

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY M I N U T E S

November 16, 1978

The first meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was convened in 135 Earle Brown Center, St. Paul Campus, on Thursday, November 16, 1978. Checking or signing the roll as present were 99 voting members of the faculty, 35 voting members of the student body, 3 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 7 nonmembers.

President C. Peter Magrath presided.

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

I. MINUTES FOR APRIL 27, 1978

Action (5 minutes)

Approved

II. SCHEDULED MEETINGS DURING 1978-79

Information

UNIVERSITY SENATE

November 30, 1978

January 18, 1979

March 29, 1979

May 17, 1979

TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY

November 16, 1978

February 1, 1979

April 26, 1979

III. OFFICERS OF THE TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY

Action (5 minutes)

The chairman of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly has designated the following as officers for 1978-79:

Parliamentarian — James E. Connolly

Abstractor and Clerk — Marilee Ward

Approved

IV. SPECIAL NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Action by Faculty Assembly (5 minutes)

The chairman of the Assembly appoints the following as members of a nominating committee to name candidates to fill, by the election procedure, 1979-82 vacancies (two 3-year terms) on the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee. (The Faculty Assembly Steering Committee forms the Twin Cities membership of the Senate Consultative Committee.) These appointments must be ratified by the Faculty Assembly.

Don Rasmusson, Chr.

Mario Bognanno

Victoria Coifman

Raymond Collier

John Gander

Approved

V. ASSEMBLY AND CAMPUS COMMITTEE, 1978-79

Action (10 minutes)

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING: Isabel Harris (Chr.), Frank Braun, Adele Donchenko, Robert Eyestone, Sander Latts, James Preus (ex officio), Charles Sigmund, Frank Unger, James Wernitz (ex officio), Keith Wharton. Students: Mike Christian, John Kottke, Debra Swofford.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES: Josef Altholz (Chr.), James Connolly (ex officio), Evelyn Hansen, Constance Sullivan, Marilee Ward (ex officio), Wayne Welch, Archie Wilson. Students: Jim Clark, Michael Checky.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON PLACEMENT SERVICES: Lee Ponto (Chr.), Roberta Armstrong, Ellen Betz (ex officio), Frank Braun, Patricia Fergus, Lasine Kaba, Janet Windmeier. Students: three to be named.

CAMPUS CALENDAR COMMITTEE: John Printz (Chr.), J. Edward Anderson, Eleanor Fenton (ex officio), John Fisher (ex officio), Robert Hudec, Edward Savage, Willard Thompson (ex officio), James Wernitz (ex officio), Arnold Woestehoff. Students: Three to be named.

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY: Donald Browne (Chr.), Dwight Brown, Robert Carr, John Gander, Evelyn Hansen, Henry Koffler (ex officio), Richard Purple, Robert Stein (ex officio), James Terwilliger, Jean Ward. Students: Jim Clark, Richard Kottke, Kenneth Rosenblum.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON CONVOCATIONS AND THE ARTS: Robert Moulton (Chr.), Albert Frenkel, Eva Keul, Lyndel King, J. Margaret MacInnes, Susan McClary, Ross Smith (ex officio). Students: Donald Bruce, Al Hovind, Pamela Burkley.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON HONORS PROGRAMS: Kathleen Houlihan (Chr.), Bernard Bachrach, Paul Cartwright (ex officio), Marie Christenson (ex officio), Marjorie Cowmeadow (ex officio), John Dahler, Harlan Hansen, James Jensen (ex officio), Catherine Kulesov, Peter Robinson (ex officio), Kenneth Winsness (ex officio), Eugene Wright (ex officio). Students: Three to be named.

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: Marion Freeman (Chr.), Barbara Banoff, Vivian Barfield (ex officio), Keith Buckley, Julie Carson (ex officio), Douglas Dearden, David French, Paul Giel (ex officio), Chet Grygar (ex officio), Merle Loken (ex officio), Charles Scott, Robert Stein (ex officio), John Taborn, Charles Walcott. Students: Anne Marie DeGroot, David Geringer, Jim Oesterle. Alumni: A. W. Davis, Diana Murphy.

