

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Constitution and By-laws

Campus Governance

2-20-2006

UMM Constitution Revision Committee Minutes 02/20/2006

University of Minnesota Morris Constitution Revision Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/const>

Recommended Citation

University of Minnesota Morris Constitution Revision Committee, "UMM Constitution Revision Committee Minutes 02/20/2006" (2006). *Constitution and By-laws*. 13.

<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/const/13>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Constitution and By-laws by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

February 23, 2006

UMM Constitutional Revision Committee
Meeting-February 20, 2006

Present: M.E. Bezanson (Chair), R. Heyman, M. Korth, T. Lindberg, McRoberts (interim Secretary), S. Olson-Loy, J. Ratliff-Crain, G. Rudney, K. Strissel, G. Thorson, and R. Webb

1. Time and place for meetings-Mondays, 3:30-4:30 pm, Science Conference Room 2550
2. Frequency of meetings-probably every other week. The next meeting will be on Monday, February, 27 at 3:30 with the following one after spring break on Monday, March 13 at 3:30 pm.
3. List Serve-The Chair noted that a list serve has been established for committee members to communicate.
4. Website-Committee member Webb has created a website which will have posted such items as, among other things, the UMM Constitution, the Regents Policy for Delegation of Authority and the all University Senate Constitution (drawn from the Regents Policy Library). These items will give the committee some context for our deliberations.

There followed a discussion of the Regents policy and delegation of authority which appears to be given exclusively to the President. A number of questions emerged about UMM's constitution, including: 1) Who has what power, assigned by whom? 2) What authority is already granted (limited) by all University requirements or regulations? 3) What is the Chancellors authority and from whence does it come? In the University's Board of Regents Policy, article 2, section 3, the President is delegated authority by the Regents-the President in turn delegates authority to other executive officers. Sandy Olson-Loy noted that there is a grid of delegation within the University of Minnesota, which describes the breakdown and line of authority.

The Power of the President is complete over the Chancellor. The UMM Constitution recognizes the power which is delegated to the Chancellor by the President. In essence, authority in the University is vested in the Regents who in turn, delegates it to others, primarily the President.

5. Review of UMM Constitution--The Chair turned to the UMM Constitution and proposed that we look at the UMM Constitution by article and section. Others suggested that we also look at other college constitutions-based on a listed proposal by Greg Thorson and others. This would include selected public and private college constitutions, and other colleges within the University of Minnesota.

Staff Support for the Committee-we agreed that we need staff support for about 5 hours a week. Bezanson noted that McRoberts will be serving as interim secretary. Bezanson went on to suggest that we review the UMM constitution and start with each article to identify what is missing or needs clarification.

- Preamble-it was noted that extraordinary power is ascribed to the Chancellor. Some thought that the faculty should play a more prominent role. It was also noted that since it dealt with the delegation of authority, it should be an article and not be contained in the preamble, which does not have the force of policy or law. There is also some confusion about the preamble, referring here to language about the separate location of campuses, such as Morris. The committee seemed to be in agreement only on the liberal arts mission of UMM and much concerned about much of the rest of the preamble.
- Other Issues-members noted other concerns about the constitution-how does UMM fit within the governance structure of the entire University? What are the layers of authority within the University? What is the role of the UMM constitution and its value?
- Section 2, Senior Administrative Officer. The power of the Chancellor seems to be great, though it seems to be contradicted (limited) in article 3, section 7 (of the UMM constitution) in which the policies of the Campus Assembly are defined. Under the administrative powers of the Chancellor it seems that the Chancellor proposes to the Assembly to be approved or disapproved by them. A committee member noted that what we are seeking a balance of power between the Chancellor and the Assembly. The Assembly seems to have only limited power. A member of the committee said that the powers of the Chancellor should be limited to administrative responsibility. Under the University policy the President is given the power and the Chancellor is delegated such power by the President. The Senate constitution however, provides for campus assemblies which must be approved by the University Senate and that is called for in the University Regents policies. It seems that the University Senate has authority separate from the President. What we need to ascertain is the power and authority of the President, the University Senate, the Chancellor and Campus Assembly as derived from Board of Regents Policy.

Again, there was suggestion that as we think about our revised constitution, we should define the Chancellors role as having administrative authority, but not necessarily policy authority and in fact, step away from some of the Chancellors authority and try to strengthen our consultative powers.

- ∑ The terms of the Chancellor and administrators need to be revised. There followed a long discussion about the terms of appointment for senior administrators and the review of those administrators and the fact that the constitution no longer reflects current realities. There was once administrative review of senior administrative officers, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors and directors, but that has largely fallen by the wayside starting first on the Twin Cities campus. We need to revisit this as we redo the constitution.

6. At the next meeting: 1) we will continue discussion of the constitution by article and section; 2) we will look at the list of public and private colleges and U of M constitutes we wish to consider (as developed by Greg Thorson); 3) we will also bear in mind that we want to think globally about the constitution-what role does it play in our campus life-and ask the major questions or concerns about the constitution, not just narrow

specific issues. We want to understand what the constraints are on UMM in terms of Regents and other University of Minnesota policies.

Final comments-one member asked that we keep in mind the essential reasons why we were asked to do a revision of the constitution. What has brought us to this point?

It was noted that we should feel free to invite expertise from elsewhere in the University to address such issues as the University's constitution, the relative authority of the Regents over the President, the President in relation to the University Senate, UMM in relationship to the rest of the University and the power of the Chancellor versus the Assembly (or faculty) at UMM.