

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

**TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY and FACULTY ASSEMBLY
MINUTES**

February 3, 1972

The second regular meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was held in Nicholson Hall on February 3, 1972. The Faculty Assembly also met after the meeting of the Campus Assembly. Signing or checking the roll as present were 76 voting members of the faculty, 17 voting members of the student body, 5 members of the Administrative Committee, and 12 nonmembers. Professor John Darley presided.

Prior to completion of items III and IV of the printed docket, the meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was recessed until 2:15 p.m., February 8, 1972. The meeting was recessed owing to the lack of a quorum.

The following items were considered and action was taken as indicated.

I. MINUTES OF OCTOBER 28, 1971

Reported for Action

Approved

II. ASSEMBLY AND CAMPUS COMMITTEES, 1971-72

Reported for Action

Campus Committee on University Health Services: Robert Matthews (chairman), Elaine Benthack, Donald Cowan (ex officio), Edward Dvorak, Betty Girling, Kenneth Malvey, Carol Ostrow, Paul Rupprecht, Louis Safer. Students: Claudia Blevins, Peter Frost, Mary Garrett, John Geier, Mark Hagedorn, Peter Hohenhaus, Etta Magnusen, Sue Nelson, Chris Taylor.

Approved

Reported for Information

Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics: Add Paul Giel to replace Marsh Ryman.

Assembly Committee on Educational Policy: Add Sigfried Grosser.

Campus Committee on Educational Services: Students: Add Ellen Raeker to replace Kathy Reynolds.

Campus Committee on Intramural and Extramural Activities: Students: Add Tracy Drake to replace Roger Krogwold.

Campus Foreign Student Committee: Students: Add Tayo Poroye to replace Precha Thavikulwat.

Accepted

III. REPORT OF ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

1. Reported for Action

On January 8, 1972, representatives of the University Division of the National Collegiate Athletic Association voted to permit freshmen to compete in intercollegiate contests in football and basketball which are sponsored or approved by that Association. To apply this policy to all intercollegiate football and basketball games requires conference and institutional approval.

At a special meeting of the Directors of Athletics and the Faculty Representatives on January 16, 1972, it was voted (subject to institutional review under the White Resolution Procedure) to amend the rules of eligibility of the Big Ten Conference so that freshmen can compete in intercollegiate football and basketball games. Participants could therefore have four seasons of competition in each of these sports, as it is now permitted for all other varsity sports. The vote was 7 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 absent. Minnesota voted in favor, based upon prior consultation with students, coaches and members of the Assembly Committee.

If no objection is filed by any member institution of the conference, or if in spite of objection this action of January 16 is sustained at the next regular meeting of the Faculty Representatives on March 6, 1972, the new policy will become effective for implementation in the 1972-73 season.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Assembly approve participation of freshmen in intercollegiate varsity competition in football and basketball.

Not approved, February 8, 1972

2. Reported for Information

A. Clarification of Committee's Consultative Responsibilities

As a result of discussions with central administration, it has now been agreed that the Committee will be consulted as major personnel, budgetary and facilities decisions concerning the intercollegiate athletic program are being made.

B. Participation in the Rose Bowl

In August 1971, the Big Ten Conference voted (8 to 1 with 1 abstention) to repeal the regulation which prohibits a football team from going to the Rose Bowl more than one year in succession. This means that, effective January 1973, the Conference champion will be invited to represent the Conference in the Rose Bowl regardless of the number of successive prior appearances. The school invited, however, continues to have the right to refuse the Rose Bowl invitation at any time.

This action was subject to institutional review under the White Resolution, with objections to be filed by November 27. At its November 4 meeting your Committee voted unanimously that it did not feel an objection should be filed, and (in view of the nature of the change and the particular timing problem) that the matter should be

reported to the Assembly for information at its next regularly scheduled meeting. One school did file an objection before November 27. At their December meeting the Conference voted to reaffirm the August action to delete the Rose Bowl no-repeat rule (9 to 1 vote).

C. Eligibility of Students in the General College

At its November 4, 1971 meeting your Committee approved the following eligibility policy, and has since notified the Big Ten Conference of its action.

"Whereas the General College has been authorized to grant baccalaureate degrees, that General College students accepted in the General College Extended Program be subject to the same eligibility requirements as students in other baccalaureate programs at the University of Minnesota Twin City Campus."

D. Approved Schedules

BASEBALL 1972

- March
 20,21 Texas A & M University (2) at College Station, Texas
 22,23 University of Texas (2) at Austin, Texas
 24,25 Sam Houston State University (2) at Huntsville, Texas
 31 Wartburg College (2) at Waverly, Iowa
- April
 1 Luther College (2) at Decorah, Iowa
 4 St. Cloud State College (2)
 7 St. Olaf College (2)
 8 St. Thomas College (2)
 11 Mankato State College (2)
 14 Indiana University (2) at Bloomington, Indiana
 15 The Ohio State University (2) at Columbus, Ohio
 18 Wisconsin State University - Superior (2)
 21 University of Michigan (2)
 22 Michigan State University (2)
 28 Purdue University (2) at Lafayette, Indiana
 29 University of Illinois (2) at Champaign, Illinois
- May
 6 University of Iowa (2)
 12 Northwestern University (2)
 13 University of Wisconsin (2)

FRESHMEN HOCKEY 1971-72

- January
 9 University of Minnesota - Duluth Freshmen at Duluth, Minnesota
 14 Anoka Ramsey Junior College
 15 Anoka Ramsey Junior College
 21 Stout State University
 22 Stout State University
 28 Lakewood Junior College
 29 Rochester Junior College
- February
 4 St. Johns University
 5 St. Johns University
 11 University of Minnesota - Duluth
 12 Lakewood Junior College
 19 River Falls State University
 26 Rochester Junior College at Rochester, Minnesota

GOLF 1972

- March
 20-21 Les Bolstad Invitational at Houston, Texas
 22 Rice University at Houston, Texas
 23-24 Guy Savage Invitational at Houston, Texas
- April
 15 Kepler Invitational at Columbus, Ohio
 22 (Open)
 29 Illinois Invitational at Champaign, Illinois
- May
 5-6 Northern Intercollegiate at Bloomington, Indiana
 12-13 Minnesota Invitational
 19 (Open - home match)
 26-27 Big Ten Championship
- June
 19-24 NCAA Championship

HOCKEY 1971-72

- November
 12,13 University of Minnesota - Duluth at Duluth, Minnesota
 19,20 Michigan State University at East Lansing, Michigan
 26,27 Colorado College at Colorado Springs, Colorado
- December
 3, 4 Michigan Tech. at Houghton, Michigan
 7 U.S. Olympic Team
 17, 18 University of Minnesota - Duluth
 24, 25 (Open)
 29, 30 University of Syracuse Tournament at Syracuse, New York
- January
 7, 8 University of Wisconsin at Madison, Wisconsin
 12 U.S. Olympic Team at Metropolitan Sports Center, Minnesota
 14, 15 University of North Dakota
 21, 22 University of Notre Dame
 28, 29 University of Denver

February

- 4, 5 University of Wisconsin
- 11, 12 Michigan State University
- 18, 19 Colorado College
- 25, 26 University of North Dakota at Grand Forks, North Dakota

March

- 3, 4 University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Michigan
- 7-11 WCHA Playoffs

TENNIS 1972

March

- 19, 20 University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa, Alabama
- 21 Florida State University at Tallahassee, Florida
- 22 Georgia Tech. University at Tampa, Florida
- 22 University of Tampa at Tampa, Florida
- 23 Miami-Dade Junior College at Miami, Florida
- 24 University of Miami at Coral Gables, Florida

April

- 7 University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Michigan
- 8 Michigan State University at East Lansing, Michigan
- 14 University of Iowa at Iowa City, Iowa
- 21 University of Illinois at Champaign, Illinois
- 22 Purdue University at Lafayette, Indiana
- 28 Indiana University
- 29 The Ohio State University

May

- 5 Northwestern University
- 6 University of Wisconsin
- 12-14 Big Ten Championships at Madison, Wisconsin

June

- 12-17 NCAA Championships at Athens, Georgia

JEROME MOSS, JR.

