

**2002-03 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**DECEMBER 5, 2002**

**STUDENT SENATE MINUTES: No. 3**

The third meeting of the Student Senate for 2002-03 was convened in 25 Mondale Hall, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, December 5, 2002, at 11:35 a.m. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone. Checking or signing the roll as present were 35 voting student members, one ex officio member, and two non-members. Chair Ryan Osero presided.

**1. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Ryan Osero announced that President Bruininks will be visiting the Morris campus on December 6 and 7 to tour the campus and meet faculty, staff, and students.

**2. MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 31, 2002**

**Action**

**MOTION:**

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

<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/ssen/021031stu.html>

**CAROL WELLS, CLERK  
UNIVERSITY SENATE/  
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

**DISCUSSION:**

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the minutes were approved.

**APPROVED**

**3. STUDENT SENATE CHAIR REPORT**

Ryan Osero, Student Senate Chair, reported that the joint stadium proposal is no longer being considered since the Vikings stated that the space was not large enough for their needs. The possibility of a Gopher-only stadium still exists. Yesterday, the projected budget deficit for the state was released. The estimate is \$4.56 billion. This might result in large cuts to the University and higher tuition increases. Students need to contact their legislators about the importance of funding for the University.

#### **4. DISCUSSION WITH CHERYL MAPLETHORPE Higher Education Service Office Budget Request**

Cheryl Maplethorpe, Director of Financial Aid with the Minnesota Higher Education Services Office (HESO), said that one of the main functions of her office is running the state-wide financial aid programs. She then distributed several handouts, including an annotated bibliography of financial aid research, information on state work study and median wages, a projection history, a state statute on funding state grants this year, how state grants are calculated, and the HESO budget request.

Ms. Maplethorpe then directed the senators to a diagram of how state grants work. She said that state grants are designed by using three types of income. The first income is from the student. The diagram assumes that the student pays the same amount towards their education irrespective of what tuition costs or how much they make. This calculation is based on the long-term benefit to the student from the education, not their ability to pay when attending.

The second type of income comes from the student's family. This contribution is based on a family's ability to pay and is determined by a federal needs analysis, with small modifications. Therefore, students from lower-income families would have no family contribution, students from middle-income families would have some level of family contribution, and students from high-income family would have full family contribution.

The last type of income is the grant amount, which comes from the taxpayers. This contribution is first paid by Pell grants and then by state grants. The amount of Pell grant money for the state is approximately \$112 million; the state grant budget is another \$115 million. The line that separates the taxpayer and family contributions changes depending on the institution that a student attends. If the student attends a community college, the line is steeper; if the student attends a private college, the line is flatter.

Due to the budget deficit this year, the legislature might choose to change the contribution formula so that less taxpayer money is spent on state grants. One way to do this would be to increase the student share from 46 percent of education costs to 50 percent, which was the calculation used a few years ago. This change would put more stress on lower income students, so HESO does not favor changing this amount.

Another way to change the taxpayer contribution would be to increase the steepness of the line that separates the taxpayer and family contributions. This change would not result in any changes for lower income families, but would result in higher income families contributing more towards education. HESO would favor this approach.

Another item that might be discussed by the legislature is the reducing one of the two pieces counted in the education budget. The first is a Living and Miscellaneous amount (LME) of \$5,405, which is supposed to cover nine months of room, board, and transportation. The second part is the maximum four year tuition, which is \$8,983.

Ms. Maplethorpe then turned to the next biennial budget request for HESO. The intent of the

budget request is to ask for base level funding for all financial aid programs, including work study and child care, to increase base level funding for state grants to cover increased tuition, fees, and enrollment at institutions, and to increase the funding for tuition and fees to cover the higher percentage tuition increases. She then walked the senators through the actual dollars being requested.

In addition to this budget request, HESO will ask the legislature in January to restore funding to work study and child care funds that were moved into the state grant system. This change would need to take place at the start of the legislative session so that the funding can be distributed to students for spring semester.

She then referred students to a handout detailing the state appropriations and HESO expenditures since 1988. These figures are used to determine what HESO will spend in two and three years, and what the budget request should be. She said that it is hard to predict these expenditures, since they are affected by enrollment numbers, tuition increases, Pell grants, and the state economy.

Q: To calculate the increase to tuition and fees, why was the calculation only based on the last two years?

A: HESO just looked at tuition increases that occurred during the last biennium to project increases for the upcoming biennium.

Q: Considering that the basis cost of living in the Twin Cities is significantly higher, why is the LME set at only \$5,405?

A: This figure is determined by the legislature, and by keeping it low, the state spends less money for the state grant system.

