

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY
MINUTES
April 26, 1979

The third meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was convened in Nicholson Hall auditorium, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, April 26, 1979. Checking or signing the roll as present were 91 voting members of the faculty, 22 voting members of the student body, and 10 nonmembers.

Professor Kenneth Keller presided.

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

I. MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 1, 1979
Action (5 minutes)

Approved

II. ASSEMBLY & CAMPUS COMMITTEES, 1978-79
Action (5 minutes)

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON HOUSING: Add Sandra Buie and Susan Nygren, students.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION & PARKING: Add Michael Orren, student.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY HEALTH SERVICES: Add Kathy Minder, student.

CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON STUDENT BEHAVIOR: Add Robert Simon, student.

Approved

III. CAMPUS CALENDAR COMMITTEE
A. 1979-80 CALENDAR AMENDMENT
(10 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus calendar be amended so that the starting date for Summer Session is Tuesday, June 17, instead of Monday, June 16.

COMMENT:

Representatives from the Housing Office appeared before the Committee to explain why the Monday starting day would create insurmountable logistical and public relations problems. If the Housing Office adjusts its schedule to the calendar approved by the Assembly, student contracts for the academic year would have to be terminated one day before the final examination period ends to compensate for the lost day of custodial maintenance. If, on the other hand, students were allowed to remain until the evening of the last day of final examinations (Saturday), summer registrants would not be allowed to occupy their rooms until Monday, which is the first day of the summer term. Moreover, there would be no guarantee that cleaning would be completed by that time.

The Committee agreed to recommend that Summer Session first term begin on Tuesday because the consequences of retaining the Monday starting date would work to the detriment of the Summer Session and the University. A much needed instructional day will be lost, but the first term calendar will have the same number of instructional days as previous first term calendars.

Approved

**B. PROPOSED 1980-81 TWIN CITIES CAMPUS CALENDAR
(15 minutes)**

MOTION:

That the Assembly approve the following 1980-81 calendar.

FALL QUARTER 1980

September 29	Monday	Fall quarter classes begin
November 27-28	Thursday-Friday	Classes excused, Thanksgiving holiday
December 9	Tuesday	Last day of instruction
December 10	Wednesday	Study Day
December 11-17		Final Examinations
December 25-26	Thursday-Friday	Christmas, holidays
January 1	Thursday	New Year's Day, holiday

WINTER QUARTER 1981

January 5	Monday	Winter quarter classes begin
February 16	Monday	President's Day, holiday
March 13	Friday	Last day of instruction
March 14	Saturday	Study Day
March 16-21		Final Examinations

SPRING QUARTER 1981

March 30	Monday	Spring quarter classes begin
May 25	Monday	Memorial Day, holiday
June 5	Friday	Last day of instruction
June 6	Saturday	Study Day
June 8-13		Final Examinations

SUMMER SESSION — FIRST TERM 1981

June 16	Tuesday	First term classes begin; last day of registration & payment of fees for first term
July 3	Friday	Independence Day, holiday
July 17	Friday	Last class meeting

SUMMER SESSION — SECOND TERM 1981

July 20	Monday	Second term classes begin; last day of registration & payment of fees
August 21	Friday	Last class meeting

Approved

**C. CALENDAR SURVEY
(10 minutes)**

INFORMATION:

A Survey of Student and Faculty Opinion toward
The Campus Calendar at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Ronald P. Matross
Student Life Studies and Planning
University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

At the request of the Campus Calendar Committee, surveys of 437 Twin Cities Campus students and 397 faculty members were conducted regarding their opinions of the campus calendar. Key findings were: Two to one majorities of both students and faculty preferred a quarter system over the semester system, but the two groups differed as to which quarter system they preferred for the University. A plurality of students (44%) favored an early start/early finish quarter system. A plurality of faculty (40%) favored the current University calendar. Most respondents from both groups wished to keep the present summer session and between quarter break systems.