Chairman

Accepted

IV. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONVOCATIONS AND THE ARTS

Reported for Information

The Campus Committee on Convocations and the Arts served in an advisory capacity to Dr. Ross Smith, Director of the Department of Concerts and Lectures.

The Committee also programmed 19 convocations during the 1970-71 academic year—14 on the Minneapolis Campus and 5 on the St. Paul Campus.

ARNOLD WALKER

Acting Chairman

V. OLD BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Recessed owing to lack of a quorum.

Meeting of the Faculty Assembly

I. REPORT OF THE SPECIAL NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Reported for Action

The Special Nominating Committee (approved by the Assembly October 28, 1971) to fill 1972-1975 faculty membership terms on the Assembly Steering Committee presents the following four names, from which two (2) are to be elected:

May E. Corcoran, Education
LaVell M. Henderson, Biochemistry
Russell K. Hobbie, Physics
George L. Shapiro, Speech

The Assembly Steering Committee is also the Assembly Executive Committee and forms the Twin Cities membership of the Senate Consultative Committee. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by: (1) petition of 12 voting members of the faculties, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Twin Cities Assembly the day before the Twin Cities Assembly meeting; (2) nomination on the floor of the Assembly. The faculty representatives of the Twin Cities Assembly shall reduce by vote the slate to twice the number to be elected, and shall forward the results to the clerk of the University Senate.

JOHN DARLEY
ELEANOR FENTON
JEANNE LUPTON
WILLIAM MARTIN
MAYNARD REYNOLDS, Chairman

NOTE: Current members of the Assembly Steering Committee whose terms continue at least through next year are as follows:

May Brodbeck, Philosophy	'71-'74
Eleanor Fenton, General Exten. Div.	'70-'73
Warren Ibele, Mech. Eng.	'70-'73
Samuel Krislov, Polit. Sci.	'71-'74
David Lykken, Psychology	'71-'74

Approved

II. SPECIAL NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Reported for Action

The chairman of the Assembly appoints the following as members of a nominating committee to nominate candidates to fill, by the election procedure, 1972-73 vacancies on the Assembly Committee on Committees: Edward Gerald (chairman), Shirley Clark, David Cooperman, John Goodding, Toni McNaron. There are two vacancies to fill.

Approved

The Twin Cities Faculty Assembly adjourned.

W. DONALD BEATTY
Clerk of the Assembly

**THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY IS SCHEDULED FOR
THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1972**

Appendix

ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION

February 3, 1972

John Darley, professor and head of psychology, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes of October 28 Meeting

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Assembly and Campus Committees

Membership on the University Health Services Committee was approved. Changes on other committees were reported for information.

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

Jerome Moss, professor of industrial education and chairman of the committee, reported that it had voted for suspension of two Minnesota basketball players following the scuffle at the close of the recent Ohio State game. He said his committee was continuing its investigation into all aspects of the incident and had scheduled a number of hearings. While the committee had intended that the two players continue to practice with the team, the Big Ten commissioner had ruled that they should not be able to do so; that ruling was upheld by the Big Ten athletic directors. Minnesota appealed the decision, but the conference faculty representatives failed to support the appeal. He reported that the committee had requested the President to appoint, in an ex officio nonvoting capacity, two students, faculty, or alumni from the black community to serve on the committee during the hearings.

Mr. Moss then turned to the subject of consultative responsibilities of his committee. He noted that the charge to the committee did not include consultation on major personnel, budgetary and facilities, and he indicated that the committee could not discharge its responsibilities unless it could perform these functions. Central administration had agreed that the committee should be included in the consultative process. The matter was discussed with the athletic director, and it was agreed that the committee should be in a position to provide meaningful input in major decisions. Stephen Goldstein, student assemblyman, suggested that since a bylaw change was involved the matter should be referred to Business and Rules, which should report back to the Assembly at its next meeting. A motion to effect this action was then approved.

Three other items were presented for information: notice of the repeal of the ban on Rose Bowl competition by a team more than 1 year in succession; notice of eligibility of General College Extended Program students; and athletic schedules for the current year.

Mr. Moss introduced the subject of granting permission to freshmen to compete in intercollegiate football and basketball. The conference athletic directors and faculty representatives had approved that move, he said, subject to institutional

review. He cited a number of reasons for favoring freshman participation, including the fact that they can enter into all other sports, that freshman or junior varsity teams will be maintained, and that the opportunity to participate should not be denied to those who are qualified. As possible objections he suggested an adverse effect on grades, although experience in other sports does not support that view; intensified recruiting of high school athletes; and possible increased costs. Kenneth Keller, professor of chemical engineering, suggested that basketball and football were not to be compared with other sports in that the athletes are largely preparing for the pro arena, and he advised voting against the measure to prevent increasing professionalism and intensified recruitment. After ascertaining that Minnesota had voted against the plan originally, John Cound, professor of law, asked why the NCAA should have such power over the University, when in 1965 and again in 1966 the faculty had voted against such a move. He asserted that the Big Ten had stood for sanity in athletics and that it was time it stood up to NCAA. Max Schultze, professor of biochemistry and faculty representative for the University, explained that the Big Ten had opposed the move. However, after consulting with players, former players, coaches, and the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee, and recognizing that all other conferences do permit participation, he found the feeling was that the Big Ten competitive position would be impaired; consequently, he had cast a vote to approve. He noted that if he were instructed to vote against the measure and the conference should vote in favor of it, the University could still maintain its individual policy.

Following a query as to whether a quorum existed and the determination that it did not, Mr. Cound suggested that some action should be taken before the March 6 meeting of the faculty representatives, and he moved that the Assembly adjourn and reconvene at 2:15 p.m. on February 8, preceding the special Senate meeting. Herbert Johnson, professor and head of agronomy and plant genetics, suggested that Business and Rules look into the situation where the ability of the body to transact any business could be destroyed on the basis of a head count. Mr. Moss indicated that a show of hands would be sufficient to instruct the faculty representative. Mr. Schultze said that he would not feel compelled to file an objection on the basis of a straw vote but that he was sensitive to the wishes of the Assembly. A motion to table the motion to adjourn and take a straw vote was ruled out of order. The view was expressed that any action taken on the basis of a straw vote would set a bad precedent, as the Assembly constitution provided protection by requiring a quorum. The Cound motion was then approved, and the meeting adjourned.

o o o o o

A meeting of the Twin Cities Faculty Assembly convened to take up two additional items.

Steering Committee Nominees

Four nominees were presented to fill two 1972-75 terms on the Steering Committee, and one additional name was presented from the floor. However, when it was determined that that person was not eligible, the nominations were closed and the slate approved.

Nominating Committee for Committee on Committees

A list of members of a nominating committee to fill vacancies for next year on the Committee on Committees was approved.

New Business

Mr. Johnson called attention to the waste of time and money in holding meetings where nothing could be accomplished due to poor attendance, and suggested that Business and Rules should look into a procedure for improving it. Vernon Weckwerth, professor in hospital administration, pointed out that there had in effect been a quorum, since there were a number of unfilled assembly openings due to leaves, terminations, and so on, and he proposed that the names of those not attending be published. Mr. Darley indicated that there was a constitutional provision to cover cases where assemblymen had left the University. Frank Sorauf, professor of political science and chairman of the Business and Rules Committee, said his committee would welcome suggestions which would improve the effective functioning of the body and he reminded the Assembly that any change in the constitution would require a two-thirds vote of the voting membership of the Senate. The question was raised about teaching obligations when they conflicted with Senate and Assembly meetings and the inability to get alternates when they, too, are committed. When asked for his view, President Moos indicated that members in this predicament should arrange to attend Assembly meetings. John Wertz, professor of physical chemistry, suggested that Business and Rules consider permitting alternates from outside one's college if they were available. Another member proposed that the attendance record be published at the end of each quarter instead of at the year-end.