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS: Tim Meehan (Chr., student), Ruth Aberwald, Paul Addis, Kent Bales, Jerome Gates, David Lane, Stephen Miletich, Carl Nelson (ex officio), Steve Simmons, Marilyn Sjoberg, Helen Skowlund, Gordon Starr (ex officio, Sec.) Students: Julie Bates, David Cannon, Peter Gieckel, Valvet Hanson, Alan Hovind, Joseph Kueppers, Greg Longtin, Margaret Judi Nelson, Cassandra Phillips, Deborah Ann Sagstetter, Phil Verstraete, Helen Roemhild. Alumni: Betty Clapp, Marjorie Mandel.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS: Roger Benjamin, (Chr.), Gilberto Lopez Y Rivas, Shirley Munson, Paul Rupprecht (ex officio), Andrea Scott (ex officio), Beverly Sinniger, Margaret Space (ex officio), Jesse Williams, Manuel Woods (ex officio), Forrest Moore (ex officio). Students: Candace Dow, Larry Gross. Three students to be named.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON STUDENT BEHAVIOR: Martin Snoke (Chr.), Vernon Albertson, Sylvia Azar, Neil Bakkenist (ex officio), Gail Crellin, James Groth, Harlan Hansen, Bernard Haxby, Martha Hilley, David W. Johnson, Leslie King, Chester Oden, John Romano, Pearl Rosenberg, Auke Tellegen, Jesse Williams, Kenneth Winsness. Students: Michael Bernatz, Monica Jones, Thomas Kraus, Don Stacom, Timara Kulzer Underbakke. Five students to be named.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON RECREATIONAL SPORTS: Richard Wilke (Chr., student), Roger Harrold (ex officio), Arne Hovin, Pat Mueller (ex officio), Edward Silberman,

Roger Stover, Mary Wyvell. Students: Michael Bernatz, Kristine A. Hanson, John Scheidler, Timara Kulzer Underbakke.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY HEALTH SERVICES: Michael Mallinger (Chr., student), Helen Dahl, Joyce Funke, Isabel Harris, Jeffrey Monroe, George Nagobads, Paul Rupprecht (ex officio), Oliver Strand, Don Zander (ex officio). Students: Candace Dow, Vicki Engstrand, Timothy Hannasch, Gregory Stanchfield. Four students to be named. Civil Service: Carol Ostrow.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING: Stuart Fenton (Chr.), C. Luverne Carlson (ex officio), Robert Jordan, Beverly Sinniger. Students: Joseph Belzer. Three students to be named. Civil Service: BettyJo Points, Margaret Wipperman.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON HOUSING: Virginia Nagle (Chr.), David Anderson (ex officio), Joan Leigh, Tsung Shun Na. Students: Five students to be named.

Approved

Information

ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE: Mahmood Zaidi (Chr.), George Blake, Kenneth Keller, Fred Morrison, Richard Purple, Betty Robinett, Vera Schletzer, L. E. Scriven. Students: Terry Marchiniak (Chr.), Tom Potter, Elizabeth Sands, Richard Kottke, Steve Carlson.

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES: Robert Beck (Chr.), Paula Berry, Virginia Fredricks, William Peria, Pearl Rosenberg, Deon Stuthman. Students: Richard Cooke, Steve Carlson (Chr. of student members), Mike Frey.

Accepted

VI. CAMPUS CALENDAR COMMITTEE

PROPOSED CALENDAR — 1979-1980

Twin Cities Campus

(10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the proposed calendar for 1979-80 be approved.

FALL QUARTER 1979

September 24	Monday	Fall quarter classes begin
November 22-23	Thursday-Friday	Classes excused, Thanksgiving holiday
December 4	Tuesday	Last day of instruction
December 5	Wednesday	Study Day
December 6-12		Final Examinations
December 24-25	Monday-Tuesday	Christmas, holidays
January 1	Tuesday	New Year's Day, holiday

WINTER QUARTER 1980

January 3	Thursday	Winter quarter classes begin
February 18	Monday	President's Day, holiday
February 26	Tuesday	Precinct Caucus Night: Evening Classes and activities suspended
March 13	Thursday	Last day of instruction
March 14	Friday	Study Day
March 17-22		Final Examinations

SPRING QUARTER 1980

March 31	Monday	Spring quarter classes begin
May 26	Monday	Memorial Day, holiday
June 6	Friday	Last day of instruction
June 7	Saturday	Study Day
June 9-14		Final Examinations

SUMMER SESSION — FIRST TERM 1980

June 16	Monday	First term classes begin; last day for registration & payment of fees for first term.
July 4	Friday	Independence Day, holiday
July 18	Friday	Last class meeting

SUMMER SESSION — SECOND TERM 1980

July 21	Monday	Second term classes begin; last day for registration & payment of fees
August 22	Friday	Last class meeting

The Committee recommends that Continuing Education and Extension be given permission to extend the last day of fall quarter to December 13 and the last day of winter quarter to March 25 in order to provide for a full tenth week of instruction.

