

[In these minutes: September 30 Student Senate agenda approval, Revisions to the Administrative Procedures for the Grievance Policy, Intra-University Student Leadership Conference, Student Affairs Committee representative to SSCC, Role of the Student Senate and SSCC, SSCC members to SCC under the proposed revision]

STUDENT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE (SSCC) MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 16, 2004

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: Nathan Wanderman (chair), James Kanten, Taquee Khaled, Jamie Larson, Seyon Nyanwleh, Tom Pielow, Stace Vonderhaar.

ABSENT: Colin Schwensohn.

1. CHAIR'S REPORT

Nathan Wanderman provided the committee a report on the following topics:

BUDGET

Following the SSCC retreat, he considered the concept of a shadow budget, and determined that this undertaking would not be feasible or prudent for SSCC. Instead, he would like to propose that a few students invest time in the budgeting process to develop expertise on how this works and how best to get students involved. He plans to meet with the Chief Financial Officer, Richard Pfutzenreuter, and Professor Chuck Campbell, Chair of the Finance and Planning Committee.

TEACHING EVALUATIONS

He met with Professor Marvin Marshak, Chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC), about this topic. Professor Marshak supports the students' access to these questions. Nathan Wanderman then emailed Professor Emily Hoover, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), who said that SCEP is reviewing the report of their subcommittee and will then determine the next action to be taken. In the meantime, Nathan Wanderman suggested that he contact the General Counsel's office to see if the University can legally mandate that these questions be released.

MEETING WITH PROFESSOR MARSHAK

In his meeting with Professor Marshak, the issue of faculty and student collaboration on student issues was raised. Professor Marshak would like to help change little things that inhibit the quality of student life at the University. He asked SSCC to brainstorm for these ideas and email him. Members noted that following student issues: weekend activities at Crookston and campus lockdown at Duluth due to a peeping tom.

SENIOR COMMITTEE DELEGATE

A draft of the Senior Committee Delegate (SCD) position has been drafted, which asks for these students to track other student attendance and report on what each committee is doing. The proposal asks for the SSCC Vice Chair to oversee this function. He then read the description.

Members then made the following comments:

- SCD should encourage more general student involvement instead of senators, so this should be a selection criteria
- There are too many committee and not enough funding to provide compensation to SCDs

The proposal will be presented to the Student Senate for discussion in two weeks.

CAUCUSES

This topic was discussed at the SSCC retreat as a way to break the Student Senate into smaller groups and have senators get to know other senators better. Each SSCC member will be in charge of one of the following caucuses: Crookston, Duluth, Morris, TC graduates and professional students, CLA senators, and all other TC undergraduate senators. SSCC members will be responsible for facilitating the caucus discussions and checking who is and is not present.

2. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 30 STUDENT SENATE AGENDA

The September 30 Student Senate agenda was approved as amended.

3. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES FOR THE GRIEVANCE POLICY

Carolyn Chalmers, University Grievance Officer, joined the committee to explain the proposed revisions to the Administrative Procedures for the Grievance Policy. The policy and procedures, which covers all non-union employment grievances, are reviewed every five years. When this last review was done, there were many comments about the University Grievance Office (UGO) offering more help with informal services that are less adversarial and legalistic.

From these comments, the document was revised to change references to 'grievance' to 'conflict resolution' and to lay out more informal processes within the office. The formal process will remain mostly the same. There is one other change that will affect students. The current procedures ask that 10 student employees be named as possible grievance panel members. However, there have been problems maintaining this roster, keeping members trained, and having student grievants choose other students for their panels. With this version, a decision was made to eliminate student representatives to the Grievance Advisory Board. However, a student representative will remain on the Grievance Advisory Committee to oversee the review of the office and the Grievance Officer.

The revised procedures have been approved by the FCC, and will be presented for approval to

the University Senate later this month. They will then go to the President and Regents for approval and implementation.

She asked how to make student employees more aware of her office and the services it offers. Last year, there were about two dozen students who came in for consultation and only one went to a hearing. She then asked members for their comments or concerns.

Q: Do these procedures cover interns?

A: It would cover paid interns in University of Minnesota programs.

Q: Is the policy provided to all student workers?

A: No. The procedures are on the web. A mass email to all student workers has been considered.

A member suggested that the UGO talk with MSA, GAPSA, and COGS to help spread the word about the revised procedures once they are approved. The UGO could also target large centers of student employment with a flyer noting where to pick up the policy.

4. DISCUSSION OF AN INTRA-UNIVERSITY STUDENT LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

Nathan Wanderman asked SSCC members to consider them holding a leadership conference for representatives from all levels of student governance on campus. The idea would be to discuss common issues among the groups, generate ideas, and breath life into the Student Senate. He would envision this meeting taking place next February.

Q: Who would be invited?

A: A first draft of invitees would include assembly/association presidents, St. Paul Board of College members, TC Board of Governors president, residence hall presidents, college board presidents, and key student group presidents. The goal would not be for a large invitee list, but a diverse list.

Q: Who would plan the event?

A: SSCC oras subcommittee with members from the Student Senate.

Members noted that funding could be requested or a registration fee could be charged. It might help to plan the event during around another campus meeting, such as SLC or Regents.

Nathan Wanderman said that he would bring a rough outline, a date, and funding sources back to SSCC at the next meeting.

5. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE ON SSCC

Members decided to ask the Student Affairs Committee chair to serve first, and if she cannot, then to ask if other members are interested in the position.

6. DEFINITION OF THE ROLE OF THE STUDENT SENATE AND SSCC

Nathan Wanderman asked members to consider the purpose of the Student Senate and SSCC in terms of academic issues, residential life, and their relationship to other student governance efforts on campus.

Members made the following comments:

- Groups such as MSA lobby for the students on certain efforts, but the Student Senate has an institutionalized presence to affect change
- Student Senate should have a bigger role, but should not create rivalry or conflict
- Better working relationship is needed for a stronger student voice
- Student Senate is more effective with direct administrative contact and elected representatives
- Student Senate can better coordinate student efforts and facilitate communication
- There is a difference between leverage and power
- It is harder to have one issue common all students to work on in the Student Senate
- It looks like the Student Senate does less because of the nature of the organization
- Most students issues do have an effect at other campuses
- Student Senate should be a resource for other student organizations
- Email regarding Student Senate role could be sent to administrators and student organizations

7. APPROVAL OF SSCC MEMBERS APPOINTED TO SCC UNDER THE PROPOSED REVISION

Nathan Wanderman said that one issue undecided last year was how to assign the seven student seats being proposed on the revised Senate Consultative Committee. The first six seats were easily assigned: SSCC/Student Senate Chair and one member from each student assembly/association. The question is how to fill the seventh seat. Members discussed the two proposals being considered last spring:

1. Last seat filled by the SSCC/Student Senate Vice Chair
2. Last seat filled by second MSA representative since this organization represents so many students

Members then discussed a third option:

3. Last seat filled by a Twin Cities representative that will alternate each year between MSA and GAPSA

Following discussion of the proposals, a vote was taken and members vote 5-1 to approve option

three.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

Nathan Wanderman stated that members can talk to him about any complaints with the meetings, or should feel free to relay concerns through Tom Pielow, the Vice Chair. With no further business, he thanked all members for attending and adjourned the meeting.

Becky Hippert
University Senate