The meeting was adjourned.

JEANNE T. LUPTON
Abstractor

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY
MINUTES**

April 27, 1972

The third regular meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was held in Nicholson Hall on April 27, 1972. Signing or checking the roll as present were 94 voting members of the faculty, 29 voting members of the student body, 11 members of Administrative Committee, and 16 nonmembers. Vice chairman Maynard Reynolds presided.

The following items were considered and action was taken as indicated.

**I. MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 3, 1972
Reported for Action**

Approved

A motion was made at this point to re-order the agenda. The motion was defeated.

**II. REPORT OF THE ASSEMBLY
COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS
AND RULES
Reported for Information**

I. Authority of the Committee:

"The committee provides both general and special rules of procedure for considering specific items of Twin Cities Assembly business. General or specific rules established by this committee may be revoked or amended by affirmative action of two-thirds of the members of the Twin Cities Assembly present and voting." (Assembly Handbook: T1.3.1.1, sec. e)

II. Rules for the Meeting of April 27, 1972

- A. Any member of the Assembly upon being recognized by the chair, may give his time in debate to a non-member of the Assembly.
- B. Members and non-members of the Assembly will be limited to a maximum of three minutes time on each occasion they are recognized for participation in debate.

Interpretations and Understandings

1. The traditional practice of alternating speakers pro and con a proposal will continue.
 2. The traditional practice of not recognizing members who have already participated so long as there are would-be speakers who have not will also continue.
 3. The usual rules of germaneness and decorum will apply both to members and non-members of the Assembly.
 4. In the event a member of the Assembly cedes his time in debate to a non-member, both shall be considered to have participated in the debate.
- C. Time limits will govern the maximum amount of time for debate of items for action. The committee sets one half hour as the limit for the action item of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and one hour as the limit for the action item of the Committee on Educational Policy.

Interpretations and Understandings

1. The time limits set only a maximum time for debate; a call for the question is in order before the expiration of the time limit.
2. At the expiration of the maximum time for debate, the chairman will put the question to a vote.

FRANK SORAUF
Chairman

Accepted

III. REPORT OF SPECIAL NOMINATING COMMITTEE
Reported for Action

The Nominating Committee (approved by the Assembly, February 3, 1972) to fill, by the election procedure, 1972-73 vacancies on the Assembly Committee on Committees presents the following four names from which two are to be elected:

Kent R. Bales (CLA, English)

John N. Clausen (Institute of Technology, Mechanical Engineering)

Lester E. Hanson (College of Agriculture, Animal Science)

Richard L. Purple (Medical School, Laboratory of Neurophysiology)

J. EDWARD GERALD,
Chairman

The Bylaws provide that, "Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by the petition of 12 Assemblymen, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Twin Cities Assembly the day before the Twin Cities Assembly meeting." (Article III, Section 1a.)

Current members of the Committee elected to serve through 1972-73 are: Wallace Russell, George Donohue, Mabel Powers, Betty Robinett.

This item is for faculty action only.

Kent R. Bales and John N. Clausen were elected.

IV. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

1. Reported for Action

The Constitution of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly provides that a "vice chairman shall be elected by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly at its first meeting in the Spring of the academic year from among its members for a term of one (1) year. He shall be eligible for re-election." (Article II, section 4).

Nominations will be accepted and an election conducted at the meeting.

John P. Navins was elected.

2. Reported for Information

Mary Corcoran and LaVell Henderson were elected to the Assembly Steering Committee for a three-year term beginning July 1, 1972.

FRANK J. SORAUF
Chairman

V. REPORT OF ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

1. Reported for Action

On January 16, 1972 the Faculty Representatives of the Big Ten Conference amended the rules of eligibility to permit freshmen to compete in intercollegiate football and basketball games. At its February 8 meeting, the Assembly voted to request reconsideration by the Faculty Representatives of the rule change (under the White Resolution procedure) and directed our Faculty Representative to vote against the change.

On March 9, 1972 the Faculty Representatives reaffirmed their January 16 action, authorizing the participation of freshmen in intercollegiate football and basketball contests (6 "yes," 3 "no," 1 abstention), effective in the 1972-73 season.

Freshmen have been competing on the varsity in all other sports. The Assembly is being asked to decide whether or not this institution shall also permit freshmen to compete in football and basketball.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Assembly approve participation of freshmen in intercollegiate varsity competition in football and basketball.

Approved

2. Reported for Information

A. Athletic Ticket Policy

The student and staff all-sports tickets have been discontinued in favor of separate football, basketball and hockey tickets, thus assuring seats for season ticket holders in each sport and providing more purchase options. At the same time, the total cost of attendance at all athletic events has been increased to establish a more equitable balance between student and staff prices and those paid by the general public, while remaining below the average price charged by other schools in the Conference:

Student:	1971-72	1972-73
Football	\$17.00	\$14.00
Basketball	incl.	6.00
Hockey	incl.	6.00
Other Sports	incl.	6.00

Staff:		
Football	\$20.00	\$18.00
Basketball	incl.	9.00
Hockey	incl.	9.00
Other Sports	incl.	6.00

(Admission to "other sports" is included in the football ticket but may be purchased separately.)

B. Approved Schedules

FRESHMAN BASEBALL 1972

Normandale Junior College (2)	April	12
Golden Valley Junior College (2)		14
St. Cloud Junior Varsity (2) at St. Cloud, Minnesota		15
Stout State Junior Varsity (2)		19
(open)		26
Mankato Junior Varsity (2)		29
Inver Grove Junior College (2) at Inver Grove, Minnesota	May	1
Rochester Junior College (2)		3
Fergus Falls Junior College (2)		8
Mankato Junior College (2) at Mankato, Minnesota		13

JEROME MOSS, JR.
Chairman

Accepted

VI. REPORT OF THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

I. Reported for Action

The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy has accepted and endorsed the following report from their Subcommittee on Grading and recommends it to the Assembly for approval.

MAY BRODBECK
Chairman, Assembly Committee
on Educational Policy

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A TWIN CITIES CAMPUS GRADING SYSTEM

For information

This report is recommended to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly by the Assembly Committee on Educational Policy and by the Twin Cities Campus members of the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations (there being at this time no official Assembly committee in this latter area, though the Assembly Committee on Committees is developing plans for an appropriate committee). The work was done on behalf of these two committees and of the Assembly by a joint subcommittee appointed by the chairmen of the two committees. The membership appears at the end of the report.

Brief history of the report

At the May 27, 1971 meeting of the University Senate (which includes, of course, all members of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly), the Senate Committees on Educational Policy and on Academic Standing and Relations presented for information a proposed grading system for the University. On May 21 the chairwoman of Academic Standing and Relations had distributed the same proposals directly to all Provosts, Deans, and chairmen of curriculum and scholastic committees with a request for internal collegiate discussions and submission of suggestions and criticisms. The report grew out of Senate action of 1967, when the P-N grading system was adopted; the committees were charged, as part of the action of adoption, with reporting back to the Senate on P-N by the end of 1971. In the 1970-71 study of the issue, the committees concluded that recommendations on P-N in isolation from other aspects of the grading system would be illogical. Consequently the May 1971 report addressed the total grading system.