JOHN PRINTZ
Chairman

Approved

AMENDMENT TO PROPOSED CALENDAR

1979-1980

Twin Cities Campus

FALL QUARTER 1979

September 4	Tuesday	Fall Quarter Classes Begin
November 12	Monday	Last Day of Instruction
November 13	Thursday	Study Day
November 14-20		Final Examinations
November 22-23	Thursday-Friday	Thanksgiving Holiday

WINTER QUARTER 1979-1980

November 26	Monday	Winter Quarter Classes Begin
December 17-January 4		Classes Excused
December 24-25	Monday-Tuesday	Christmas Holidays
January 7	Monday	Winter Quarter Classes Resume
February 18	Monday	Presidents' Day Holiday
February 22	Friday	Last Day of Instruction
February 23	Saturday	Study Day
February 25-March 1		Final Examinations
February 26	Tuesday	Precinct Caucus Night — Evening Classes and Activities Suspended

SPRING QUARTER 1980

March 10	Monday	Spring Quarter Classes Begin
May 16	Friday	Last Day of Instruction
May 17	Saturday	Study Day
May 19-24		Final Examinations
May 26	Monday	Memorial Day Holiday

SUMMER SESSION — FIRST TERM 1980

May 29	Thursday	First Term Classes Begin Last Day for Registration and Payment of Fees for First Term
July 2	Wednesday	Last Class Meeting
July 4	Friday	Independence Day Holiday

SUMMER SESSION — SECOND TERM 1980

July 7	Monday	Second Term Classes Begin, Last Day For Registration and Payment of Fees For Second Term
August 8	Friday	Last Class Meeting

**Submitted by Richard Linden
Tabled**

**VII. CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES
BYLAWS AMENDMENT — ACIA
(15 minutes)**

MOTION:

That the following Bylaw amendment be approved by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly.

Amend the Assembly Bylaws, Article III. 5-Intercollegiate Athletics to read "... one member from the Men's Alumni letter club, one member from the Women's Alumnae letter club, and one member from the alumni at large ..."

The Chair of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics explains that historically the President of the Men's Letter (M) Club and the President-Elect of the Alumni Association have been the representatives and that now it is appropriate that there be an alumnae athlete representative.

**JOSEF ALTHOLZ
Chairman**

The amendment was not approved; lack of a majority vote.

**VIII. CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON STUDENT BEHAVIOR
APPEALS POLICY: THE STUDENT DISCIPLINE SYSTEM
(20 minutes)**

MOTION:

That the Assembly approve the following Appeals Policy of the Student Discipline System:

I. INTENT

The Board of Regents has delegated the authority for student discipline to the President. The President has authorized the Vice President for Student Affairs (and through the vice president, other staff/student administrative agents) and the Campus Committee for Student Behavior to handle original individual and student organization complaints. Such complaints arise from alleged violations of (1) "A Statement of Standards of Student Conduct Enforceable by University Agencies" or (2) "Policies Affecting Registered Student Organizations."

Complaints of alleged scholastic dishonesty involving a student enrolled in the same college in which the disputed behavior originated is a disciplinary matter within the jurisdiction of that college. As described in the University Senate Constitution and some collegiate constitutions, each institute, college, or school

of collegiate rank controls the internal affairs and policies of its own institute, college, or school, including the specific academic disciplinary matter of scholastic dishonesty. This policy applies to appeals in the area of student conduct arising from the decisions of collegiate disciplinary bodies, administrative disciplinary hearing units, or the Campus Committee on Student Behavior.

A hearing body will instruct a student when the hearing is being conducted under the guidelines of a full due process hearing as cited in footnote (1) below. That hearing body will then be responsible for following those guidelines. It is the responsibility of the hearing body to provide a copy of this appeals policy to the student.

II. CHANNELS FOR APPEALS

It is anticipated that most alleged disciplinary violations can be handled on a person-to-person basis without the necessity of a formal hearing. However, within the systems covered by this policy, any student or student organization charged with a disciplinary violation is entitled to one hearing at the collegiate or administrative unit level that assures fundamental fairness in its procedures.¹ Attempts at person-to-person resolution of complaints by academic or administrative staff will not be considered formal hearings for purposes of this policy and complaints unable to be resolved at those levels will be forwarded to the appropriate formal hearing body.

Although any college or administrative unit may, if they so choose, provide more than one hearing, it is from the first full due process hearing that a decision can be appealed outside the collegiate or administrative unit structure. From that first full hearing provided to the student or student organization, a single appeal is permitted to an all-campus appellate body. The recommendations of an all-campus appellate body shall be reported to the President of the University for action.

There are two designated all-campus appellate bodies, the Campus Committee on Student Behavior (which can also hear original complaints) and the President's Student Behavior Review Panel (a standing presidential advisory committee that functions only as an appellate body). If a complaint is heard by an administrative unit in the first instance, one all-campus appeal is permitted to the Campus Committee on Student Behavior. If a complaint is heard by a collegiate body or the Campus Committee on Student Behavior in the first instance, one all-campus appeal is permitted to the President's Student Behavior Review Panel.