SURVEY

In higher education, the academic calendar has pervasive and important effects on individual and group behavior. The schedule of classes, holidays, and exams structures the day-to-day activities of students, faculty, and staff. Where persons spend their time, how they spend their time, how they behave toward one another, and even what they think all are affected by a preordained academic year. Because of its wide ranging effects, the academic calendar is a worthy subject to study. The present paper is a report of a study of the academic calendar on one campus — the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. The study was commissioned by the Campus Calendar Committee, a body which meets continually to determine the exact dates of University events. The purposes of the study were to gain data on the effects of the present University of Minnesota calendar on the activities of students and faculty, and to assess student and faculty opinions about various calendar options.

The most immediate motivation for the study was the question of whether or not the University calendar is optimally fitting the needs of students and faculty. The University's present calendar, the traditional quarter system, was developed partly in response to the rhythms of an agrarian society. The calendar features three quarterly terms, beginning in the third week of September and ending in the second week of June. The starting and ending dates were designed to fit the dates for employment on farms and in agricultural related industries. The relatively late starting date allows students to continue working in harvesting and canning beyond the point where other students have to return to school. Additionally, with three terms, the effects of skipping one term, e.g., for spring planting, are not as great as for a 2-term semester calendar.

In a society which until recently has become increasingly urbanized, the traditional quarter system may no longer be advantageous for students. Among students seeking jobs in cities, the late ending of spring quarter may be a disadvantage. A survey sponsored by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 16, 1978) found that only 24% of American colleges now employ the quarter system. The remainder use variations of the 2-term semester systems, most with starting and ending dates two to four weeks earlier than under the usual quarter system. There is clearly a trend toward an earlier start and finish of the academic year. In 1967 the most popular calendar, used by 83% of the colleges, was the traditional semester, with a start in mid-September and an ending the end of May. By 1977 the usage of the traditional semester had dropped to 7%, while an early start, early finish semester calendar had gained dramatically in popularity. This calendar, now used by 48% of American colleges, has a fall starting date at about the fourth week in August and an ending date in the first or second week of May. Not considered in the survey was the early start/early finish quarter system, a 3-term calendar beginning the first week in September and ending the last of May. Some institutions such as the University of Minnesota at Duluth have further added to the trend toward early start/early finish by adopting this calendar.

For University of Minnesota, Twin Cities students, their University's adherence to a calendar used by a minority of colleges has several possible implications. Students may have difficulty competing for summer jobs with other students who have been seeking and starting work two to four weeks earlier. They may miss charter flights,

summer sessions, or special education programs tuned to the earlier summer break of the majority of students. It is important to understand whether the starting and ending dates of the current calendar are an advantage or disadvantage to students in their job seeking and summer school prospects.

Aside from the effects of calendars on employability, their effects on education are very much at issue. Educational concerns are the main issues in discussion of the relative merits of semester and quarter systems. On the one hand, the semester system offers the possibility of studying subjects in greater depth, extending the time available to explore and reflect, and reducing the number of exams. On the other hand, the quarter system offers the possibility of allowing students to take a wider variety of subjects, to end disagreeable classes more quickly, to skip terms more readily, and in general to have more flexibility in their course planning.

Concerns about educational issues also lead to questions about two other aspects of the academic calendar — summer sessions and between quarter breaks. With regard to summer session, the University currently offers two 5-week terms. In each term an attempt is made to cover the same material as in a full 10-week quarter. Because the pace in summer session is necessarily doubled, concern has been expressed about whether this pace is too fast for students to adequately absorb the material presented in the summer session. An alternative arrangement would be one 10-week summer quarter comparable to other 10-week quarters, covering the same material at the same pace. While the latter arrangement might reduce the pressure on students and faculty, it would inevitably reduce the variety of summer course offerings.

The question of pace also applies to other breaks for vacation. The University currently has a 2-week December break (including Christmas) between fall and winter quarters, and a 1-week break in March between winter and spring quarters. These breaks could be changed in a number of ways, including shortening them and offering more frequent short holidays as a change of pace. The question of what arrangement best aids students' learning is most salient.