Because of some resignations and other changes in the 1970-71 grading subcommittee and because, more importantly, of the values that could come from an independent and unbiased criticism of the proposals that had been developed, a second, reconstituted subcommittee was appointed in December, 1971, with the charge of reviewing the proposed system and recommending appropriate action to the parent committees and the Senate.

As soon as the subcommittee had developed its position that grading systems should be under the jurisdiction of campus assemblies rather than under the jurisdiction of the Senate (endorsed eventually by the Senate on March 9), it sent again, on January 21, to the deans of all Twin Cities Campus colleges, schools, and institutes the grading proposals that had been published and distributed in May of the previous year, requesting reactions, criticisms, and counter proposals. The same material and invitation were sent directly to the chairmen and presidents of college student boards and councils and to the Minnesota Student Association. The directors of placement bureaus of the several colleges and schools were also surveyed, by informal written inquiry, about some of the grading issues that the committee was considering.

Open, public meetings were held in late January on the St. Paul campus and the Minneapolis campus, following fairly good news and editorial coverage in the Daily and a notice in Brief. Deans and student presidents and chairmen were sent direct invitations to be represented at a special information-discussion meeting on February 21.

Against the background of these sessions and the knowledge and insights gained in its own weekly meetings throughout the quarter, the subcommittee published in the Daily of March 30 the full text of its proposed report, including announcements of three open hearings scheduled for the next week. There was front page news coverage in addition to the two pages, center section of the Daily, that presented the proposed draft in Assembly docket format. The same document was sent directly, on March 27, to deans and student presidents and chairmen, with the invitation to communicate reactions in writing or by phone and with the announcement of an April 11 meeting to discuss the report. Colleges and schools were strongly urged to begin at once to develop positions on the several options delegated to colleges by the proposed grading system; it seemed unlikely that the Assembly would reverse the recommendations in that regard.

The committee believes that every possible effort has been made, over almost a year's time, to involve the University community in this problem.

The national scene on grading

Grading systems are in flux all across the country, reflecting the change and turmoil that characterize higher education today. In a nation-wide survey of 1301 institutions in spring, 1971 ("The AACRAO Survey of Grading Practices in Member Institutions," 1971), 50 percent of the universities with enrollments over 20,000 had changed their grading system within the last year or had change currently under consideration; another 45 percent had changed within three to five years. Ninety-six percent of institutions with enrollments over 20,000 utilize a pass-fail or credit-no credit system. This general state of affairs gives an institution more leeway to devise a system that reflects its considered judgment about what would best serve its students. Though pressures for conformity and relations with other institutions must be taken into account, the widespread development of alternate grading systems makes variation easier.

The subcommittee's general views on grading

Like its predecessor subcommittee (as reported to the Senate in May of 1971), the subcommittee had to address the relationships of teaching, grading, and certifying. Informing students about their performance—whether through criticism of their work, identification of strengths and weaknesses, or ranking one student against other students or against an established criterion—is, of course, central to the teaching process. Recording that appraisal on a transcript is a second step, not essential to the teaching-learning relation but rather directed to certification. Certification is the report on student performance to some other person or agency. Grade reporting is related chiefly to certification, though it is one way of telling students how they have performed. There are other activities in which instructors engage that relate to certification and do not involve grading—writing letters of recommendation and completing application forms, for example.

Most subcommittee members think of certification as an extra-instructional chore; a few call it more than irrelevant to education, even a detriment to good student-teacher relations. The University does have certification obligations, however. (The term "University" throughout this report refers to the Twin Cities Campus.) Many of its degrees are certifications to the public of competence, on which the public depends. The general subcommittee conclusion was that teachers of maturity and sophistication can play a part in certification without significant damage to student-faculty relationship and that certification is a legitimate tie between a college, itself an institution of society, and other institutions of society.

With respect to the kind of certification record that the University should present, the subcommittee again followed the main thrust of the report presented to the Senate last spring: The official transcript should be a chronological record of accomplishment, of standards met, not a detailing of the various ways in which a student did not earn credit. Certification is, after all, a positive statement. Such a transcript of credits earned, with grades attached, would seem to discharge adequately the University's obligation to certify. If further information is needed by persons and agencies external to the University, it can be sought directly from instructors and college officials and the responses can be appropriately individualized. Such a change in the definition of the University's official transcript would no doubt stimulate some adjustments on the part of those who receive it—an even more critical study of the record, more questions of the student, more inquiries to the college. These developments are considered by the subcommittee to be gains rather than losses.

A college typically has a great deal of information about its students that is not part of an official transcript. Student petitions, adviser interview notes, registration blanks and cancellation slips, scholastic committee actions, and instructor grade books contain insights into a particular student's progress and difficulties. Some colleges even file in college offices more detailed grade records than those that appear on University grade slips. The subcommittee believes that one such set of supplementary information might be conveniently

and usefully maintained by the Recorder on behalf of the colleges—notations on the outcome of registrations that do not result in credits earned. These notations are defined and included in the recommended University grading system.

Against this background of extensive University consultation and involvement, the nation-wide experimentation in grading, and the general positions on grading and certifying taken by the subcommittee, the following grading system is recommended:

For Action

University of Minnesota (Twin Cities) Grading System

1. There shall be two grading systems, ABCDN and SN. Each college (meaning also each separate school or institute) shall determine to what extent and under what conditions each system may be available to its students and its faculty. Any college may specify what courses or what proportion of courses taken by its students or by its prospective students must be on a particular grading system.
2. The SN system represents a self-contained alternative to the ABCDN system and the two may not be combined for a particular student in a particular course. Students may receive only symbols from the grading system under which they are registered.
3. When the two grading systems are available to a student, he or she should declare a choice of systems as part of the initial registration. The choice may not be changed after the end of the second week of classes (first week, in Summer Session).
4. The following symbols, as defined, may be used on the University's official transcript, the chronological quarterly record of the student's credits earned. The official transcript is released by the University, at the student's request, with the official Recorder's seal imprinted.
 - 4.1 A - Representing achievement that is **outstanding** relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements.
 - 4.2 B - Representing achievement that is **significantly above** the level necessary to meet course requirements.
 - 4.3 C - Representing achievement that **meets the basic course requirements in every respect**.
 - 4.4 D - Representing achievement that is **worthy of credit** even though it does not fully meet the basic course requirements in every respect.
 - 4.5 S - Representing achievement that is **satisfactory** to the instructor, for the program in which the student is registered. This definition is intended to imply that the standards for S may vary from one program to another.
 - 4.6 In connection with all achievement symbols, but especially in connection with S, the instructor is obligated to define to a class in its early meetings as explicitly as possible the performance that will be necessary to earn each.
 - 4.7 V - Indicates registration as an auditor or visitor, a non-credit, non-grade registration.