III. PROCEDURES FOR FILING AN APPEAL

A request for an all-campus appeal to the President's Student Behavior Review Panel or the Campus Committee on Student Behavior must be filed with the University's Conduct Code Coordinator. The request for an appeal must be filed in writing within ten weekdays (excluding University-observed holidays) of re-

¹What constitutes minimal fundamental fairness in a University hearing depends on a number of factors, not the least of which is the seriousness of the potential maximum penalty. However, a fundamentally fair hearing usually allows for at least a person(s) or group to present their case including witnesses; to hear all evidence against them; to question adverse testimony; to be confronted by their accusers; to be represented by someone other than themselves (the issue of attorney or legally trained counsel participation is a matter for individual hearing body determination); and to be notified in writing of the following: (a) the complaint or facts that constitute the charge, (b) the time, date, place of the hearing, (c) the range of sanctions available to the hearing body, (d) the decision of the hearing body, and (e) the procedure for an appeal if guilt was determined. There is the presumption of innocence until guilt is proven, as well as a commitment to a promptly scheduled hearing. Finally, a formal record of the initial collegiate or administrative unit full due process hearing must be kept for appellate purposes.

ceipt of the decision of the original hearing body. The request should state the grounds on which the person or group believes the original hearing body clearly erred and offer preliminary argumentation as to the support of their claims according to the criteria specified below. In matters involving requests for appeals, the Conduct Code Coordinator's sole function is to forward the request for appeal to the secretary or chairperson of the appropriate appellate body. The Conduct Code Coordinator will forward a request for appeal immediately upon receipt of the written request.

Under extreme circumstances, an extension of time may be requested, but the request for extension must be presented to the Conduct Code coordinator within the ten weekday time limit (excluding University-observed holidays). The chairperson of the appellate body will decide on the merits of the request whether to grant or reject the extension and, if granted, what new time limit will be imposed.

IV. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

Appellate bodies are concerned with reviewing and deciding only those matters raised in the written appeal. Under no circumstances will an appellate body become involved in rehearing an original complaint. The following will be recognized as grounds for appeal within the University's disciplinary system:

1. The decision was made without benefit of relevant evidence not reasonably available at the time of the initial hearing. (If this ground is favorably reviewed, the case will be returned to the original body for presentation of the new evidence.)
2. The hearing was procedurally unfair, in that:
 - a. A voting member(s) of the original body had a bias or preformed judgment against the appealing party, an objection to which was not permitted at the original hearing or was permitted and was not honored by the hearing body.
 - b. The original hearing deviated in a substantial way from the body's established hearing procedures.
 - c. During the first full hearing of the original complaint, a student right established under University policy was violated.
3. The sanction was clearly inconsistent with the severity of the alleged violation of rules or policy.
4. The decision was made contrary to the weight of the evidence.
5. The interests of the residents, group, college, or the University were not adequate or sufficiently weighed and considered.

The grounds for appeal as specified will not preclude the filing of an appeal in other instances that can be documented or supported as a valid claim for review. If a new ground is to be proposed by the appellant, the ground should be clearly stated and documented in the written request for the appeal.

In any written requests and initial hearings on appeals, the mere assertion of any of the stated or created grounds for appeals alone will not constitute sufficient reason for an appellate body to accept the appeal for review. The statement of grounds must be supported in writing and at the initial hearing with reasoned argumentation and, if possible, with specific references to testimony, procedures, or rulings that support the assertions.

V. NATURE OF APPELLATE REVIEW

In the hearing of a disciplinary appeal at any level of adjudication within the University, the appellate body will focus on the central question: Has the previous adjudicative agency clearly erred?

The appellate body will initially meet to determine whether the grounds for appeal are sufficient as presented to warrant a formal review. This hearing is based on the written request for an appellate review transmitted to the secretary or chairperson of the review board and whatever argument is necessary to support the written request. Only in unusual cases will a ground for appeal not

cited in the written request be allowed to be added at the time of this first hearing. This initial hearing will not involve the substance of the appeal, only the merits of the grounds as presented.

If the appellate body finds the grounds as established sufficient and convincing to warrant a formal review, they will commence such a review within one month and conclude within a reasonable amount of time thereafter. In addition, the appellate body will review the record of the proceedings of the previous adjudicative agency prior to the actual appellate hearing. If no formal record of the previous hearing was made, the appellate body may dismiss the case or return the matter to the original body for a rehearing. Both the initial pre-appeal hearing and the appellate hearing are closed hearings unless the principal parties to the appeal agree to open them.

