

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

**TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY**

**MINUTES**

**April 28, 1977**

The third regular meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was convened in the auditorium of Nicholson Hall on Thursday, April 28, 1977. Checking or signing the roll as present were 109 voting members of the faculty, 25 voting members of the student body, 3 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 23 nonmembers. The following items were considered, and action was taken as indicated.

**REPORT ON THE BIENNIAL REQUEST BY THE PRESIDENT**

See Abstract for summary of discussion.

**I. MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 3, 1977**

**Action (5 minutes)**

*Approved*

**II. ASSEMBLY AND CAMPUS COMMITTEES**

**Action (5 minutes)**

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY HEALTH SERVICE: Steven Mestity and Phil Dalton replace Dennis Hogan and Joe Gerber, students.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON STUDENT BEHAVIOR: Timothy Pinkowski replaces Rita McCormick, student resigned.

*Approved*

**III. REPORT OF THE CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES**

**Action (15 minutes)**

**ELECTION OF A VICE CHAIRMAN**

The Constitution provides that a vice chairman shall be elected by the Twin Cities Assembly at its first meeting in the spring of the academic year from among its members for a term of one (1) year. He/she shall be eligible for re-election.

Robert Holt was elected.

## CONSTITUTION AND BYLAW AMENDMENTS (10 minutes)

### MOTIONS:

1. Amend the Constitution, Article II, Section 4 to read: (Portion crossed out is to be deleted. Addition underlined)
4. Twin Cities Assembly Officers  
    . . . . The chairman, with the consent of the Twin Cities Assembly, shall appoint a clerk and a parliamentarian of the Twin Cities Assembly, ~~who need not be a member of the Assembly, and~~ (nonmembers of the Assembly), whose duties shall be prescribed in the Bylaws.
2. Amend the Bylaws, Article I: (add Section 5)
5. The parliamentarian shall advise the presiding officer or, upon request, any member of the Twin Cities Assembly on matters pertaining to parliamentary procedure. Parliamentary authority for the Twin Cities Campus Assembly shall be Robert's Rules of Order Revised, provided said Rules are not in conflict with the Twin Cities Assembly Constitution, Bylaws, or special Rules.

### COMMENTS:

The above Constitution and Bylaw amendments would provide authority for the parliamentarian of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly. The Constitutional amendment was approved, 125 to 0 at the February 3, 1977, meeting of the Assembly. This was not the required two-thirds for approval and therefore requires a second vote at this meeting for final approval.

**MARIO F. BOGNANNO**  
Chairman

*Approved*

## IV. NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES (15 minutes)

MOTION for action by the Faculty Assembly;

The Nominating Committee places the following names in nomination as candidates. Richard Skaggs, a current member of the Committee, has resigned effective June 30, 1977. Therefore, members of the Assembly may vote for three of the following nominees (the person placing third will fill the one year remaining in Professor Skaggs' term):

Frederick A. Cooper, Associate Professor, Art History, CLA  
Adele K. Donchenko, Associate Professor, Slavic and E. European Languages, CLA  
Virginia Fredricks, Professor, Theatre Arts, CLA  
William T. Peria, Professor, Electrical Engineering, I.T.  
Morris Smithberg, Professor, Anatomy, Medicine  
Charles W. Wolfram, Professor, Law

### COMMENTS:

The by-laws of the Twin Cities Assembly provide that two of the six faculty members of the Assembly Committee on Committees (who also serve as Twin Cities faculty representatives on the Senate Committee on Committees) shall be elected by secret ballot at the last regular meeting each year, from a slate of candidates selected

by a special Nominating Committee and such other candidates as may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Assembly. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the Nominating Committee's slate must be in the hands of the clerk of the Assembly on the day before the meeting at which the election is to be conducted.

Other elected faculty members of the Committee whose terms continue at least through 1977-78 are:

Robert H. Beck, Professor of Education

Deon Stuthman, Associate Professor of Agronomy and Plant Genetics

Clare Woodward, Assistant Professor of Biochemistry, Biological Sciences

**George R. Blake, Chairman**

**Thomas Clayton**

**Caroline M. Czarnecki**

**Ruth F. Hovde**

**William G. Shepherd**

Professors Virginia Fredricks and William T. Peria were elected to serve 3-year terms and Professor Charles W. Wolfram was elected to serve a 1-year term.