The present study sought data on the effects of the University's current calendar. Students were asked about the nature of their previous summer employment and other activities, including the type of employment, whether they had sought work at various times or wished to work but did not, and whether they found the University's calendar to be an advantage or disadvantage in their summer activities. Faculty members were asked a comparable set of questions about the effects of the calendar on their teaching, research, travel, and other summer activities. Most importantly, both groups were asked to rank their preferences among the five major calendar types in use today — the traditional quarter system, the early quarter system, the traditional semester system, the early semester system, and the 4-1-4 interim semester system. They were also asked about what types of summer session and quarter break arrangements they would prefer. Additionally, students were asked questions concerning the manner in which they approached their college study.

METHOD

Both students and faculty were surveyed by mail during April, May, and early June of 1978. Faculty names were drawn from a random sample of 494 persons with full-time faculty appointments at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. Seven of these individuals were later deleted because they were no longer employed at the University. At approximately 2-week intervals, faculty were sent a pre-letter describing the nature of the study, the questionnaire, cover letter and two subsequent follow-up reminders. Returns were received from 397 of the 487 in the sample, for a response rate of 80%. Among those responding, 56.9% reported having 12-month appointments, 41.8% having 9-month appointments, and 1.3% having other appointments. Sixty-eight percent taught undergraduate courses, and 48.2% taught graduate courses.

Student names were drawn from a random sample of 594 students registered spring quarter at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. Seven names were subse-

quently deleted because they were either deceased or no longer enrolled. Also, at approximately 2-week intervals, students were mailed the pre-letter, questionnaire, cover letter, and three follow-up reminders. Returns were received from 437 of the 587 persons, for a response rate of 74%. Among student respondents, 37.2% were enrolled in the College of Liberal Arts, 12% in the Institute of Technology, 5% in General College, 5.5% in the College of Education, 12% in the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, 22.1% in Graduate, Law, and Medical Schools, and 8.3% in other schools on campus. Nine and eight tenths percent of the respondents were freshmen, 20.1% were sophomores, 21.7% were juniors, 20.6% were seniors, 23.6% were graduate or professional school students, and 4.2% were adult specials.

RESULTS

Table 1

Percentage Distribution of Student Employment by Date

Date	Employed full-time (40 or more hours)	Employed part time	Not employed but wished to be	Not employed, not available to work
May 1-15	16.9	43.1	7.7	32.2
May 16-31	20.2	42.3	9.2	28.2
June 1-15	25.2	40.0	9.8	24.9
June 16-30	50.1	28.6	6.6	14.8
July 1-15	51.5	27.4	5.2	15.9
July 16-31	52.9	25.9	4.9	16.2
August 1-15	53.5	25.8	4.2	16.4
August 16-31	51.8	26.2	3.5	18.4
Sept. 1-16	44.5	28.3	4.3	22.9
Sept. 16-30	31.4	35.0	4.9	28.7

Table I shows the summer employment of the student respondents by date. Students were asked about their employment status for 2-week intervals of the previous late spring and summer — whether they were employed full-time or part-time, not employed but wished to be so, or unavailable for employment. Of most interest are the employment trends for the weeks just prior to the ending of the spring term (when other college students have begun summer jobs) and just prior to the beginning of the fall term (when many other students have returned to college). During the first three fortnights (May 1 to June 15), there was a gradual increase in full-time employment (from 16.9% to 25.2%) and in the number reporting that they were not employed but wished they were (7.7% to 9.8%). For the next fortnight (June 15 to June 30) during which time the spring term ended, the percentage with full-time employment nearly doubled, while the percentage not working but wishing to declined to 6.6%. From the end of June to the end of August, the percentage working full-time remained relatively stable at 50 to 53% of the respondents. The percentage not working but wanting to declined to 3.5% for the fortnight of August 15 through 31. The number not available for employment declined from 28.2% the end of May to 18.4% the end of August. During the fortnight prior to the beginning of the academic year, September 1 through 15, the number not available for employment increased to 22.9%, and the number employed full-time decreased to 44.5%. The most salient features of these data are that the number not employed but wishing to be so peaked at approximately 1 in 10 just before the ending of spring quarter, and fell to below 1 in 20 thereafter. Nearly half continued to work full-time from September 1 to 15, a time when many other college students have returned to school.