If, as part of the appeal, new evidence that is demonstrated not to have been reasonably available at the time of the original hearing and that is also demonstrated as potentially having a substantial impact on the outcome of the original hearing is introduced, the complaint will be returned to the previous adjudicative agency for a hearing of the new evidence. The appellate body will, in other cases, accept the factual determinations of the previous agency if it determines that the agency had a reasonable basis for its findings. This is done with the understanding that a choice between one of two or more permissible interpretations of evidence or testimony is not clearly erroneous. An appellate body will also accept the determinations of the previous agency regarding policy interpretations and sanction dispositions if such determinations cannot be shown to be clearly erroneous in light of the record.

If the appellate body determines that the previous agency did not sufficiently weigh or consider the interests of the University college or group or clearly lacked a reasonable basis for making its findings, applying or interpreting a policy, or determining its sanctions, the appellate body will proceed in a manner to amend or reverse the previous agency's decision. If the appellate body decides that the previous agency clearly erred in a matter involving substantial procedural unfairness, they may dismiss the case, amend or reverse the previous decision, or return the case for a rehearing.

If the determination of the original agency regarding the appropriateness of sanctions or the application of policy is overruled on the basis of disagreement rather than clear error, the original hearing body will be informed in writing of the basis for the decision so that guidelines for the application of future sanctions or policy interpretations can be made. In all cases, the previous adjudicative agency will be notified of the disposition of any appeal.

VI. REPEAL OF CONTRADICTION POLICIES

This policy supersedes any existing appeals policies and procedures for individual student or student group discipline in contradiction. It specifically repeals the Appeals Policy approved by the Board of Regents, January 11, 1963.

INFORMATION:

In January 1978 a committee was established to review the University's appeals policies and procedures for student organizations. It was chaired by Eleanor Fenton and included V. Lois Erickson, John Taborn, Hoyt Wheeler, and students Kathleen Ferkul, Tim Meehan, and Mark Stone. After careful consideration of 5 alternatives, that committee recommended that appeals of Campus Committee on Student Behavior decisions regarding student organizations be heard by a body separately constituted for the sole purpose of hearing such appeals.

MARTIN SNOKE
Chairman

Approved

IX. CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON RECREATIONAL SPORTS ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

The Campus Committee on Recreational Sports held six meetings during the year ending June 15, 1978. Attendance by student members of the Committee was poor; one student attendee out of five student members was the norm. Principal activities of the Committee were:

1. Placed in operation a St. Paul Campus Subcommittee. (The Subcommittee was created in the previous year.)
2. Pursued a request to the administration by the 1976-77 Committee that a regular policy be established permitting student, faculty, and staff spouses and certain others to purchase quarterly participation cards. This proposal was finally and completely rejected by the administration on January 24, 1978.
3. Reviewed and approved (with some changes) a proposal for an Alumni Sports Club to be operated in cooperation with Recreational Sports.
4. Took specific action on several facilities use problems, of which some were:
 - a. Request for showers for recreational sports on West Bank — apparently successful.
 - b. Request for improvement of locker service for recreational sports — some improvement obtained.
 - c. Request for better maintenance and more convenient use times for track in field house during winter — successful.
 - d. Participation by St. Paul Campus Subcommittee on location of new sports facilities on St. Paul Campus — still ongoing.
 - e. Request for access to seating area and track in Memorial Stadium for recreational sports even though field surface is not to be used by sport clubs — not resolved.
5. Consulted with Office of Recreational Sports on budget, fees, and financial proposals.

The Committee has had excellent rapport with personnel in the Office of Recreational Sports and appreciates the cooperation of persons in that Office. On the other hand, the Committee has had little influence on the Office of Vice President for Student Affairs as regards matters of interests to the Committee.

EDWARD SILBERMAN
Chairman

Accepted

X. THE CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON STUDENT BEHAVIOR (CCSB) ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

The CCSB has met as a hearing body of original jurisdiction for a total of four cases this past year. It did not meet this year as an appellate body. The four cases, all involving student organization complaints and all voluntarily decided to be open to the public, were (1) Mr. Ray Roybal vs. The International Committee Against Racism; (2) Messrs. Carlson and Duarte vs. Mr. Greg Longtin, et al; (3) Messrs. Carlson and Duarte vs. The College of Liberal Arts — Student Intermediary Board; and (4) Members vs. The Indo-American Club (pending a hearing at the time of this report). Excluding the pending Indo-American Club case, the other three cases involved five preliminary conferences, six hearing meetings, and two separately scheduled deliberation sessions. Of the three completed cases, two were appealed to the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs (ACSA). One was subsequently dropped by the appel-

lants while the other is pending an appellate review at the time of this report. The CCSB in 1977-78 provided information to appellate bodies (ACSA and the President's office) on a 1976-77 CCSB case which had been appealed and carried over into 1977-78.