## **V. CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON HONORS PROGRAMS**

**(30 minutes)**

### **HONORS RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **MOTIONS:**

1. That the overall performance of degree candidates in each undergraduate collegiate unit should be judged in relationship to the performance of their peers, and not in relationship to other University students. Thus, while many students may be outstanding when they are admitted to a program, the idea of distinction should be reserved to those who have excelled in the program\* itself, relative to their peers.
2. That each undergraduate unit of the University institute a percentage system for determining those students who will graduate with distinction. We recommend that this percentage be 10% or smaller.

#### **COMMENTS:**

At the request of SCEP, the Campus Committee on Honors Programs (CCHP) has studied current standards used by each collegiate unit in granting degrees with distinction. Statistical information from all colleges for the past five years is summarized in the attached table. We also call attention to a graph which shows how the average GPA's of CLA freshmen and sophomores has changed over the past 16 years (graph is on file in the Office of the Clerk of the Senate).

It is CCHP's belief that the GPA necessary for graduation with distinction was originally determined in order to recognize a smaller number of people than it currently does. The assumption that a certain minimum GPA is necessary for graduation with distinction is based upon the idea that only a small fraction of the students in any one graduating class will demonstrate distinction with respect to their classmates. The fact that this is not true either makes the assumption invalid, which means that some device other than a minimum GPA is necessary to make the distinction, or indicates that the minimum GPA should be increased.

We have contemplated the association of graduation with distinction with a certain percentage of each college's graduating class, in order to recognize the fact

\*Each program includes, of course, all work taken to qualify for a degree, whether or not it is offered by the unit awarding the degree.

that the GPA is not a static parameter (see the graph below). Alternatively, each college could recalculate the minimum GPA necessary for graduation with distinction, say, every 3 years, in order to take into account those variations. We feel the latter is the less desirable way. The accrediting Review Team (TART) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools commented on this subject in the report (p. 12) of their April 1976 visit to the University:

"In order to reduce the number of acceptable applicants for admission to (a certain) College, its Executive Office has raised the GPA level required for admission. TART questions this procedure on the ground that one of its effects is almost certain to be a strong upward pressure on grades assigned for achievement in high school and lower level college courses. In this sense the procedure promises to be self-defeating within a very few years."

(1) Amend motion number 1 so that the first line reads "That the overall performance of degree candidates in each *undergraduate* collegiate unit..."

(2) Amend motion 2 so that the first line reads: "That each *undergraduate* unit of the University institute a percentage system for determining..."

COMMENTS:

(1) The Constitution of the Senate, upon which the Bylaws of the Assembly depend, reserve to individual collegiate units the determination of internal matters. Senate and Assembly jurisdiction only extends to matters that affect more than one college or to matters affecting liberal education. Thus the Assembly has no jurisdiction over post-baccalaureate degree programs that are limited to one college.

Degrees with Distinction as % of Total Degrees

Colleges	1971-72		1972-73		1973-74		1974-75		1975-76	
Agriculture	3	10	6	23	6	24	9	23	10	30
Biological Sciences	12	4 11	11	6 7	8	5 4	3	3 1	9	4 3
Business	3	18	7	16	4	18	7	17	8	17
Business Administration	—No data—									
Dentistry	—No data—									
Education	9	40	12	42	15	35	19	41	20	39
Forestry	8	18	7	20	7	21	5	23	9	29
Home Economics	9	21	11	26	14	28	11	32	15	38
Law	1	7 15	1	7 20	1	9 29	0	7 32	0	6 30
CLA	16		14		15		8		9	
Medical Technology	—1972 to December, 1976-39% average—									
Nursing	—1972 to 1976-17.2, 48.0 average %—									
Occupational Therapy	61		80		90		83		93	
Pharmacy	25		26		34		38		45	
Physical Therapy	11	61	32	48	34	38	38	35	26	56
Inst. of Technology	12	23	15	23	11	28	14	29	8	24
University College	—No Data—									
Veterinarian Medicine	—1972 to 1976; 21/40 for BS Candidates, average—									

NOTE: One figure: No differentiation  
 Two figures: 1st—High distinction  
 2nd—Distinction  
 Three figures: Summa/Magna/Cum

(2) As a matter of policy, considerations that apply to B.A. and B.S. programs do not apply to graduate and professional programs at the postbaccalaureate level. The distinctions and honors that are awarded in such programs are used for different purposes, and need not be similar or uniform across the University as a whole.