- 4.8 T - Posted as a preceding supplement to the original grade to indicate credits transferred from another institution or from one college or campus to another within the University when re-evaluation is required.
- 4.9 In the Doctor of Medicine and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine programs, O (Outstanding) may be used with S-N.
5. The supplementary symbols listed below, as defined, may be used on the University's internal, operational record. While the operational record is officially available only to the student and to advisers and college officials of the student's own college, it may be made a part of the operational record in the student's next undergraduate college within the University after transfer if the new college so desires.
- 5.1 W - Entered by the Recorder when a student officially withdraws from a course, in accordance with procedures established by the student's college.
- 5.2 I - Assigned by an instructor to indicate Incomplete, in accordance with provisions announced in class at the beginning of the quarter, when in the instructor's opinion there is a reasonable expectation that the student can complete successfully the work of the course. An I that is not made up by the end of the next quarter of residence becomes an N; instructors may set dates within the quarter for make-up examinations. (In the Graduate School, in Master's degree programs in undergraduate colleges, and in the Doctor of Medicine programs, an I remains until changed by the instructor.) When an I is changed to another symbol, the I is removed from the record.
- 5.3 N - Assigned when the student does not earn an S or a D or higher and is not assigned an I. It stands for no credit.
- 5.4 X - Reported to indicate that a student may continue in a continuation course in which a grade cannot be determined until the full sequence of quarters is completed. The instructor shall submit a grade for each X when the student has completed the sequence.
- 5.5 The supplementary symbols shall be removed from the computer record when the student graduates.
6. If a student is permitted by the college to repeat a course in which credit is already earned, the later (latest) grade is the one reported on the official transcript. It is reported in the quarter earned, the previous grade not being reported though it remains on the internal, operational record.
7. Any college may set special scholastic or other standards for registration in a particular course, for scholastic probation, for admission, for honors, for continued residence, for degrees, etc.
8. This grading system shall go into effect for the fall quarter, 1972, thereby replacint all previous University systems, but its definitions and provisions may not be applied retroactively to any grades or symbols recorded before that time. Each college shall devise ways to relate the new system to the former systems in a manner best suited to its purposes.
9. The new official transcript will be implemented as the University's record-keeping is converted to computer and as transcripts are computer produced. It is not feasible to maintain manually (the current method) an official transcript and supplementary operational records. Computer-produced transcripts are tentatively scheduled for new freshmen in fall, 1972, for new advanced standing students in fall, 1973, and for all students in the University by the end of 1974-75. During the transition period, some official transcripts

will be under the new system, some under the old. Under the old, supplementary symbols as well as grades of accomplishment will be part of the officially released transcript. Of course each transcript will be clearly identified as to the procedures under which it was produced.

10. An appropriate standing Assembly committee shall have authority to grant to individual colleges permission to use experimental grading methods outside the provisions of this official University system, for a specified period, provided that the proposals do not interfere significantly with the registration options of students from other colleges and programs. Such experimental systems shall be reported for information to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly as soon as permitted and, after the specified period, shall be reevaluated, either to be extended, discontinued, or, with Assembly approval, made a regular system for the unit concerned.
11. An appropriate standing Assembly committee is charged with resolving disputes between and among colleges, should procedures developed under this grading system result in unacceptable complications for students registering across college lines. The Committee may bring to the Assembly issues it is unable to resolve informally through negotiation, with recommendations for resolution.

After presentation of the report, the following amendment was introduced: The Executive Committee of the College of Business Administration recommends the adoption of the following amendment to the University of Minnesota (T.C.) Grading System proposals published by the Subcommittee on Grading—

- A. Delete item 5. and 5.5 and renumber 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 as 4.10, 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13.
- B. Amend item 6 to read "If a student is permitted by the college to repeat a course in which credit is already earned, the collegiate unit is authorized to specify which grade or grades shall be reported on the official transcript."
- C. Delete item 9.

The effects of the adoption of this motion are—

1. require maintenance of only one transcript for external and internal use, and
2. permit individual collegiate units to specify which grade or grades shall appear on the transcript when a course is repeated.

Not approved

Another amendment was proposed to add the "plus" and "minus" to the new grading system. The amendment was defeated.

After further discussion, the report was—

Approved

For information

Elaborations and Explanations

(The numbers below refer to the numbers of the grading system above.)

1. There is considerable interest in this University as well as generally in higher education in having a two-point grading system along with a more traditional five-point system. The recommendation leaves to each college how much or how little each system is available to its students, to prospective students, and to faculty. No University guidelines or restrictions are set.
2. When S-N is available, by college action and student choice, students should be registering S-N for certain purposes and instructors should set certain expectations in terms of those purposes. The expectations lead not to the finer differentiations of the five-point grading system but to the simpler determination of satisfactory (or non-satisfactory) performance with respect to the goals of the student's program. When circumstances permit, the instructor may ask quite different performance of S-N students: a paper related to the reasons that bring the student to the course, rather than a regular examination; a special project with other S-N registrants in the course; more intensive study in depth of a special aspect of the course, rather than the general mastery required of others; and so forth.

The different grading systems should imply different systems of requirements and appraisal.

3. A regulation that requires declaration of a grading system by a certain time may seem just a detail, but the extensive registration across college lines in the University makes uniformity a necessity. Nor could the intention that the two grading systems be separate be realized if students could change from one to the other late in a quarter. Procedures should not set up a cat-and-mouse game in which the student can juggle grading options depending on performance. If instructors and students are taking full advantage of S-N registration, as noted in 2, above, it simply will not be possible to move from one grading system to the other once the quarter is underway. Two weeks may be too late, if anything.
4. The general rationale of an official transcript that reports only accomplishment was presented in the introductory section. For the receiving academic institution or prospective employers, much less is lost than one might at first suppose. Graduate and professional schools admit A and B students; if an applicant's transcript is not predominantly so marked, he or she will have little chance of acceptance in any event. Certainly there are few grades lower than C on the records of applicants who are seriously considered, and students with mostly As and Bs and some Cs seldom perform below the D level. When a student withdrew or got an I simply doesn't seem important in a University's official report to an agency or institution external to the University.

Prospective employers are typically much less interested in the details of a transcript than are academicians. The certification of accomplishment that is represented in the proposed transcript seems more than adequate for this purpose.

- 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 These fuller descriptions of three levels of achievement are intended to give assistance to instructors in thinking through grade assignments in their classes. Whether instructors attempt to determine ahead of time (though based on previous experience, to be sure) the kinds of performance deserving of a certain grade or whether they are inclined, in a large class of generally known quality, to arrive at grades comparatively, at least some official definitions are available for guidance.
- 4.4 The D grade leads—appropriately, perhaps—a marginal existence, and the subcommittee voted by a majority of only one to recommend its continuation. The prevailing argument seemed to be that there are students who cannot in every course meet the basic course requirements in every respect, and yet they deserve credit. Not having available a minimum passing grade would force the instructor to place such students in the no credit category, or to lower the C standard. Its existence frees the instructor to define rigorously the basic course requirement (for C) and yet saves many students (and the University) the expense and time of repetition resulting from no credit. In all there seem to be more gains than losses in having such an option. Instructors who do not find it useful are not compelled to use it, but its unavailability would deny it to instructors who do find it useful.
- 4.5 Satisfactory (S), unrelated in any official way to ABCDN and defined by the instructor for the program in which he or she is teaching, is recommended as a more useful definition than that represented in the current P (Passing), equated, by Senate legislation, to D or better. There have been several Bureau of Institutional Research studies of P-N since its 1967 inception, the last, unhappily, almost two years ago. A review of those studies, an accumulation of grading statistics, and a distillation of the insights and experience represented in the subcommittee lead to the following brief summary. The majority of the faculty appear to favor some sort of two-point grading system, especially for the purpose of encouraging student exploration into new fields, without the usual grading pressures. Many express concern, however, that the P-N system permits a “getting by” attitude. Student choices of P-N registration certainly suggest that exploration is sometimes the objective, but undoubtedly many P-N registrations are in courses that are required by the curriculum, courses for which the student either lacks motivation or fears deficiency of background or aptitude. The average number of P-N grades throughout the University runs 7 to 10 percent per quarter. There are wide variations among colleges, departments and courses. As noted earlier, a two-point system is generally available in large institutions in the country.

The S would seem to retain the main advantages of the two-point grading system without dictating, as under P-N, that the most marginal performance be accredited. The more generally defined S can be used in Graduate School courses (where S is now authorized), in Medical School and Veterinary Medicine (they have been using S also), and in general or professional courses in all the undergraduate colleges (if so voted by college faculties). In each case the instructor can develop standards appropriate to the program for which the course is offered.