LOCATION OF STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Because agricultural employment is part of the rationale for the traditional quarter system, the number of students employed in agricultural related industries is

an important question. Five and six tenths percent of those responding to the survey reported that they worked on a farm or ranch in the summer of 1977 and 2.8% said they worked in the canning or packing industry. As would be expected, a greater proportion (17.6%) of those who were enrolled in the St. Paul campus schools — Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics — worked on farms and ranches. In contrast to the small number employed on the farm, nearly 2 in 3 (64.5%) said they were employed in the Twin Cities area. About 1 in 6 (15.9%) was employed by the University of Minnesota.

PERCEIVED EFFECTS OF THE CAMPUS CALENDAR

Students were asked to report adverse effects of the current calendar on their summer activities. Fifteen and three tenths percent said they did not apply for a job because it began before spring quarter ended; 15.1% said they missed vacation or travel opportunities because of the calendar; 7.6% said they were turned down for jobs because they began before the end of spring quarter; 3.5% said they could not attend summer school at another college because of schedule conflicts; and 2.1% said they left school early because of job requirements. Sophomores were more likely ($p < .01$) than members of other classes to have not applied for jobs (26%) or to have been turned down for jobs (15%). While the quarter system takes away time from the beginning of the summer break, it adds time at the end of the break in the fall. Students were thus asked whether the late starting date of fall quarter was an advantage or disadvantage for their activities. Twenty-six and six tenths percent said the late starting date was an advantage to their employment, 6.1% a disadvantage, and 67.3% said it was neither an advantage nor a disadvantage. With respect to scheduling vacation and travel, 32.9% said the late starting date was an advantage, 7.5% said a disadvantage, and 59.6% said neither. With regard to participation in summer educational programs, 7.3% said it was an advantage, 2.6% said a disadvantage, and 90.1% said neither.

Student views on the advantages of the fall starting date appeared to be colored by their experiences with the spring ending date. Those who reported that they suffered ill effects of the calendar, not being able to apply for jobs because they began before spring quarter ended, being turned down for a job because it began before spring quarter ended, missing a vacation or travel opportunity, were significantly more likely than those who did not experience problems to regard the late September start of fall quarter as a disadvantage to employment, vacation and travel, and enrolling in summer educational programs ($p < .01$). Similarly, those who were employed full-time during the fortnight of June 1 through 15 were more likely ($p < .01$) than others to see the late fall start date as an advantage to their employment. Those who were employed on farms or ranches were no more likely than others to see the fall start as an advantage.

EFFECTS OF THE CAMPUS CALENDAR ON FACULTY SUMMER ACTIVITY

Like the students, faculty members were asked about adverse effects of the late ending of spring quarter on their activities. Seven and one tenth percent reported that the ending date made it difficult to teach at another university; 17.3% said the late date kept them from attending conferences, conventions, and symposia; 15.5% said it interfered with an opportunity to conduct research in the summer; 14.5% said it caused them to miss the summer travel opportunity; 7.9% said it limited summer consulting opportunities; and 2.3% said it caused them to miss a post-doctoral or other summer training program.

Student and Faculty Calendar Preferences

Table 2
Percentage Distribution of Student and Faculty Ranks
of Academic Calendar Systems

	Student Rank						
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	M	SD
Traditional quarter (current U of M)	27.1	37.9	13.3	11.2	10.5	2.400	1.280
Early quarter	44.2	24.5	12.8	12.6	5.9	2.116	1.264
Traditional semester	10.2	15.7	32.1	22.4	19.5	3.252	1.246
Early semester	12.1	10.2	22.4	36.4	18.8	3.395	1.246
4-1-4 semester	6.4	11.9	19.7	17.1	44.7	3.810	1.305
	Faculty Rank						
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	M	SD
Traditional quarter (current U of M)	40.8	26.9	13.3	10.7	8.4	2.197	1.300
Early quarter	22.7	31.9	16.2	13.3	10.9	2.478	1.315
Traditional semester	17.3	18.5	38.1	15.2	10.9	2.839	1.201
Early semester	12.5	12.5	15.4	43.6	16.0	3.383	1.177
4-1-4 semester	3.2	9.4	15.0	14.2	58.1	4.145	1.177