(3) The Law School has maintained its own system of honors since at least 1925. It varies substantially from that suggested in this resolution and the resolution passed by the Assembly last year. It does have, however, the acceptance and understanding of the legal profession, to whom our students present their credentials for employment. We oppose being required to conform to a monolithic system simply for the sake of uniformity when our own system has not been shown to have any demonstrable insufficiency.

In short, uniformity should be imposed only where uniformity is necessary. It may be necessary to provide equivalence between baccalaureate programs. It is not necessary to provide uniformity between undergraduate baccalaureate programs and graduate or professional programs.

The motions, as amended, were *approved*.

**ROBERT M. HEXTER**  
Chairman

## **VI. ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY** **(30 minutes)** **GRADING POLICY**

### **MOTIONS:**

1. To approve the changes in the grading policy as printed below.
2. To recommend to the colleges that, in the course of their on-going evaluation of grading, they examine their policies in light of our move to a complete registration record as the official record. The colleges should recognize that we are not simply returning to some previously used system, but that we have made several substantial changes in grading since our last experience with a "single-transcript" system.
3. To recommend to the colleges that they be diligent in their efforts to inform both students and faculty members as to current rules and regulations governing grading. They should also assure themselves that students and faculty members understand proper procedures for handling unique individual circumstances which arise with regard to grading.

### **COMMENTS:**

At the Winter Quarter meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly, the Assembly Committee on Academic Standing and Relations reported that they planned to recommend to the Assembly that it adopt a single transcript system beginning Fall Quarter 1977. The Assembly requested its Educational Policy Committee to consider the implications of the proposed change.

A review of the discussions which had occurred when the Assembly adopted the "dual-transcript" system indicated that there had been some tension between the perceived need of admissions committees for information on which to base admissions decisions and the perceived advantages in certifying only the accomplishments of University students. In 1972, the decision was made to try a system in which admissions committees would not have access to records of non-accomplishment; that is, to use an official "accomplishment only" record.

During the past two years admissions committees have had considerable experience with the use of the accomplishment record. One by one they have returned to insisting that they need the complete registration record if they are to make the best decisions. Many are already requiring this record directly from the students.

Results of a survey by our Office of Admissions and Records indicated that 18 of 19 other major universities across the country were using a transcript showing a complete record of registration and all grades earned. The survey results indicated that 17 of the 19 Admissions Offices interviewed in other institutions did not approve of our use of an accomplishment record as an official transcript. A local survey of our placement directors revealed no objections to our proposed use of a single transcript.

The Educational Policy Committee has considered again the questions of the information needed by committees granting admissions to educational programs versus the benefit which accrues from an official record which shows only accomplishment. On balance, and being particularly persuaded by the experience of our admissions committees, we have decided that the need of these committees for information to enlighten their decisions takes precedence. We therefore recommend that, starting in the Fall of 1977 and thereafter, the official transcript from the University shall include a complete record of a student's course registrations on or after the end of the second week of classes each quarter (end of first 5 days of classes for each summer term) and the grades or registration symbols assigned for those courses.

### GRADING POLICIES AND PRACTICES

NOTE: Portions crossed out are to be deleted. Portions underlined to be added.

The grading policy below was adopted by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly on April 27, 1972, and is applicable in its entirety to the Twin Cities campus. The coordinate campuses have their own grading policies. The policy is as follows:

1. There shall be two grading systems: A-B-C-D-N and S-N. 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 its prospective students must be on a particular grading system.
2. The S-N system represents a self-contained alternative to the A-B-C-D-N 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 sessions).
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~~, registrations after the end of the second week of classes (end of first five days of classes for summer sessions). The official transcript is released by the University, at the student's request, with the official recorder's seal imprinted.
  - 4.1. Grade of A—Represents achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements.
  - 4.2. Grade of B—Represents achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements.
  - 4.3. Grade of C—Represents achievement that meets the basic course requirements in every respect.
  - 4.4. Grade of D—Represents achievement that is worthy of credit even though it does not fully meet the basic course requirements in every respect.
  - 4.5. Grade of S—Represents 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 connections 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. Symbol of V—Indicates registration as an auditor or visitor, a noncredit, nongrade registration.
  - 4.8. Symbol of 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 reevaluation 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 as defined below may be used on the University's internal, operational record. While the operational record is officially available only to the student and 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. 4.10~~ Symbol of W—Entered by the records office when a student officially withdraws from a course in accordance with procedures established by the student's college.
  - 5-2. 4.11 Symbol of 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 makeup 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. 4.12~~ Symbol of 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. 4.13~~ Symbol of X—indicates 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. 5.~~ 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 all grades are 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. 6.~~ Any college may set special scholastic or other standards for registration in a particular course, for scholastic probation, admission, honors, continued residence, degrees, etc.
  - ~~8. 7.~~ This grading system shall go into effect for the fall quarter ~~1972~~, 1977, thereby replacing 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. 8.~~ 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 at 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. Each transcript will be clearly identified as to the procedures under which it was produced, and will be maintained and released under policies in effect during the time of registration.~~