The CCSB responded to the charge as given to it by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly to initiate a review of the present appeals policy. Extensive consultation on collegiate hearing/appeals systems for complaints of scholastic dishonesty was completed prior to the formulation of a draft revision. At the time of this report, a second comprehensive draft of a revised appeals policy covering individual misconduct (all-University and collegiate) and student organization misconduct has been completed. The CCSB has given its preliminary approval to the concepts contained in this revision, and the Committee is proceeding to request comments on this draft from collegiate units, the specially appointed Appeals Committee of the Assembly Committee on Committees, and the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs.

The CCSB has also been asked to review during Spring Quarter a revision of "A Statement of Standards of Student Conduct — Procedures for Disciplinary Proceedings, Twin Cities Campus" that is being forwarded for consideration to the ACSA by the Vice President for Student Affairs office. Besides meetings on cases and the policy reviews already mentioned, the CCSB met twice in orientation and training sessions in 1977-78.

MARTIN SNOKE
Chairperson

Accepted

XI. CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

At the October, 1977, meeting the Committee proposed several objectives for the year. We feel we reached most of our goals and report the following for your information:

HANDICAPPED PARKING. The Committee requested additional parking spaces be allocated for the use of the physically handicapped. State Law 169.345 requires special parking privileges be extended to persons displaying distinguishing insignia. The Office of Physical Planning submitted a proposal in April, 1978, outlining three phases that would provide this additional parking. Spaces would be signed with the international handicap symbol. The State Plan would be adopted and \$10 fines would be imposed for illegal parking.

UNIVERSITY AREA SHORT-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM. The Committee spent a major portion of its time reviewing the various components that go to make up this summary report. The participants were the Project Management Board, a Citizen Advisory Committee, technical staff from the University, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Metropolitan Transit Commission as well as our Committee. We were presented with several draft reports that were discussed in detail. Several revisions were suggested by our Committee that were not reflected in subsequent or final drafts. Our comments were not taken seriously. Our final recommendation was that the University of Minnesota *not* adopt the Program because the costs seemed to us to be excessive with little, if any, benefit accruing to the University.

PARKING RATES. We reviewed the parking rates in the Fairground lot on the St. Paul Campus at the request of the Regents' Student Concerns Committee. After discussion covering increased costs, the Committee agreed that the University should maintain the status quo. The Committee reviewed a request for free parking for staff members who return to campus in the evening. We concluded it would be unwise to

recommend this because of the number of evening students who would not have this privilege, as well as conflicts with various University events.

STRUCTURE OF THE PARKING DEPARTMENT AND PARKING POLICIES. We reviewed the structure of the department and questioned several practices employed such as the waiting list for contract parking and how they are handled, event parking, enforcement, etc. Parking policies have been established through committee and administrative decisions since 1947. Unfortunately, only a few of these policies were substantiated by written documents. The Committee requested a written document outlining these policies. This was forwarded to C. Luverne Carlson on April 24, 1978. We feel this written policy statement will more clearly provide a basis for enforcement.

TRANSPORTATION. Mr. Hugh Lampert reviewed the available transportation system for the Committee. This system includes express buses to the Campus, the shuttle system between St. Paul and Minneapolis, and mini bus system to outlying administrative offices. We felt, while they are doing a good job, needs were still unfulfilled and we encouraged the department to expand services as much as was possible and still remain within our financial limits. The Committee recommended that a study be made to determine the feasibility of building several small ramps, particularly on the West Bank. Surface lots provide spread out parking for persons using private transportation, are costly to maintain, produce less revenue, and have to be moved when needed for construction.

BICYCLE REGULATIONS. Proposed regulations submitted by Planning and the University Attorney were approved by the Committee by unanimous vote in July, 1978. Our recommendation requested they be included in the Regents' Ordinances on Traffic and Parking. The regulations cover a wide spectrum of problems from riding on sidewalks to the application of traffic laws. Planning also included a section of regulations covering Motorcycle and Motorized Vehicles. The attorney's office is checking into what punitive measures can be taken should any of the regulations be disregarded. Enforcement is a major problem.

POLICE FORCE. A discussion was held covering the lack of police enforcement of parking and traffic ordinances. Part of the problem could be that ordinances and policies are not adequately publicized and violations are not intentional.

STUART FENTON
Chairman

Accepted

XII. CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY HEALTH SERVICES ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

The Campus Committee on University Health Services has 10 student members and 7 faculty and staff members. On the average, 7 students were able to attend each meeting.

The Committee meets once a month to review and discuss issues regarding the nature of services to be provided by the Boynton Health Service. Committee approval is one prerequisite to any action taken to change existing services and policies, or to implement new ones.