Q: If higher enrollment creates funding problems, why is enrollment not controlled or capped so that there are more funds available for the enrolled students?

A: HESO does not have the authority to determine enrollment at institutions, or to affect tuition being charged. Enrollment numbers, tuition, and fees are determined by each institution.

Q: How does HESO work with institutions?

A: The legislature determines the amount of funding for HESO and the higher education systems. Currently 90 percent of the funding goes to the institutions and 10 percent goes to HESO. HESO's funding is mostly pass-through funding which is sent to each institution based on a student's need. The process proceeds this way: student completes an application, the information from the application is sent to HESO and the institution, the institution calculates the amount of state grant for each student, HESO sends this amount to the institution, and the institution disperses it to the student.

## **5. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT**

Judy Berning, Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) Chair, said that SSCC will be meeting next Thursday to discuss issues for spring semester, which will include travel expense reimbursement for Senate meetings and revisions to the Student Conduct Code.

## **6. CAMPUS REPORTS**

**Crookston** – Jean Korkowski reported that the full CSA Board last night, at which time student stipends were discussed since some students felt that these should be volunteer positions. This is the first year that campus is having a non-denominational holiday display to light up the campus. CSA is participating in Winter Wonderland, which is a push for holiday shopping in downtown Crookston and a way for the campus to connect with the community.

**Duluth** – No report.

**Morris** – Eric Steinhoff stated that MCSA replaced the retiring Reginald Davis as the Vice President of Student Services, after seven hours and 62 votes. The new vice president is Danielle Stuart. An election reform task force is also refining the process and establishing an appeals process.

**Graduate and Professional Student Association** – No report.

**Minnesota Student Association** – Josh Colburn said that the next Forum meeting will be in 30 Mondale Hall next Tuesday. MSA issues include a constitutional review, campus safety walks, an approved resolution on the joint stadium, reviewing applications for the student fees process, and celebrating Coffman's reopening on January 21, 2003.

## **7. STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Resolution Welcoming President Bruininks Action**

### **MOTION:**

To approve the following resolution:

### **RESOLUTION WELCOMING PRESIDENT BRUININKS**

**WHEREAS**, the University of Minnesota Student Senate, representing students across all four campuses, offers our congratulations to President Robert Bruininks for his well deserved selection as the next President of our fine University. Students recognize that his vast experience and commitment to students during his tenure as a Professor, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost are attributes that make him an outstanding President for the University.

**WHEREAS**, the University has a long and proud history of student involvement in the governance of the University. In keeping with this tradition, we invite President Bruininks to the

first Student Senate meeting of the spring. To encourage continuous communication with students, from all four campuses, we invite President Bruininks to regularly attend Student Senate Consultative Committee meetings.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** we, the students at the University, are optimistic about President Bruininks' presidency and we look forward to continuing to work with him. As to be expected, students and administration will not always see eye to eye. However, it is our hope that the relationship is open and honest and, most importantly, it is based upon respect. We, the students of the University of Minnesota, look forward to working with President Bruininks to further the student experience here at the University.

**Approved by the Student Senate Consultative Committee, December 4, 2002**

**JUDY BERNING, CHAIR  
STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**DISCUSSION:**

Judy Berning, Chair of the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), started by making a motion that the middle paragraph be replaced with the following two paragraphs:

WHEREAS, the University has a long and proud history of student involvement in governance at the University.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT in keeping with this tradition, we invite President Bruininks to the first Student Senate meeting of the spring. To encourage continuous communication with students, we extend President Bruininks an open invitation to attend Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee meetings.

The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and the motion was approved by a majority.

A senator then proposed an amendment to the revised resolution, that the second and third sentences in the last paragraph be deleted since this is a welcoming resolution, and these sentences do not fit the tone.

The motion was seconded.

A senator then spoke against the amendment, noting that the two sentences state the actual facts of the relationship between the students and the administration, but that respect is needed in both directions.

Another senator noted that when these sentences are removed, the remaining sentences state the same concept, so the rest of the wording would need to be revised.

With no further discussion on the amendment, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 15 in favor, 14 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

A senator then made a motion that the last sentence of the last paragraph be deleted.

The motion was seconded.

With no discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 27 in favor, none opposed, and 4 abstentions.

Another senator then made a motion to reword the last paragraph to read: “Therefore, be it resolved that we, the students, hope that the relationship is open and honest, and most importantly, is based upon respect. We, the students of the University of Minnesota, look forward to working with President Bruininks to further the student experience here at the University.”

This motion was then seconded.

A senator then noted that perhaps this item should be tabled so that the entire resolution could be rewritten and then brought back to the Student Senate at the next meeting instead of proposing more amendments.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved with 18 in favor, 3 opposed, and 8 abstentions.