- ~~10- 9. An appropriate standing Assembly committee.~~ The Assembly Committee on Academic Standing 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- 10. An appropriate standing Assembly committee.~~ The Assembly Committee on Academic Standing 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.

**PATRICIA B. SWAN**  
Chairman

*Approved*

## **VII. ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS ANNUAL REPORT**

### **INFORMATION:**

The Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics met once a month during the past year to consider its regular duties of establishing ticket prices, maintaining eligibility requirements, practice and competition schedules, compliance with Title IX, awards, and promoting programs which encourage both athletic participation and academic achievement. Additional meetings were convened to consider:

1. Violence in hockey.
2. The request by the National Collegiate Athletic Association to declare several student athletes ineligible after the University Committee on Student Behavior (acting as a fact-finding body for the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics) had found that the athletes had received only the courtesies extended to all students. After consideration, the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics voted not to rescind the athletes' eligibility.
3. Defining the duties and responsibilities of the Faculty Representatives, the lengths of their terms, and the criteria for their selection.



4. The legislation to be voted upon at the annual national conventions of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. The Assembly Committee recommended to the University Representatives how they wished the representatives to vote on proposals. For example, the University representatives were instructed to vote for athletic grants-in-aid based on financial need.

Other areas of concern to the Committee are scheduling of games, class days missed, degree completion of student athletes, financing and integration of the men's and women's programs, limited sport facilities for both intercollegiate and recreational sports, and sports clubs applying for intercollegiate status.

**MARION FREEMAN**  
Chair

*Accepted*

### **VIII. CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING ANNUAL REPORT**

#### **INFORMATION:**

The Campus Committee on Transportation and Parking has been active less than two years. Thus an important part of this committee's work has been to assemble the basic information from which decisions can be made. The Committee met with the Vice President for Finance to further delineate the Committee's responsibility for "studying, formulating and recommending policies regarding all aspects of transportation and parking." The parking and transportation facilities at the Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota have been reviewed by the Committee and trends in the availability of parking have been studied. A list of all known policies and operating procedures for transportation and parking was assembled by the Office of Physical Planning and has been studied by the Committee. The Committee has attempted to compare our policies and operating procedures with those of other Universities located in metropolitan areas.

The Committee has made recommendations to the Vice President for Finance on two issues. The first issue was the parking rate structure for 1976-77. After reviewing the need for additional funds to operate the parking facilities at the University of Minnesota and the 1975-76 rate structure, the Committee recommended a revised schedule of rates to the Vice President.

The second issue was payroll deductions for contract parking. The Committee surveyed persons with University of Minnesota parking contracts for which they pay on a quarterly basis. The purpose of the survey was to assess the attitudes of the University community toward the proposed elimination of quarterly billing. Based on the survey responses, the justification for the request, and modifications to the proposed policy which would minimize the problems identified by respondents to the survey, the Committee has recommended to the Vice President that contract parking for persons on the University payroll be available only by payroll deduction.

The Campus Committee on Transportation and Parking is the recognized representative of University students, staff and faculty to the University Area Short Range Transportation Program Project Management Board. The Committee is regularly reviewing materials developed by the Board and making recommendations to the Board.

**DAVID R. THOMPSON**  
Chairman

*Accepted*

## **IX. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

## **X. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

## **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The Meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was adjourned.

**MARILEE WARD**  
**Clerk of the Assembly**

## Appendix 1 ATTENDANCE OF ELECTED MEMBERS 1976-77

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly held three regular meetings during 1976-77.

