

Minutes*

Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 23, 2006
3-4:30 pm
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Jean Bauer (chair), Nicholas Allyn, Gary Balas, Josh Breyfogle, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Jacqueline Cottingham-Zierdt, Stacy Doepner-Hove, Daniel Feeney, Anthony Kouba, Scott Lanyon, Judith Martin, Rick Orr, Terry Roe, John Sullivan, Jeffrey Wencil, Jennifer Windsor

Absent: Marvin Marshak, Barbara Elliot, Megan Gunnar, Fred Morrison, Timothy Tangen, Dion Turgeon

Guests:

Other: Kate Stuckert

[In these minutes: (1) Review of Senate Docket; (2) New Business]

Professor Bauer convened the meeting at 3:05 pm.

1. Review of Senate Docket

Professor Bauer presented the senate docket and its proposed changes. Professor Feeney moved to open the docket review for discussion. Professor Martin seconded the motion. The committee discussed the docket. The committee discussed motions of the Social Concern Committee on the docket. The first was a request that the Board of Regents replace their policy outlining the investment responsibilities of the Social Concerns Committee in favor of one delegating these responsibilities to the President of the University. Professor Balas said that he felt this was an appropriate realignment, and Professor Feeney suggested it would be necessary to set the context for the motion and to point out that it has FCC support. Professor Chomsky asked for clarification on the issue, and asked if it was a reporting change. The committee discussed the clarification and the scope of the charge of the Social Concerns Committee. Professor Martin moved to accept the motion, and Mr. Orr seconded the motion. The motion passed.

The second resolution was a request from the University Senate that the President prepare an administrative policy documenting how the social impacts of the University's investment responsibilities will be addressed. Professor Bauer said that this was to establish a code of conduct for vendors, and as stated on the resolution, to specify University values in a policy that would allow it to influence vendors and act as a positive force for change in corporate ethics. Professor Martin asked who would enforce the code and said that the University cannot police this. Professor Chomsky said she thought this was about deciding whether or not to use a particular vendor. Mr. Orr asked for a definition of "vendor" and Ms. Cottingham-Zierdt defined it as those who provide goods and services to the University. Professor Lanyon said he was unclear about the scope of university vendors, saying that it could be prohibitively far-reaching, and Ms. Cottingham-Zierdt said that in her view it would not be about extra policing but rather who the University chooses to contract with for services. Mr. Orr asked if the code of

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

conduct would factor in the current discussions with the Coke-Cola Company, for example. Professor Lanyon said that they were not responding to a current problem and that the policy was about future issues. However, he cautioned against adding more bureaucracy around it. Professor Feeney moved to accept the resolution on the Senate docket; the motion was seconded. Motion approved.

The committee discussed the resolution on the docket to establish a Disabilities Studies Program. Professor Bauer noted that the FCC had voted to remove it from the docket. Professor Martin emphasized that the Senate does not endorse the establishment of new programs and that the resolution should not be on the docket. Mr. Orr suggested that perhaps the reason it was on the docket was because of Peter Singer's appearance on campus and the Disabilities Issues Committee feeling that his views are at odds with the University's equal opportunity statement. Professor Bauer said that nonetheless it was not appropriate as a Senate issue, and Professor Martin said that message should be conveyed that it isn't that the committee isn't supporting the program, but that this was not the forum for it. Professor Feeney moved to strike the resolution from the docket; the motion was seconded. Motion passed.

The committee went on to discuss the order of the items on the docket. Professor Martin moved to switch the order of the Faculty Senate Bylaws Amendment addressing collegiate membership and the Faculty Senate Constitutional Amendment addressing the definition of Faculty and Faculty-like Academic Professionals. Professor Chomsky seconded the motion. The motion passed.

After completion of the review of the Senate docket, Professor Martin moved to approve it. Professor Feeney seconded the motion. The motion passed.

2. New Business

Ms. Cottingham-Zierdt updated the committee on a new working group that had been established to define P&A classifications and define terminology. For example, clarification on what "associate" means in different positions. She said that the committee would be looking at what classifications mean over the year. Professor Carpenter asked if there was representation on the committee from the coordinate campuses. Ms. Doepner-Hove said there was not, but that they were trying to make sure they were brought into the discussion. Ms. Cottingham-Zierdt described the composition of the working group and described the difficulties in getting representation from coordinate campuses.

Professor Carpenter discussed the final process for the Chancellor position at the Morris campus and told the committee about the upcoming opportunities to meet the finalists.

Professor Bauer adjourned the meeting at 3:45 pm.

--Mary Jo Pehl