

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Campus Assembly

Campus Governance

12-15-1969

Campus Assembly minutes 12/15/1969

Campus Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly

Recommended Citation

Campus Assembly, "Campus Assembly minutes 12/15/1969" (1969). *Campus Assembly*. 248.
https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly/248

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 Campus Assembly by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY MINUTES

December 15, 1969

The third General Assembly meeting of the current academic year was called to order at 10:40 a.m. The meeting was called in order to consider proposed amendments to the draft constitution.

Constitution - Article II, Section 1. The amendment was withdrawn at the request of the proposer.

Constitution - Article III, Section 2. The specific ratios of students to faculty in the Campus Assembly were discussed. The Task Force Committee was guided by what was being done on the Twin Cities Campus in arriving at the figure of one representative per each hundred students. It was also pointed out that since student representation is a relatively new development, criteria for particular student representative-faculty ratios are practically non-existent.

An amendment combining the two Section 2A proposals by adding the phrase ". . .whichever of the two is a larger number." was introduced and defeated.

The Assembly voted on and defeated the proposed amendments covering Section 2A. (first A), 2B, 2D, and 2A (second A).

Constitution - Article V, Section 1. The proposed amendments dealing with the structure and powers of the Consultative Committee were introduced by MCSG and by Mr. Hempeck. After some deliberation the Assembly decided to consider at the same time the proposal from the Consultative Committee. In view of the similarities between the three proposals, the two student amendments were withdrawn by their sponsors.

Assembly discussion centered about the functions and structure of the Consultative Committee and the exclusion of certain individuals from membership in the committee. It was pointed out that the Consultative Committee was not just a grievance committee. Frequently, it acted as a sounding board for new developments on the campus; the Provost has invited, in the past, its comments on proposals and its recommendations as to administrative appointments. The Chairman of the Committee, moreover, indicated that when it does concern itself with individual grievances, it tries to react to the basic principles involved in the dispute as well.

The Assembly briefly considered the advantages and disadvantages of a Consultative Committee with three constituent oriented subcommittees versus three separate Committees. It was mentioned that most of the business could be handled by the combined single committee. The question was also brought out as to whether the entire committee needed to be involved in a particular problem. It was pointed out that the nature of the Consultative Committee was such that sometimes it might be more appropriate for a single member to handle a particular issue.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. The Assembly did not reconvene at 1:30 due to lack of a quorum.