FACULTY	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Abul-Hajj, Yusuf .....	2	0
Adams, Russell S. ....	2	1
Alexander, John .....	2	0
Allred, Evan .....	3	0
Anderson, John S. ....	2	1
Bagley, Ayers .....	2	0
Bales, Kent .....	2	1
Barber, Donald .....	2	0
Bayman, Benjamin F. ....	2	0
Bear, W. Forrest .....	3	0
Berninghausen, David .....	2	0
Berry, Donald A. ....	0	0
Blake, George .....	3	0
Brown, David M .....	0	0
Caldwell, Elwood .....	2	1
Capps, Mary Jayne .....	3	0
Carlson, Harley C. ....	0	0
Carter, Clarence .....	3	0
Chase, Harold .....	2	1
Clark, John P. ....	0	1
Cole, Theodore M. ....	resigned	
Collins, W. Andrew .....	2	1
Cooper, Laura .....	3	0
Courant, Hans W. J. ....	3	0
Doyle, Margaret .....	3	0
Dykstra, Robert .....	3	0
Eaton, Marcia .....	2	1
Ederer, Grace Mary .....	3	0
Edstrom, Ronald D. ....	2	0
Egeland, Byron .....	3	0
Erickson, W. Bruce .....	2	0
Foster, Edward .....	2	0
Fredricks, M. Virginia .....	3	0
Freeman, Mervin .....	0	0
Garmezy, Norman .....	1	0
Garner, Shirley .....	1	1
Gertjansen, Roland O. ....	3	0
Gillmor, Donald .....	2	0
Goldstein, Richard .....	3	0
Goldstein, Sheldon .....	2	1
Goodman, Lawrence .....	2	0
Green, Leon W. ....	3	0
Griffin, Edward .....	2	0
Hafner, Jack .....	2	1
Hallgren, Alvin .....	0	2
Hammond, Jerome .....	3	0

Hanna, Patrick	3	0
Hardy, Robert	3	0
Harein, Phillip	1	0
Hartup, Willard	1	2
Heller, Walter W.	1	1
Henderson, Laveil M.	2	1
Heneman, Herbert G	0	3
Hexter, Robert	2	0
Hirschbach, Frank D.	3	0
Hobbie, Russell	3	0
Holt, Robert T.	1	1
Holum, Katherine	1	1
Hoyt, John S.	0	3
Jenkins, James J.	2	1
Johnson, Herbert W.	1	1
Johnson, Paul E.	1	1
Jordan, Richard C.	0	3
Jorstad, Helen	3	0
Kjervik, Diane	3	0
Krislov, Samuel	1	0
Kroll, Patrick	2	0
Lassman, Frank	2	0
Lee, E. Bruce	3	0
Lykken, David T.	2	1
MacEachern, Donald	3	0
Macy, Janet K	2	0
Mantis, Homer	1	1
Mason, Homer Eugene	1	1
Matalamaki, William	0	0
Mather, George	3	0
Meadows, Garland K.	1	0
Milbrath, William A.	1	0
Miller, Gerald	1	0
Moen, Norman W.	2	0
Moller, Karlind	3	0
Morrison, Fred	3	0
Moss, Jerome	1	2
Munson, Shirley	3	0
Murthy, V. Rama	2	1
Osier, Donald	3	0
Pankake, Marcia	3	0
Patermann, Maria	3	0
Penn, Mischa	1	0
Petersen, Allan	3	0
Plunkett, Robert	2	0
Pohtilla, James F.	2	0
Poppele, Richard E.	2	1
Pratt, Douglas C.	2	0
Ranz, William E.	3	0
Rausch, Verna	3	0
Reynolds, John W.	1	0
Riedel, Johannes	0	1
Robinett, Betty W.	2	1
Root, Michael D.	2	1
Rubenstein, Irwin	2	1

Schletzer, Vera	2	1
Schofield, William	1	2
Shepherd, W. G.	1	2
Sime, Alice Marilyn	3	0
Southall, Geneva H.	2	0
Speidel, Michael	3	0
Stockdale, William	3	0
Storvick, David	2	1
Stuthman, Deon	3	0
Sullivan, Constance	1	1
Swan, Patricia	3	0
Swanson, Harold B.	2	1
Thompson, David W.	1	1
Toth, Louis	3	0
Touchberry, Robert W.	3	0
Tracy, James	0	0
Turner, John E.	2	1
Usenik, Edward	1	1
Webb, John W.	2	1
Weckwerth, Vernon	1	1
Weeks, Richard E.	0	0
Weiss, Gerhard	2	1
Wertz, John E.	2	0
Weyhmann, Walter V.	3	0
Whitman, Andrew F.	1	2
Wilsman, Norman	3	0
Zimmerman, Kenneth	2	1

#### CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Keller, Kenneth, chr.	3
Aris, Rutherford	2
Robinett, Betty	2
Rasmusson, Donald	1
Stuhler, Barbara	3
Watson, Dennis	3
Zaidi, Mahmood	2

#### STUDENTS

Adelberg, Charles	resigned	
Ahlness, Patricia	2	0
Ahrens, Mary	1	0
Barbe, Greg	1	1
Berman, Beth	3	0
Brovold, Nancy E.	2	0
Brownell, Celia	2	0
Bruce, Don	2	0
Carlson, Tom	resigned	
Caruso, Jerry	3	0
Curtis, Elizabeth A.	removed*	
Digby, Linda	resigned	
Dunn, Kelly R.	1	0
Durbahn, Cindy	1	1
Estomba, Mike	1	0

\*For neglect of Senate meetings.

Fellows, Roger	3	0
Ferguson, Sally	1	1
Finkelstein, Phil	2	0
Gilson, Betsy	1	0
Goodman, Barb	0	1
Grimsby, Carl	1	1
Grindy, Steve	2	0
Hall, Cynthia	resigned	
Harkness, Holly	resigned	
Hawley, Karen	1	0
Ironshield, Harold	1	0
Jansen, David A.	resigned	
Jarvis, Mark	2	0
Johnson, Joann	2	0
Karr, Beth	1	0
Kern, Dave	1	1
Keye, Zehra	1	0
Lagrange, Frank	1	1
Lazarow, Mike	3	0
Lee, Robert	removed*	
Lenander, David	2	0
Malter, Mike	3	0
March, Barbara-Ann	3	0
Marchiniak, Terry	2	0
Marsden, Rick	resigned	
McCormick, Rita	resigned	
Meyer, Paul	1	0
Miller, John A.	removed*	
Oesterle, James	removed*	
Olsen, Jan	3	0
Olson, Cheryl P.	removed*	
Powers, John Thomas	resigned	
Roach, Michael	1	0
Roemhild, Helen	2	0
Ryan, Phil	3	0
Schnobrich, Mark	2	0
Sebring, Phil	removed*	
Skalberg, Lane	resigned	
Sletner, Peggy A.	0	0
Tomasko, Andy	3	0
Tonskemper, Ann M.	removed*	
Torgesen, Kris	1	1
Wagner, Joe	removed*	
Wagner, Mike	2	0
Wilke, Dick	1	1

### CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

DeGroot, Ann	2
Fairbanks, Tom	3
Lewis, Harriet	3
Werb, William R. III	3
Malter, Mike	3
March, Barbara-Ann (ex officio)	3

\*For neglect of Senate meetings.

## Appendix 2

### ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION

The meeting was called to order by President C. Peter Magrath at 3:15 p.m. in Nicholson Hall auditorium. Coordinate campuses were linked by telephone to hear the president's remarks on the current biennial request to the legislature.

The president opened his discussion with a review of the procedures and issues. The request had been discussed with the Consultative, Facilitative, and Biennial Request & Budget Review committees last week, he said. The budget was complex, he noted, and it would be hard to project its fate at the legislature. The president called it a "mixed picture" at this point because a number of issues were still open. The House appropriations bill had been prepared that week, he said, and the Senate version included some differences that would have to be resolved by a conference committee. Guidelines prepared by former Governor Anderson and concurred with by Governor Perpich stated there should be no new position money. The legislature had held 18 hearings to date in which central administrators, faculty members, and students had had opportunities to speak.

The president described a number of factors bearing on decisions affecting the University: the greatly diminished state surplus compared to 1975; the state's commitment not to spend more than it would take in; the legislature's intention to provide property tax relief; and the general attitude that facilities were overbuilt and over-staffed in view of enrollment trends. He pointed out that the University's enrollment did grow but not as much as had been projected, and the University had added positions based on that anticipated increase; these added positions had been cut by the legislature and this was the most serious present problem. The legislature had indicated that new positions could be added if the enrollment increases did occur and that those positions would be funded by the increased tuition funds. This was the background for his issuing the temporary freeze on new hiring the previous week, he said.

