

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Campus Assembly

Campus Governance

---

2-14-1983

### Campus Assembly minutes 02/14.1983

Campus Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp\\_assembly](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly)

---

University of Minnesota, Morris  
Campus Assembly Minutes  
February 14, 1983

The meeting was called to order by the provost at 4:08 p.m.

I. Announcements

- A. The provost announced that he had been in Minneapolis the last three days of the previous week attending regents' meetings and legislative hearings. The situation now, as viewed by Imholte, is a "ganging up" against HECB by all segments of higher education in the state. The criticism of HECB's reaction to House File 2 is coming from significant sources. Comments came from at least 7 or 8 of the 12 regents at their Friday meeting, supporting President Magrath and Vice President Kegler's stance on the issue. They were united and consistent with the attitude that if cuts are to be made, let the systems decide on what the cuts are to be, not the legislature, not the governor, and certainly not HECB.
- B. UMM's retrenchment for the remainder of this year (between now and June 30, 1983) is \$49,000. There are some approaches we might take that would seem to make it less harmful than it otherwise might be. The UMM administration is exploring options now, and when they feel they have a worthwhile plan, the appropriate consultation will take place on campus.
- C. Guyotte announced a special hearing on tenure code revision to be held on Friday, February 18, from 2:30-4:30 p.m. The phone hook-up for the Morris campus will be in Humanities 112. Spring said that the Tenure Committee is particularly interested in hearing faculty views on tenure as related to programmatic changes and financial exigency. B. Ahern said that the faculty Consultative Committee will be preparing a statement and would welcome any ideas. Gieske stated that the faculty should keep in mind that on programmatic changes, the tendency is to focus on very small programs and not large, nationally respected programs. This could hurt the smaller campuses. He also felt that financial exigency should be resorted to only as a last step. He felt it could be destructive. He preferred a voluntary emergency approach that would save tenure instead of destroying it.
- D. Dean Blake reminded faculty that the Horace T. Morse Amoco Foundation Award competition was underway. She announced that the campus deadline is March 1, and that Roland Guyotte, the last UMM recipient, is chairing the campus committee. She encouraged those who were planning to make nominations to let Guyotte know of their intentions.

II. The minutes of the January 17, 1983, Assembly meeting were approved.

III. The report of the Task Force on By-Laws Revision was up for discussion. The provost explained the Executive Committee's approach to handling this item: 1) Kearnes, chair of the task force will make whatever comments he wishes, 2) general, all-inclusive kinds of comments will be entertained, 3) the report will be gone through item by item and comments will be invited, and 4) this meeting is for discussion only, no action will be taken.

The provost encouraged members to make known whatever amendments they intended to propose. Written amendments were encouraged and the provost stated that some would be passed out at this meeting.

Kearnes opened by thanking all those who had supplied the task force with written comments. He based further remarks around the following points: 1) that the proposed revision only addresses part of the problem on campus of continued growth and committees, 2) that the contribution of the revision provides a mechanism for change in a systematic way, and 3) he believes that this is a place of beginning and that future changes are anticipated.

Spring questioned whether the five items listed on page two of the Executive Committee memo would be a part of the action taken at the February 28 meeting. Imholte replied that items 3 and 5 would be affected if the revision were adopted, but items 1, 2, and 4 would require separate action. Spring wondered if item 4 would come up for discussion on the 28th. Imholte said that if there was time on the 28th, discussion could be held, but because of constitutional procedures no action could be taken.

Provost Imholte asked for comments on Section 1 and 2. There were no comments on Section 1. Under Section 2A, Ahern asked for the committee's rationale for wanting membership from each division. Kearnes replied that it followed the general philosophy of greater equity on committees and reflected a more democratic approach. The committee felt that each area would have a contribution to make and with only four permanent committees, it was important to have contributions from the various segments on campus. Kissock added that the Morris Campus Planning Committee has this representation and the Curriculum Committee has operated along these lines. This simply makes it more consistent. Ahern argued that the Executive Committee has resisted the attempt to identify faculty representation by division, believing that they should be representing the campus. Gremmels said that division representation did not mean that the faculty member would be representing the feelings of the division. Farrell said there may be good reasons for division representation, but felt that if the Executive Committee continued to ask for committee preferences, this restriction would make it very cumbersome. Ahern flagged item A for a possible amendment.

Imholte moved to item F which Ahern had also questioned. Kearnes replied for the committee saying that some already existing committees pick their own chair and the feeling was that perhaps a committee that did so would work better together and be more successful. Ahern felt that the Executive Committee, by selecting a

chair prior to the beginning of the year, would be providing good leadership. Being selected chair by the committee is not always seen as an honor. It occurs later in the quarter after priorities are set and the committee gets a late start. Granger felt that continuity is important and when committees select their own chairs, that continuity is broken. He wondered if the task force felt that the Executive Committee should not be given the power to name committee chairs. Gremmels replied that the revision would prevent an Executive Committee that might be controlled by a particular faction from loading a committee. Kearnes stated again that the revision was promoting a spirit of democracy, feeling that those who work together should choose their own leadership. Dorsey commented that the logic in the proposed change was that a committee would have more solidarity than if the chair was pre-selected. He thought that this would contribute to more efficiency. Hinds thought that the old method of the Executive Committee selecting chairs was a better one. The Executive Committee was able to ascertain ahead of time whether the person was willing to serve and had the time to make sure that committee responsibilities could be carried out. Hart encouraged an amendment from Ahern and item F was flagged.

