UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University Senate Consultative Committee
328 Millard Hall
435 Delaware St., S.E.
Minneapolis, Minn. 55455
Telephone: (612) 373-3226

TENTATIVE AGENDA

Senate Facilitative Committee
Friday, September 21, 1979
9:30-11:00 a.m.
404 Coffman Union

1. Fix Agenda

2. Report of the Chair

   a. Consultative Committee actions, and intended mode
      of operation for the 1979-80 year vis-a-vis Senate
      Committee business.

   b. Request for Senate Committee statements regarding
      open meeting policy.

3. Senate Reorganization Plan (Professor Spring)

   It is intended that this will be the major topic of
   discussion at the meeting.

4. Senate Newsletter

5. Outreach Report

6. Old Business

7. New Business

8. Adjournment

Minutes of the Senate Facilitative Committee

The first meeting of the Senate Facilitative Committee for the 1979-80 academic year was convened at 9:35 a.m. in Room 404 of Coffman Memorial Union. Members present included Josef Altholz, Virginia Fredericks, Paul Grambsch, Isabel Harris, Robert Hexter, Richard Kottke, Fred Morrison, Roger Park, Richard Purple, Chair, Donald Spring, James Terwilliger, Arthur Williams and Frank Wood.

1. A motion to fix the agenda with the addition of an UCBRBR report was approved without dissent.

2. Professor Purple reported briefly on the first meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee. He cited Professor Spring's presentation on Senate reorganization, the structuring of the agenda on outreach for the special November 1 Senate meeting, and the collection of concerns being channeled into the new Grievance and Legal Affairs subcommittee.

     Professor Purple requested from each committee a statement on its open meeting policy. The statements will be kept in a notebook in the SCC office.

3. Professor Spring presented background on the Senate reorganization plan. Last year the Senate reorganization task force operated as a subcommittee of the SCC. The various Senate committees provided helpful suggestions. There appeared almost no interest in reorganizing the Senate itself. Rather, there was agreement that the committees needed restructuring first before the overall Senate organization was studied.

     Professor Spring distributed copies of the reorganization report: the proposals taken to the Senate last spring, reaffirmations and modifications suggested over the course of the summer in response to the initial report, and a general plan to bring the proposal for change to the Senate's 1980 spring meeting.

Professor Spring hopes to hear from all Senate committees within a few weeks regarding their comments and recommendations.

Professor Spring then summarized each proposal from the original set of recommendations, adding the responses in support of, in place of and in opposition to them.

Professor Hexter inquired what the ramifications are of having seven committees reporting through SCEP to the Senate. He noted that the Senate Committee on Research usually discusses facilitative matters[and that he has not seen business of that committee which has any relation to other committees.] Professor Spring noted that presently about 10 committees are supposed to report through SCEP, although in practice they do not. Reporting through the chair of the SCEP guards against matters with policy implications being reported by inclusion in a committee's direct operational reports -to the Senate. Professor Spring explained that the line of reporting is to be followed only when a committee is meeting for matters other than operational. An example is the Research Committee's consultation this summer with the administration on fund distribution.

Professor Purple stressed the need for an overall Senate Committee on Educational Policy and not merely a disparate collection of specialized committees. And what is there, asked Professor Morrison, that is not related to educational policy? He suggested that the Senate could require a committee to file a seven-day notice with SCEP before filing a report with the Senate.

The Senate Committee on Business and Rules has a nominal screening role which consists usually in simply assigning an agenda number to the item submitted. It was noted, however, that when business crosses committee lines, as it almost always does, it goes through the Senate Consultative Committee.

There was general agreement on a lack of adequate Senate debate on agenda items. Typically, senators are not informed on new business coming before the Senate, with the results that either a report is overthrown as problems are noticed,or items are passed rather thoughtlessly. Three points were made on the information issue: hold regular facilitative committee meetings; circulate reports in lieu of holding meetings; note that many people do not read a report until they arrive at the relevant meeting.

Professor Spring asked the thinking of the Facilitative Committee as to whether the University committee structure should be abandoned and all committees made committees of the Senate. There was no immediate discussion.

Matters coming before the Research Committee
do not have a lot to do with educational policy
but do have a lot to do with the research
interests of the faculty at large. Hence
there is good reason for the Research Committee
to report directly to the Senate rather than
through the SCEP.

(correction by Robert Hexter)
     10/4/79