A considerable increase in student aid had been sought, but it would be recognized only in the form of an increase to the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board. The president reported there would be a significant increase in funds for the University libraries for acquisitions and automation, and there were allocations for graduate fellowships as well as for equipment replacement. On salaries and fringe benefits, the University had sought 11 percent and 8 percent increases for the next 2 fiscal years, respectively. The governor had recommended 6 percent plus fringe benefits for each year. The Senate subcommittee had recommended 6.5 percent and 6 percent including fringe benefits. The House had not taken a position, but indications were that it would recommend about 7 percent for each year including fringe benefits. The president said any new fringe benefit plan for state employees would include faculty and staff but that costs would come from the total University appropriation. In the area of "specials," he said, there had been some progress. He said the University would face a \$4- to \$5-million cut in the position money requested, although the level hadn't been decided. He wanted the impact on units to be minimized, and he indicated that such a decision would be reached after discussions with the Consultative and Biennial Request & Budget Review committees.

Harriet Lewis, student, said she had heard that 160 teaching assistants would be cut. She charged that 167 had been cut since 1970, even as enrollments were increasing. The president said her comments would be taken into account. Sam Krislov, professor of political science, expressed concern that there would be even greater cuts in positions; Stanley Kegler, vice president, responded that differences lay in the amount of the reduction in dollars, not in positions. Robert Holt, professor of political science, said it appeared that the legislature had two sets of books—total dollars and total size of staff. He deplored certain lobbying efforts that he understood

were slanted to specific programs. Citing the recent speedy University response to an NCAA decision involving eligibility of certain Minnesota basketball players in which the University backed up its position based on certain principles, he accused the administration of not having developed a statement of principles on which it could base its biennial request. The president said that time and again the University's commitment to quality education and the University's Mission Statement had been presented to legislators, but that there had been a general lack of interest on the part of the news media. He said that, where specific programs were explained, they were intended as illustrations, not as lobbying efforts—that the concern was for the total University. He said the University wanted to move away from using ratios, but that it was hard to make the change at the legislature. He would work toward reporting total dollars needed and relating this figure to a total number of students the University hoped to educate, he said.

Walter Weyhmann, professor of physics, asked how the University would absorb cuts in staff and how they would be spread. The president said it wasn't the time for a definitive answer, but that every effort would be made to minimize the effect on all academic areas and that as much as possible would be absorbed in administrative units. Woods, Halley, associate professor of physics, asked whether the University had actually requested 147 positions; the president answered that a specific number had not been requested. Mr. Halley asked whether, in retrospect, the president considered that a tactical error; the President replied he did not.

John Turner, Regents' professor of political science, raised the issue of "soft money" positions, asking whether, when they were created, they were fairly widespread, or whether they were confined to a few units. He wondered whether all units were now being asked to pick up the burden for those positions. The president said that many had been in the College of Liberal Arts and the Institute of Technology and that the cuts would affect everyone. He stated that those added positions would be identified and removed. Mr. Turner contended that the Medical School had soft fund positions, and he expressed concern that they had been converted to line items, with the result that CLA and IT would have to bear a disproportionate share of the eliminated positions. Donald Geffen, professor of physics, endorsed Mr. Holt's opinion and indicated that the proposed 6 percent salary increase figure and the failure to add positions was a reflection of a general attitude at the legislature that the role of the University was being evaluated and there was a trend toward equating the University with other higher education systems in the state. He called on the president to debate publicly and to make statements and speeches to explain the University's mission. The president maintained the University's views were being well articulated and that it was important not to overreact to legislative actions. (A UMEA Statement on Administrative Handling of the University Legislative Request is on file in the Office of the Clerk.) Mr. Kegler commented that, in the face of a \$45- to \$60-million increase in the University appropriation over the 1975 appropriation, it would be hard for the public to understand the University's pain when "we will end up with about our usual share of the pie." (A summary status report distributed at the meeting is on file in the Office of the Clerk.)

The discussion concluded at 4:15 p.m., and the vice chair, Barbara-Ann March, presided over the meeting until its conclusion.

The minutes of the February meeting and student replacements on committees were approved.

*Election of Vice Chair*—Ms. March asked for nominations from the floor for the vice presidency of the Assembly for next year. Michael Malter, student, nominated Tom Fairbanks, student, and Sam Krislov, professor of political science, nominated Robert Holt, professor of political science, after which nominations were closed. Mr. Malter told the Assembly that Mr. Fairbanks had served on a number of University committees and had acquired a good knowledge of procedures. Another considera-



tion, he said, was that students would be more willing to state their views if a student were presiding. Voting was by written ballot; Mr. Holt was elected.