During the 1977-78 school year the committee discussed:

1. The organization and progress of a Long Range Planning Committee.
2. Various aspects of the Boynton Health Service budget.
3. The amount of fees needed to maintain the Health Service.
4. The possibilities of provided services to people in the University community not required to pay student services fee.
5. The advisability of selling the Health Service fifth floor to Central Administration.
6. To comply with Title IX requirements, the expansion of benefits under the University sponsored hospital, medical, and surgical supplemental insurance plan to include all pregnancy related services.

The committee has supported the Boynton Health Service in its decisions to:

1. Extend services (1) to students who have graduated within the past year, but are without medical coverage and (2) to all extension students (regardless of the number of credits they are carrying).
2. To place the Health Service Plan fees on payroll deduction.
3. To transfer the Health Service fifth floor to Central Administration.
4. To request a \$29.94 fee.
5. To comply with Title IX requirements, to expand the benefits of the University sponsored hospital, medical, and surgical supplemental insurance plan to include all pregnancy related services.

The Boynton Health Service is charged with the responsibility of providing needed health care to the University community at the least possible cost. Due to the complexity of the health care field, policies guiding the Health Service in its attempts to do so must be formulated by professionals. The committee, however, can (and does):

1. Raise pertinent questions about existing and proposed policies.
2. Act as a resource to people with questions and complaints about or involving the Health Service.

Student representation is necessary:

1. to provide the community with input from students' perspective.
2. to give students a voice in how the Health Service portion of the student services fee is being spent.

MICHAEL MALLINGER
Chairman

Accepted

XIII. OLD BUSINESS

None.

XIV. NEW BUSINESS

None.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Clerk

Appendix

ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION

The first meeting of the year of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Magrath at the new Earle Brown Center for Continuing Education in St. Paul. The minutes of the April meeting were approved as were officers for the current year. The Assembly also approved the membership of the nominating committee that would bring in candidates to fill next year's vacancies on the Steering Committee. Additions and changes in committee memberships were approved after the addition of Michael Frey on the Committee on Committees and the designation of a student chairman as "chairman, student."

1979-1980 calendar. John Printz, assistant director, CLA operations and Calendar Committee chairman, presented the general outline of a calendar for next year. Last year, he said, his committee had conducted a survey of students to discover preferences as to format. The results were not yet complete, so the present proposal followed the traditional pattern with 50 instructional days fall and winter quarters, and 49 during spring quarter, with 24 for the first summer session and 25 for the second. Willard Thompson, director of summer sessions, said he had discovered that an early start for the first summer session would be a real problem for the Housing Office, which would not have enough time to prepare dormitories with spring quarter ending on the previous Friday. Also, many teachers enrolling in the College of Education would be unable to get away from their commitments in time for the first day. He recommended amending the calendar so that classes could start on Tuesday for both sessions. Because the amendment had not been circulated prior to the meeting, a vote was taken on whether to consider it. That accomplished, Mr. Thompson moved his amendments. Steve Carlson, student, felt that the extra instructional day was more important than the few problems involved. Mr. Thompson's amendment failed, after which Richard Linden, student, introduced a calendar starting three weeks earlier than usual with summer sessions following in sequence. He said that an earlier conclusion of the school year would be a big help to students seeking summer employment, and he felt that for that reason students tended to prefer those institutions that follow the earlier pattern. He said the survey had indicated that 44 percent favored the earlier start, 27 percent, the traditional calendar, and 28 percent favored moving to semesters. He pointed out that his calendar provided 50 days each quarter and 25 each summer session. Mr. Thompson once more called attention to the special problem an early summer session start would present for those in the Minnesota school system. Mr. Linden said his principal interest was in the fall through spring sequence. Pat Eckman, student, noted that the survey had asked students whether they preferred the current calendar, a modified calendar, or a semester, so it was not a valid source when citing student preference. He opposed the amendment because students would be hard put to maintain any continuity in their studies during the long break in the middle of winter quarter. Russell Hobbie, professor of physics, pointed out that there was little enough time between winter and spring quarters for staff to process grades; the Linden proposal would make it even shorter. Robert Touchberry, professor and head of animal science, asked when the last examination of calendar alternatives had been made; the President said about 10 years ago. He noted that UMD had already gone to an earlier start. Mr. Printz said the survey indicated a preference for the quarter system, with students preferring an earlier start and the faculty in favor of the present schedule. He said full results of the survey would be made public winter quarter and his committee would make a recommendation for 1980-81. However, the 1979-80 calendar needed to be acted on so that orientation and registration plans could move ahead. He said that Mr. Linden had been invited to participate in his committee's deliberations. Mr. Touchberry then moved to table the Linden amendment. James Connolly, professor of rhetoric and parliamentarian, explained that, if the Linden proposal were a substitute motion and the Assembly voted to table it, it could then go back to the original motion. The President ruled that the motion to table applied only to the substitute motion, and the

motion was approved. Mr. Carlson asked why the calendar couldn't indicate the final exam periods for the summer sessions. A vote on suspending the rules to discuss that proposal failed, and the main motion was approved.