The motion, as amended, was then brought to the floor for discussion.

A senator stated that they are uncomfortable with some of the actions that President Bruininks has already taken, and that the discussion of the search process should have taken place first.

Another senator noted that President Bruininks is the new president, and should be welcomed by the student body, regardless of any actions that he has taken.

A motion was then made to call the question. The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and the motion was approved with 26 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

A vote was then taken on the motion as amended, and it was approved with 23 in favor, 4 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED**

## **8. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCEDURES**

### **Discussion**

Ryan Osero, Student Senate Chair, said that for the recent presidential search, a finalist was selected, the same day forums were held, and the next day the Regents approved the appointment. Also, for past searches, there were at least two, and up to four students, on each search panel. He asked if student senators had any comments or concerns about any of these processes.

Q: Does the Student Senate have any control over the number of students on the search committee? Why was only one placed on the committee for this search?

A: The Regents decide the number and distribution of positions on each search committee, and they decided that there would only be one student position this time. The Student Senate could ask for more positions in the next search.

A senator said that they were not aware of the decrease in student representation on the presidential search committee, but it is disturbing considering the focus of the University is education of the students. A statement should be sent to the Regents, expressing that discomfort with the number, and not the quality, of the student representation.

There is also a concern with one having only one finalist, since at the last Student Senate meeting the issue of diversity was raised. It also appears that the process was rushed at the end.

Josh Colburn, student representative on the search committee, said that the search committee made one decision, and the Regents made a different decision. The search committee considered more than one person, and forwarded a diverse pool to the Regents for consideration. He said that the pool was kept confidential to attract a good pool while still protecting the candidates during the review process. Diversity was a key issue during the entire process. The process was not rushed, but moved quickly because of the number of other presidential searches at other institutions.

Q: Was there enough student representation on the search committee?

A: The student opinion did carry weight with the committee. The search committee was concerned about the student opinion, and he advocated for students. If the committee was larger, more students should be appointed, but the current committee size worked well, and a larger committee might impede the process.

A senator said that Duluth did not have any student or faculty representation on the search committee, which is a worry for future committees.

Another senator said that he realizes that President Bruininks is an asset for the University. He is concerned about privacy at a public institution in relation to the University's responsibility to the state and citizens. He was also bothered that President Bruininks was not part of the search committee candidates, but he was the one selected by the Regents. Does this result in a failed search? Lastly, he expressed concern about the one student representative on the committee, outweighed by the faculty and external people. Adequate representation, especially from the coordinate campuses, should be considered in the next search.

Ryan Osero said that he would have the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC) consider writing a letter to the Regents, expressing concerns raised today.

## **9. OLD BUSINESS**

**NONE**

## **10. NEW BUSINESS**

A senator noted that he had recently received a proposal from the Minnesota Private College Council (MPCC), and was presenting it here for all senators to be aware of actions that might be taken. The proposal asks that funding be taken from each MnSCU and the University to be added to the pool for financial aid. While this proposal has not been presented to the legislature yet, it is being circulated and should raise concerns for public institutions, especially since some of the authors will be part of Governor Pawlenty's administration. The Student Senate might want to ask someone from MPCC to attend an upcoming meeting and explain the rationale for this proposal. Student assemblies and associations should also be prepped to talk about this proposal.

A motion was made and seconded to hold a five minute discussion. The motion was approved with 24 in favor and 1 opposed.

A senator said that currently the state allots 90 percent of the higher education budget to public institutions and 10 percent goes into financial aid. MPCC states that their students receive half of the financial aid funds or 5 percent of the total. Therefore, public institution students, roughly 75 percent of all students in the state, receive 95 percent of state funding while private institution students, which account for 25 percent of the state's students, only receive 5 percent under the current mechanism.

The proposal asks that only 70 percent of state funds are allotted to public institutions and that 30 percent are used for financial aid. The private institution students, 25 percent of the state's students, would then receive 15 percent of the state funding for higher education, and public institution students, 75 percent of the state's students, would only receive 85 percent of the state funding for higher education.

A motion was then made and seconded to forward to the Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC).

Q: What is the process once the proposal is forwarded to SSCC? Will the issue return to the Student Senate?

A: SSCC will discuss the issue and determine whether the committee will handle it themselves, or refer it to another committee. A committee will examine the issue, and produce a statement that will come back to the Student Senate.

A senator said that he supports referring the proposal to committee, but each assembly/association should continue their own examination.

A motion was made and seconded to call the question. The motion was approved by a majority.

A vote to refer to committee was then taken and the motion was approved by a majority.

**APPROVED**

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:24 p.m.

**Rebecca Hippert  
Abstractor**