It is hoped that in many classes an instructor may be able to set for S-N registrants expectations that are different from those set for A-N registrants,

based on their objectives in the course. Non-majors may register S-N for particular reasons, as many students from sciences in a humanistic course or social science majors in a technological course. Each of these kinds of registrations suggests a different "contract" or understanding about the work the student might do and the way it should be evaluated. Ideally there should be no need to relate the S-N student's performance to the scale set for the ABCDN student.

With "satisfactory" replacing "Passing" in the two-point system, very likely colleges will be more liberal in permitting S credits to count toward the degree than they have been accepting P. Many consider this possible development a significant advantage for S.

4.6 Self-explanatory.

4.7, 4.8 Continuation of symbols and definitions that have proved satisfactory for over 20 years.

4.9 O (Outstanding) is currently in use in these two programs. There is essentially no cross-registration by other students.

5. Efficiency and convenience are served by having the Recorder post as part of the University operational record the outcomes of registrations that do not result in credit. Otherwise colleges would have to develop their own supplementary records, to meet their responsibilities for identifying students who are having academic difficulties and for husbanding the scarce resources of the institution.

The same rules should govern the release of the operational record to other colleges within the University as govern its release to other institutions. This is dictated by consistency, but also by the need for University colleges to have full experience with the implications of the release policy, in order to evaluate the policy. Once the student is transferred to another (undergraduate) college of the University, however, the informal supplementary record could prove helpful to advisers and college officials in the new college as they work with the student toward success in the new program. Since the student is continuing under the same grade definitions and procedures, the operational record could legitimately be continued.

5.1 The University's internal operational record should show, for the benefit of advisers and college officials responsible for appraising and assisting student success, when a student has been given official approval to withdraw from a registration obligation. Because colleges vary in their views on when and under what circumstances withdrawal should be permitted, no University-wide definitions are proposed.

5.2 The current, permissive catch-all I, in force since fall, 1970, has been close to a disaster. It seems, at first view, to provide complete freedom for a student unilaterally to leave any course at any time. In addition, the I has implied the availability of make-up, because neither faculty nor student could forget the previous and perfectly logical definitions of I that included make-up privileges; but commitment to make-up is not, in fact, a part of the definition. Most colleges have responded to this liberally available I by defining a student's academic progress as unsatisfactory if too many Is are earned. The contradiction between the permissive definition and the later unpleasant

consequences has led to confusion and resentment. And only a very small percent of Is have been made up. (Fall, 1971, about 2300 out of 20,600 assigned the previous spring, for example.)

The recommended definition is more traditional, reflecting the instructor's judgment both that the missing work, if done at a level that can reasonably be expected, could earn credit and that the make-up should be permitted. In connection with the latter, the instructor's policies on prior notice, kind of excuse, and the like, prevail. (These policies should, of course, be made clear to the students at early class meetings.)

The I of indefinite tenure, the current definition, has been a disservice to both student and instructor. To provide a target date, it is recommended that the I terminate after one quarter (of residence). If colleges wish to work out extensions of time, on an exception basis, and, presumably, with the instructor's permission, that option of course exists, as does the option of petitioning requests in connection with any general procedure.

Errors in the too liberal assignment of I are self-correcting; the I becomes an N if not made up. If, on the other hand, an instructor who assigns an N is later convinced that credit could be earned and permission to do so should be granted, a change from N to a grade would be possible, even though that is not the usual, expected course of events. Both the I and N, reported at the end of the quarter, represent the instructor's best judgments based on information available at the time.

5.3 N seems to the subcommittee an adequate notation that the student did not, in one way or another, earn credit. (This assumes that the student has not officially withdrawn and that the instructor had not assigned an I.) It covers disappearance from class; it covers doing so little work that an I is unrealistic; it covers doing unsatisfactory work while attempting the full course. It seems best to put all these non-achievements in the same category. Having different categories often merely results in inequities, a function of availability of information, of shrewdness, or of chance. In any event, it appears that the course must be repeated if credit is to be earned.

At this point, it should be clear that the subcommittee, like its predecessor subcommittee, is not recommending the continuation of F. Interestingly, this was one of the few unanimous decisions, and it was made in the very early stages of deliberation without the need to bring a reluctant member into the majority. The recommendation is, in fact, much less radical than it might seem, because the University faculty has essentially stopped giving Fs. Less than 1 percent in each of the last three quarters; .9 percent, .7 percent and .8 percent, in order from winter, 1971. An F grade does not have to be posted on a transcript even to accommodate those who believe that a student is entitled to know that minimum standards of a course have not been met. Full evaluation—the more detailed, more helpful criticism of a student's work—can relay to the student whatever messages an instructor believes appropriate. The no-credit symbol, however the student comes by it, also tells student (and adviser and college official) that successful work has not been done; the student knows how much work was attempted.

5.4 A useful, temporary symbol, in use for many years.

5.5 Self-explanatory.

6. Since the official transcript shows accomplishment, it should show the latest accomplishment. A student who obtains an N, I, or W may register again for the course and the later credit accomplishment shows. The same record-keeping regulation should obtain if the student's college permits repetition after credit has been earned. The earlier grade, like N, I and W, should remain part of the internal, supplementary record, but the official transcript shows the later grade.

7. The traditional, long-standing assertion of the authority of each college to determine its own standards.

8, 9, 10, 11. Require no elaboration.

A final comment, on grade point average. The recommended grading system does not include a grade-point average. Combining a C in Political Science, a D in French, and an A in Physics to yield a three digit number—this repeated over quarters and over a range of courses—seems to a majority of the subcommittee neither helpful nor wise. What does such a single summary figure represent? Individual course grades can be interpreted; an overall number cannot. Few academic practices contribute more to an over-emphasis on grades or to a sort of de-intellectualizing of learning than to summarize a student's education with a single number. The fact that a good grade will improve a disembodied grade point average rather than be evaluated in connection with the particular course to which it is attached has led many a student to look for courses the only quality of which is that a good grade is likely.

It is difficult to predict all the implications of not defining grade point average in the recommended grading system. There is no way that colleges, advisers, or students can be prohibited from calculating such a figure. (And the current grade point assignments are as close to standard as any in higher education. Presumably S and N, following current practice, would not enter into such calculations.) It is hoped that omission of GPA from the system will stimulate colleges to consider alternative ways of summarizing student performance. Numbers or percents of various grades, for example, would appear to communicate more about a student's record than a single average figure. The unavailability of a GPA might encourage if not compel a closer study of a student's transcript. For all these reasons, the official grading system recommended by the committee for the University does not include a grade point average.

Members of the subcommittee:

Richard Anderson, CLA senior; John Carnahan, CLA senior; John Fisher, Assistant Director, Admissions and Records, ex officio; B. V. Haxby, associate professor, Electrical Engineering; Michele Holt, education senior; Ernest Kemble, associate professor, psychology (UMM)—left Assembly committee; Lee Karayusuf, business administration senior; Blanchard Krogstad, professor, biology (UMD)—left Assembly committee; Keith McFarland, acting dean, College of Home Economics; Toni McNaron, associate professor,

English; Becky Naegele, Agriculture senior; Roger Page, associate dean, CLA, chairman; Stephen Prager, professor, Chemistry; William Schofield, professor, Clinical Psychology (Medical School); Elayne Shapiro, teaching associate, Communication (General College); James Terwilliger, associate professor, Psychological Foundations (Education); Charles Walcott, assistant professor, Political Science. Jean Freeman, graduate research assistant, secretary.