Farrell raised a question concerning item B. Would it be true that division chairs could serve on nothing but the Curriculum Committee? Kearnes thought that such was the case. Gremmels felt there might be times when curricular decisions must be made and division chairs might act as "chairs" instead of faculty. Guyotte said that item B would bar chairs from being on the Executive Committee. Kissock noted an exception to the above because the Education chair could serve ex officio on the Education Committee and that chairs might serve ex officio on other committees. Hart wondered if there were enough faculty to go around. Kearnes said that there were. Kissock mentioned that there were 97 faculty members on current committees of the Assembly and under the new proposal there would be 63. Kemble said the Executive Committee would have nightmares when naming committees because of all the restraints. Kearnes stressed again that equity and the desire that no one would be overburdened was their main consideration. They never claimed it would be easy. Straw commented that if it stopped the Executive Committee from generating committees, it would be worth it. Hinds wondered if the reduction in the number of faculty on committees would give all faculty the opportunity of serving on committees. He felt that this was important because of service considerations in evaluating tenure. Farrell agreed. Kissock answered that this was the reason for limiting terms. Benson wondered if the disparity in the number of faculty in each division would mean that the Education Division would be overburdened. She was referring to both items A and B. Kissock said this might be true in dealing with the four main committees, but not so when looking at the total number of committees. He also indicated that there were many ways of serving the institution and committee service was just one of them. Item B was flagged for a possible amendment.

Concerning item D, Blake questioned the reason for the two-year terms. Kearnes wondered what was too much and what was too little? Blake remarked that the first year of service was not too effective.

She felt there was a problem in continuity with the shorter terms. She preferred a three-year term with the chair being someone in their third year of service. Gremmels said that shorter terms would mean more faculty involvement and participation. Benson stated that item D would be another example of too many restraints on the Executive Committee's ability to establish committees. Kissock mentioned that it was also the intent of the revision to appoint people on staggered terms to provide some continuity. Lammers asked if after serving a two-year term with one year off, a person could be renamed to a committee. The answer was yes. Item D was flagged for a possible amendment.

Kemble asked what kind of consultation was meant in item C. Kissock mentioned the distribution of committee preference forms and Gremmels mentioned consultation with the division chairs. This procedure is already followed.

Discussion turned to Section 3. Kemble indicated he would offer an amendment. He felt this proposal would take up too much of the Assembly's time and said he would like to see this section removed from the report. Farrell agreed. He thought too much time would be spent reporting to a parent committee to which the adjunct committee had no responsibility since they could go directly to the Executive Committee. He believes they are "subcommittees" instead of "adjunct" committees. Kearnes said the task force was suggesting a very brief, simple report, nothing cumbersome. He commented that all change was bothersome and the group could not think of a way to make it easier. Kemble was sympathetic to the need of change, but wondered if coming to the Assembly with this question every two years was the way to do it. Ordway replied that it was necessary to come to the Assembly because only the Assembly could change the responsibilities of committees. Farrell said that the Teacher Education Committee should not have to justify its existence every two years. Burnes stated that the campus would be hard pressed to explain this item on the Teacher Education Committee to NCATE. Gremmels explained that every adjunct committee would not have to justify their very existence. He cited the Athletic Committee as another example of one that would always be necessary as long as we have intercollegiate athletics. He did point out that some Assembly committees at some time might want to assume more responsibility and not feel the need for an adjunct committee.

Spring asked if there had been objections submitted to the task force during the long interim since the proposal had first been submitted. Kearnes said no. Imholte reminded Kearnes of some concerns forwarded to the task force by the Executive Committee. Kearnes responded that they were of an administrative nature.

There were no comments on Section 4.

MCSA distributed a number of amendments, one dealing with Section 5. It proposed increasing the student membership on the Student Services Committee from five to seven and decreasing the faculty representation from five to three. It also proposes adding the following sentence, "It shall develop and implement rules and

procedures for all campus-wide student elections" as the last sentence under Powers. Blake wondered what was meant by the phrase "one member of the administration," under membership. No one could provide an answer. Uehling felt that modification of the original document would make it difficult for the committee to perform in the area of student behavior. Kearnes said that there was nothing to prohibit the committee from appointing an adjunct committee to perform that function if necessary. Gremmels asked why MCSA wanted to add the last sentence under Powers when that responsibility had already been given to another committee. Skjerven stated that MCSA would propose to strike the Student Nominations and Elections Committee from the revision. Gremmels wondered why. Skjerven said that MCSA now fulfills this function and the committee is not necessary. Kissock stated that this was in violation of the current constitution and the task force was reiterating the policy dictated by the constitution. Spring explained that reference must be made somewhere to show that MCSA simply recommends students for committees and does not name them to committees.

Section 6 was up for discussion. Under membership, Uehling asked why the change in faculty membership from 4 to 6? He felt comfortable with 4. Gremmels said that the Curriculum Committee is a very important one dealing with academic courses, GER, etc., and that faculty had a lot at stake. Barber felt that the committee already had 4 faculty in the division chairs and did not need 6 more. Farrell was concerned about the large number of people on all committees. He felt the number should be reduced so it would be easier to establish meeting times. Otherwise, he felt it important to seriously consider setting up a weekly time slot that would be free for committee work. Uehling indicated he would offer an amendment changing the membership from 16 to 14 and the faculty membership from 6 to 4.

Olson wondered whether a student's major was what constituted student representation from the division? Kearnes said that this was desirable and a goal to work toward.

Imholte closed the meeting by saying that he was not discouraging amendments, but wanted to call attention to the fact that the proposed revision is a "whole" proposal. If it is pecked away at, it no longer is the same document. The provost said it would be helpful for anyone who had amendments to present them in writing prior to the next Assembly meeting.

Before the meeting closed, a proposed amended revision from the Functions and Awards Committee was distributed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 and will resume on Monday, February 28, at 4 p.m. in the Science Auditorium.

Submitted by Pat Tanner