*Authority of Parliamentarian*—Mario Bognanno, professor of industrial relations and chairman of the Business and Rules Committee, introduced for a second hearing an amendment to the Constitution authorizing the appointment of a parliamentarian. After it had achieved the required majority, he presented the corresponding Bylaw amendment outlining the duties. It, too, was approved.

*Election, Committee on Committees*—George Blake, professor of soil science and chairman of a committee to make nominations to the Committee on Committees for next year, listed six faculty members, and written ballots were cast during the meeting. Virginia Fredricks and William Peria were elected to 3-year terms and Charles Wolfram to a 1-year term.

*Honors Recommendations*—Robert Hexter, professor of chemistry, brought to the Assembly a proposal that each University unit draw up a percentage system (not more than 10 percent) for determining students who would graduate with distinction. He recalled that his committee had been requested to study current standards used by each unit in granting degrees with distinction. He called the resulting evidence a "runaway" situation because it indicated that upward of 50 percent of the students in some units were awarded such honors. He said the committee believed grade inflation was the cause, and he feared that merely raising the GPA requirements would result in still higher GPAs. Fred Morrison, professor of law, moved to limit the action to undergraduate nonprofessional units. Mr. Hexter viewed it as a friendly amendment. A student inquired about those currently in honor programs; Mr. Hexter explained that only degrees with distinction were involved, not honors programs. Philip Ryan, student, said that grade inflation was used as the argument for the proposal, which was a slap at students. He emphasized that underlying problems needed to be looked at, and he challenged the Academic Standing and Relations Committee to do so. The Hexter motion (including a recommendation that performance should be judged in relation to that of the candidate's peers) was then approved.

*Grading Policy*. Patricia Swan, professor of food science and nutrition and chair of the Educational Policy Committee, presented a proposal to return next fall to the single transcript policy with several substantial changes. A similar proposal had been made by the Academic Standing and Relations Committee at the last Assembly meeting but was referred to Ms. Swan's committee to look into the implications of a change and to identify the central issues. Ms. Swan said the committee had talked to both faculty members and students and that two issues had emerged: the questions as to whether admissions committees should have a complete record of a student's educational accomplishments and whether there was an educational benefit to the student in maintaining an accomplishment record. She reported that admissions committees had been demanding the complete record so that they could make the best decisions. The results of a survey of 19 other institutions indicated that 18 were using the complete record; 17 of them replied with negative responses on the Minnesota procedure, several of which she read to the Assembly. Her committee, she said, was not unanimous, but the majority favored the proposal.

Roger Fellows, student, accused ACEP of not responding to the questions mandated at the last Assembly meeting. He contended that the effect of the proposed change on job-oriented students should have been studied, but that no answers had been sought by the committee. Instead, he said, "soft" evidence was brought in. He demanded "hard" evidence, such as responses from employers. He urged the Assembly not to vote until it had the facts. Ms. Swan said her committee had sought written comments from four placement directors as to whether the single transcript would impair the ability of students to obtain jobs. She said her committee felt that, by

making the complete record available to admissions committees, the University admits there is value in the record, and that surveying employers on its merits would put the University in an untenable position.

A faculty member made the point that the faculty itself doesn't show publications failures or unmet plans for curriculum change, and it seemed that students should have the same kind of privilege. Kent Bales, associate professor of English, said there was dishonesty on both sides. He said the committee was saying that admissions committees could do what they liked and the students were saying that a complete record would hurt them, which was self-serving. He found the argument that others used the single transcript to be foolish. He asked what the implications would be for registrations in courses. A student argued that the issues were part of still larger issues that needed to be discussed next year. Jim Clark, student, indicated that student response had been very strong. He said a poll of faculty members who opposed the single transcript concluded that it was dishonest to maintain two records, but he claimed the system didn't force dishonesty; people were dishonest. Shirley Munson, assistant professor of horticulture science and landscape architecture, pointed out that the University, with limited resources, could ill afford to have students registering and subsequently withdrawing from courses, when other students had been denied admission—those who were required to take such courses. The debate concluded, and a standing vote was requested. The motions changing the grading policy were approved 72 to 26.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

**MARILEE WARD**  
**Abstractor**