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee membership. Josef Altholz, professor of history and chairman of the Business and Rules Committee, introduced an amendment to the Assembly bylaws to increase alumni representation to include a member from the Women's Alumnae letter club. Vera Schletzer, professor and director of continuing education and extension counseling, explained that the proposal would give equal representation to the women's letter club, the men's club having by tradition held a position for a long time. Mike Checky, student, moved to amend the amendment to include 5 students with equal representation for men's and women's athletics. A motion to suspend the rules to consider the Checky amendment which had not been circulated failed, and a vote on the original motion failed by 7 votes (93 to 21) to achieve the required majority. It was apparent that there were a number of abstentions, and Mr. Altholz moved for reconsideration. That was approved, but once more the motion failed.

Appeals policy and procedure. Martin Snoke, professor of psychoeducational studies and chairman of the Student Behavior Committee, described the procedure on original individual and student organization complaints and reminded the Assembly that it had asked his committee last year to develop a new policy on appeals. The committee had spent a year, first canvassing colleges, then submitting a draft to them, which was later rewritten to include some suggested revisions, and was now presenting the document for approval. He noted that the appeals review committee headed by Eleanor Fenton, professor and associate dean, continuing education and extension, had concurred in the portion that described procedures for student organizations. Mr. Checky then asked a question that had been posed by Tom Potter, student who had been unable to attend. He was concerned that the provision covering insufficient weight or consideration for a University college or group, or lack of a reasonable basis for making findings would appear to reflect some bias against students. Mr. Snoke assured him that was not the case, that the committee was trying to consider all possibilities. He said there were no criteria for appellate body determinations and that those would best be left to the appellate body itself. Mr. Carlson said he had been directly involved in the events that brought about the proposed changes. He said there appeared to be a contradiction on who had authority to exercise jurisdiction and oversee student discipline because the authority of the office of the President in such matters had been delegated by the Regents, and still the Assembly was acting on the proposal. He asked who approved the policies and what the justification was for making changes. Mr. Snoke responded that there was multiple jurisdiction, citing the college units, and various constituencies that provided dual channels. He said that the Assembly was concerned with those that grew out of the student conduct code that was approved by the Regents. The other channel dealt with those matters of student discipline directly related to colleges, he said. The reason for having the policy, he said, was that there had been a number of cases where there had been appeals and some had resulted in a complete *de novo* hearing. The intent was to eliminate repetitious hearings by providing a full-scale defined due process with one appeal and specifications on the grounds on which it could be heard. Richard Cooke, student, asked whether the proposed President's student behavior review panel would include students; he was assured that it would. Mr. Carlson continued his questioning, requesting that Mr. Snoke list the cases where there had been complete *de novo* hearings and the President to delineate the responsibility between the Assembly and his office with respect to student organizations. Mr. Snoke stood by his previous statement. The President maintained that there should be a clearly defined appellate system. The two committees ACSA and CCSSB would have a major responsibility, and the President would have authority to review decisions. Mr. Carlson wanted to know whether the Assembly had jurisdiction over ACSA. The Assembly then approved the policy. When Mr. Carlson asked about

the status of a student involved in the procedure who might not be paying fees for a limited period and whether he could be billed, he was directed to take that question to CCSB.

Identification of parking areas for physically handicapped. Paul Walker, associate professor of pediatric dentistry, urged that the Transportation and Parking Committee be apprised that the University symbol for reserving parking spaces for the physically handicapped was not enough. He said it should be accompanied by a sign indicating that anyone using such a space must be able to show State of Minnesota Department of Motor Vehicles certification that the individual qualified as a handicapped person. The president asked the clerk to send a letter to that effect to the Committee.

Bicycle regulations. A student rose to speak against the bicycle regulations that were noted in the annual report of the Transportation and Parking Committee, indicating that the ticketing procedure would be punitive and that, when the country was trying to limit the use of the automobile, bike riding should be encouraged.

The President adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m. after reminding the assemblage of the open discussion on the interim guidelines and decision-making criteria on the 1979-80 budget that would take place following the meeting. Leaders in the discussion would be Mahmood Zaidi, Senate Consultative Committee chairman, Fred Morrison, Biennial Request and Budget Review Committee chairman, and the central administrative officers, he said.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

PROF ROBERT A STEIN
ADM OPERS
200 MOR H U OF M
MPLS, MN 55455