VII. REPORT OF THE TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Reported for Information

The Committee on Committees has been primarily concerned in 1972-73 with the following:

- 1) **Revision of the Handbook: A Compilation of Rules and Operational Procedures.** This revision has been carried out in cooperation with the Committee on Business and Rules through a sub-committee chaired by Professor Betty Robinett. Its proposals will be submitted to the Assembly when the revision is complete.
- 2) **Faculty Interest Survey.** 2700 copies of a survey questionnaire on faculty interest in serving on committees of the Senate and Assembly were circulated to Twin Cities Campus faculty. 710 copies were returned from that group. Results of the completed survey provided a major resource for making faculty nominations to Assembly and Campus Committees. The Survey Subcommittee was chaired by Mr. William Neher.
- 3) **Double slates of faculty nominations for 1972-73 replacements on Assembly and Campus Committees** have been completed and submitted to the President.
- 4) **Student members of the Committee** are conducting interviews for student nominations and student slates will be submitted through this Committee in the near future.

WALLACE A. RUSSELL
Chairman

Accepted

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

IX. NEW BUSINESS

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly adjourned.

W. DONALD BEATTY
Clerk of the Assembly

Appendix I

ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION

April 27, 1972

The meeting was called to order by Maynard Reynolds, vice chairman of the Assembly.

Business and Rules Committee

Frank Sorauf, professor of political science and chairman of the committee, reviewed procedural rules for the conduct of the meeting, copies of which were distributed to the members. He reminded the body that its constitution provided that faculty and student members of Assembly committees who were not members of the Assembly had the privilege of speaking on reports of their committees.

Donald Swanson, professor of classics, moved to reorder the agenda to introduce early in the meeting his resolution calling for withdrawal of United States forces from Indochina and cancellation of all University research contracts bearing directly or indirectly on the arsenal of weapons in this country. His motion to alter the agenda was defeated.

February 3 minutes

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Special Nominating Committee

Four nominees to fill two 1972-73 vacancies on the Committee on Committees were presented, tellers were named, and the balloting took place. Winners were announced later as Kent Bales and John Clausen.

Vice Chairman of Assembly

John Navins, student, was elected on a unanimous ballot to be vice chairman of the Assembly for next year.

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

Jerome Moss, professor of industrial education and chairman of the committee, reported on past actions of the faculty representatives of the Big Ten Conference in the vote to permit freshmen to compete in intercollegiate football and basketball, indicating that they had approved it in January and reaffirmed that action in March, effective in the 1972-73 season. He said his committee's information was that all other schools in the conference would use freshmen at that time. He cited a number of reasons for favoring the plan: freshmen participate in all other sports; only exceptional freshmen would be involved; junior varsity teams would be continued so freshmen other than the exceptional athletes could continue to develop skills; the number of grants-in-aid and the number of years an athlete could serve under a grant would not be altered; there have been no negative effects scholastically on freshmen who have competed in other sports; recruiting efforts at the University would be seriously disadvantaged if participation were not permitted; and the University could not long continue to field competitive teams in either sport.

John Wertz, professor of physical chemistry, asked the Assembly to consider the best interests of the student. He took the view that the University has an obliga-

tion to its new students, that the freshman athlete would be exploited for his talents and would be diverted from his studies too early in his college education. He urged the Assembly to reaffirm its stand. David Truax, student, spoke for the Moss motion, indicating that freshmen were eligible for athletic scholarships and that they were, through their athletic activity, preparing for their careers. Paul Giel, athletic director, also spoke for the motion. He said there would be earlier pressure to maintain good grades to remain eligible, and urged that the University must continue its competitive position. Calvin Stoll, football coach, added that denial of participation would be a hindrance to the development of the athletic program. The Moss motion to approve participation was then approved.

Peter Hames, student, expressed concern about the structure of athletic ticket charges for students and staff as outlined in the docket. He proposed a resolution calling for adjustment in the student ticket prices to reflect the contribution students make toward the Intercollegiate Athletics Consolidated Improvement Fund. His motion was ruled out of order, and Mr. Reynolds suggested it be introduced under "New Business" later on the agenda.

Educational Policy Committee

May Brodbeck, professor of philosophy and chairman of the committee, introduced the committee's report on the proposed Twin Cities Campus grading system recommended by its subcommittee. When the pass-no credit system was adopted in 1967, she said, the committee was asked to report back to the Senate by the end of 1971. Thus, in May that committee and the Academic Standing and Relations Committee presented for information a proposed grading system. A second, reconstituted subcommittee was then appointed to review the proposed system and to recommend action to the two parent committees and the Senate. The subcommittee took the position that grading systems should be under the jurisdiction of campus assemblies, and many open hearings were held on the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. The final document was then published in the *Daily* and was now being introduced to the Assembly for action, she said.

Roger Page, associate dean in CLA and chairman of the subcommittee, emphasized that his committee wanted the system considered as a whole. He pointed out that it provided sharper definitions for all the symbols; that the proposed S-N system would lead to a simpler determination of satisfactory or non-satisfactory performance with respect to the goals of the student's program; that it would provide a more limited transcript, although a fuller record would be available; and there would be greater emphasis on the autonomy for each college in matters of grading.

Arthur Williams, professor and associate dean of business administration, presented two amendments recommended by the Executive Committee of his college. The first called for elimination of the dual reporting system and the second authorized the collegiate unit to specify the grade to be reported on the official transcript where a student repeats a course. Mr. Williams contended that colleges needed to know how well a student had done in earlier college work; that potential employers are interested in grades of applicants; that many other colleges do provide grades in detail and University students would be disadvantaged by not making them available; that students would be more equitably treated if all In-completes were recorded; and that only the last grade should be shown on the record of a student repeating a course, with an Incomplete to be registered if he did not make up a course. In response, Toni McNaron, associate professor of English, said that the internal, operational record would be available to the student, advisers, and college officials; that placement officers had been solicited and had approved of the grading proposals; and that the subcommittee had discovered that the whole subject of transcripts was in a state of flux throughout the country.

John Carnahan, student member of the subcommittee, responding further to Mr. Williams, said there were many reasons for getting an Incomplete, and that the whole report is based on a dual reporting system.

Other arguments favoring the proposal were that a student could not accumulate large numbers of Incompletes because that grade could remain on the record for only one quarter and that there is, in effect, a dual system now where the official transcript does not reveal all information about a student. An opposing view was that the proposal would work to the advantage of those students with the best financial resources. Richard Goodrich, professor of animal science, contended that the proposal should not be based on a dual system of grades, and he indicated that a recent study in the Institute of Agriculture pointed up the importance being able to show areas of strength, as well as the trend in grades for a given student. Mr. Page responded that the final document was the best means of giving reasonable satisfaction to extreme views on the subject, there being some who wanted to abolish grades altogether. At this point the Williams amendment was defeated.

Mr. Webb posed the question of responsibility for policing the new policy—whether by the Assembly, the individual colleges, or some other body. Mr. Page said no policing was necessary because the committee had set up the definitions and that it was up to each college to see that the definitions were implemented. Carl Auerbach, professor of law, observed that the distribution of grades for a particular course are the responsibility of the individual faculty member.

Kent Bales, associate professor of English, proposed the plus or minus option for each grade as a means of making more sensitive decisions. Charles Walcott, assistant professor of political science, opposed this move which he said would increase the system to 12 categories and would contribute to more emphasis on grades. The Bales amendment was defeated.

Mary Ebert, member of the Council of Graduate Students, reported that the Council had gone on record in support of the proposal, and Gerhard Weiss, professor of German, indicated approval from his area, where there were large numbers of students in the P-N system of grading. Mr. Navins inquired whether the two standing committees named in the proposal for resolving disputes and approving experimental methods were to be named by the Assembly or whether the two functions were to be assigned to two existing committees. Wallace Russell, associate dean of CLA and chairman of the Committee on Committees, responded that there was the Committee on Academic Standing and Relations for the Senate and that his committee was recommending a similar committee in the Assembly structure.

