committee should constitute the task force membership and that is the basis for the resolution.

A recommendation to strike the first "appropriate" in the fourth paragraph was accepted as a friendly amendment, and the motion, as amended was approved.

APPROVED

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Martha Kvanbeck
ABTRACTOR