Vernon Weckwerth, professor in hospital administration, asked whether in the process of removing the supplementary symbols from the computer record after a student graduated the course could still be listed. He said it is valuable to know that a student had registered for a course. Mr. Page said that as the proposal stood now there would not be such a record. Josef Altholz, professor of history, called attention to the fact that there appeared to be no action called for in the resolution which would eliminate computation of the grade point average, although the committee had indicated its disapproval of continuing it as a tool for measuring student performance. Mr. Page replied that the stipulation that the new system would replace all previous University systems was intended to convey that disapproval, but that there would be nothing to prohibit computation of the GPA. The recommendation to accept the proposed new grading system for the Twin Cities Campus was then approved.

New Business

Leonid Hurwicz, Regents professor of economics, presented a resolution which he said was being submitted to the members of the Assembly as a means of stating their convictions on the course of recent events in Indochina and the present war policies of the United States government. He said doubt had been expressed as to whether the resolution was appropriate business for the Assembly, and he wanted therefore to assemble the faculty and student members after adjournment to support the document which he had drawn up.

Mr. Hames introduced the proposal which he had suggested earlier in the meeting, calling for revision of student ticket prices for athletic events to reflect the contribution and commitment that students now have to intercollegiate athletics in the fee structure. Mr. Reynolds said that jurisdiction of ticket sales was in the vice president's office and that the proposal should be taken up there. Mr. Sorauf advised that the Assembly could register its view on the subject. Mr. Auerbach stated that, since neither the chairman of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee nor the Assembly knew how the prices were set, it was difficult to act intelligently, and he suggested referring the Hames' motion to the Steering Committee with instructions to discuss it with central administration before the new price schedule went into effect. Mr. Hames said it was important to understand the structure of student fees, whereby through payment of an Intramural Consolidated Fund fee of \$2.75 students were committed for the next twenty years to retiring a debt incurred primarily in the building of the Bierman Field structure. He argued that students were thus being unfairly taxed twice to pay for the facility. At this point there was a call to determine whether a quorum existed. There being no quorum, the meeting was adjourned on a motion by Mr. Althoz which included a call to reconvene as a body of individual members.

JEANNE T. LUPTON
Abstractor

The next regular meeting of the Twin Cities
Campus Assembly is scheduled for
Thursday, October 26, 1972,
at 3:30 p.m.

Appendix II

ATTENDANCE OF ELECTED MEMBERS 1971-72

The attendance of Twin Cities Assembly members elected for the current year, based on attendance rosters circulated at each meeting, is reported for information. During the year there were three regular and two special meetings. Assembly members and the number of meetings attended follow:

FACULTY MEMBERS

Aris, Rutherford—on leave	Howell, William S.	4	Parker, John	4
Armstrong, Wallace	Hurrell, John	5	Paulu, Burton	4
Bales, Kent	Hurwicz, Leonid	4	Peck, Theodore	1
Bandt, Carl	Ibarra, Oscar	3	Pratt, Douglas	3
Bearman, Jacob E.	Jaeger, Eloise	5	Quie, Paul—leave	
Beck, Robert	Jenkins, James	0	Ranz, William	4
Berman, Hyman	Johnson, Herbert W.	4	Rasmussen, Donald	4
Borchert, John	Johnson, Walter N.	5	Rudelius, C. W.	4
Boyd, Landis L.	Jordan, Richard C.	4	Rose, Caroline B.	3
Brantner, John	Keller, Kenneth	5	Rosenblatt, Paul C.	4
Brown, William, Jr.	Kernkamp, Milton F.	3	Russell, Wallace A.	4
Carter, Clarence	Kingsley, James	4	Saloshin, H. Etta	2
Chiang, Huai	Kjelsberg, Marcus O.	2	Schlotthauer, John—leave	
Clark, Shirley M.	Klinger, Eric	0	Schultz, Richard	1
Cooper, Edward H.	Krislov, Samuel	2	Sethna, P. R.	1
Corcoran, Mary	Larson, Vaughn	2	Shapiro, Burton	5
Cound, John J.	Lazarow, Arnold	4	Shapiro, George	0
Darley, John G.	Lock, Peter W.	2	Shoffner, Robert N.	0
DeYoung, Robert	Lofgren, John A.	2	Silberman, Edward	3
Dornblaser, Bright	Loud, Warren	4	Smith, Robert G.	0
Dziuk, Harold	Lupton, Jeanne	5	Sorauf, Francis	3
Elling, Laddie J.	Lykken, David	1	Spear, Allan H.	3
Erickson, Robert	Mace, Arnett	4	Terrell, D. Burnham—leave	
Erickson, W. Bruce	Martin, Roger	4	Titus, J. L.	0
Gardner, William E.	Maxwell, Grover	2	Ulstrom, Robert	1
Gillmor, Donald	McKhanh, Charles	4	Urnese, Carol	5
Goetz, Frederic—Leave	McLaughlin, Charles	3	Varco, Richard	0
Goodman, Lawrence	Meehl, Paul	1	Webb, John W.	4
Goodrich, Richard D.	McPherson, J. R.	0	Weiss, Gerhard	3
Gordon, Joan	Meiske, Jay	4	Weckwerth, V. E.	5
Gorham, Eville	Merrell, David	0	Wertz, John	4
Graham, Kenneth L.	Miller, Kenneth W.	4	Wilcoxson, Roy D.	2
Green, Leon	Moore, Robert	2	Wilford, Sharon	3
Hansen, Evelyn	Mork, Gordon M. A.	3	Wilk, Roger	2
Hanson, Lester E.	Moss, Jerome	4	Williams, C. Arthur	4
Haxby, B. V.	Mueller, Van D.	3	Winchell, C. Paul	0
Heggestad, Carl	Nelson, J. Russell	0	Wright, Eugene	3
Heller, Walter W.	Nelson, Wallace W.	1	Zanoni, Candido	5
Hobbie, Russell	Nylund, Robert E.—leave		Zimmerman, W. Jr.	1
Hooker, Clifford	Paparella, Michael	0	Zoltai, Tibor	3

Student Members

Anderson, Larry M.	Carnahan, John	4	Garrett, Mary	1
Auvin, Victoria	Cline, Mark	0	Geier, John	1
Bagley, John Jr.	Darling, Patricia	1	Glover, Roy A.	4
Bjerke, Carol	de la Camp, Roman	1	Goldstein, Steve	4
Blair, William J.	Ebert, Mary Ann	3	Guernsey, Joan E.	1
Bunin, Richard	English, Mark	5	Hallgren, Stephen W.	2
Burns, Dorothea	Farr, Scott	1	Hohenhaus, Peter	2
Bush, Eugene M.	Fox, Rosemary	1	Isaacs, Virginia	4
Carlson, James	Frisch, Mark	4	Johnson, Duane	1

Johnson, Kenneth	1	Michaelson, Cyril Ann	1	Roberts, Joe D.	2
Jordan, Dena	1	Miller, Dennis	2	Schanfield, Sandra	4
Kaplan, Sandra	3	Navins, Jack	5	Schwartz, Gary	1
Kalz, Debra Rae	1	Nelson, David M.	1	Seebach, Leslie	1
Kaufman, Barbara L.	3	Olson, Darryll Lynn	2	Siller, Philip	0
Larson, David	2	Parent, Elaine	2	Sims, Kathy	1
Lohman, Ed	1	Peltier, Steve	2	Thomsen, John C.	0
March, Barbara Ann	3	Peterson, Roger	0	Werke, Dennis	0
McCarty, Jeff	1	Porter, Michael	1	White, Julie	3
Meese, Grant	0	Reynolds, Art	1		

TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE

Faculty Members

Cari Auerbach	2
May Brodbeck	3
Eleanor Fenton	2
William Howell	3
Warren Ibele	3
Samuel Krislov	0
David Lykken	0
Warren P. Martin	1

Student Members

Peter Hames	2
David Truax	3
Scott Erickson	0
Elaine Parent	3
Mary Ebert	3