Students and faculty were asked to rank in order of their preference (1 = most preferred) five calendar systems: The traditional quarter system (the current University of Minnesota calendar), the early start/early finish quarter system, the traditional semester system, the early start/early finish semester system, and the 4-1-4 interim semester system. As seen in Table 2, among students, the most preferred calendar was the early start/early finish quarter, chosen first by 44.2% of those responding. Second in popularity was the traditional quarter system, ranked first by 27.1%. Variations of the semester system were favored by about 28%, with 10.2% favoring the traditional semester system, 12.7% the early semester system, and 6.4% the 4-1-4. In contrast to student preferences, the most preferred calendar among faculty was the traditional quarter system, favored by 40.6%. Twenty-seven and one tenth percent ranked the early quarter system as their top choice, 17% favored the traditional semester, 12.1% the early semester, and 3.2% the 4-1-4. Familiarity was a factor in both student and faculty preference for change. Those students and faculty who had attended the variations of semester systems were more likely to favor these systems ($p < .01$). Some student characteristics and values were related to their choice of a semester or a quarter system. Graduate and professional school students were more likely than students in other colleges to favor the semester system ($p < .01$). Those who lived in apartments of their own year-round were more likely to choose a semester system than were students who lived at home, on campus, or in school-year-only quarters. Those who favored a semester system over a quarter system more often said it was very important to them to take courses in fewer subjects and greater depth ($p < .01$), to read and reflect on important ideas beyond their coursework assignments ($p < .01$), and to participate in campus life ($p < .05$).

PREFERENCE FOR BREAK ARRANGEMENTS

Students and faculty were both asked their opinions about various options for spring and winter breaks between quarters. A majority of students (57.8%) favored the current system of a 2-week break in December and a 1-week break in March; 18.9% favored a system with a shorter summer break and longer winter and spring breaks; 6.4% said they would prefer a system in which all three major breaks were shorter and where there would be more short holidays during the year; and 8% expressed no preference. Fifty-five percent of the students said they worked during the last winter break, and 49.1% said they worked during spring break. These working students did not differ significantly from other students in their break preferences. However, students enrolled in the schools of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Eco-

nomics were more likely ($p < .01$) than others to favor the longer summer system. Among faculty, 57.4% favored the current system; 15.4% a longer summer break and shorter winter and spring breaks; 15.1% a shorter summer break and longer winter and spring breaks; 4.3% favored the system with short holidays spaced throughout the year; and 7.8% expressed no preference.

PREFERENCES FOR SUMMER SESSION ARRANGEMENTS

Both groups were asked whether they preferred the current summer session of two 5-week terms or a single 10-week summer term. Among students, 68.8% favored the current system; 12.1% the single 10-week session; and 19.1% expressed no preference. Among faculty, the preference for the current system was less pronounced: 45.8% said they preferred the current system; 21.1% the single 10-week session; and 33% had no preference.

DISCUSSION

By a 2 to 1 margin, both students and faculty prefer a quarter system to a semester system. However, the two groups clearly differ as to which quarter system they would prefer. A plurality of students (44%) said that they would prefer an early start/early finish quarter system, giving them more time in the early summer and less time in the late summer. In contrast, a plurality of the faculty (41%) favored the current system, the traditional quarter.

On the one hand, many of the justifications for the traditional quarter system appear not to apply. Fewer than 1 in 10 students work on a farm or ranch or in the canning and packing industries. Moreover, these students were no more likely than others to favor the current system, and in fact, more of those working on farms and in related industries favored the early start/early finish system than the current system. As one student put it, "As a horticulture major, it is important for me to start working in the spring. If the University continues with its present calendar, I plan to attend only fall and winter terms next year." The majority of students do not see the time gained in the fall as a particular advantage to their employment, vacation, or educational activities. For some students, the first two weeks in September are "dead" time, e.g., "I'd like to start earlier because there isn't anything to do in September waiting for school to start. I'd much rather get out in May so I can enjoy the weather." Probably the most forceful case against the current late fall starting system and late spring ending system is made by students who have found that this calendar disadvantages them in their employment, e.g., "I have undergraduate work at the U and at Concordia College, Moorhead. In my experience, entering the summer job market at the end of April rather than the middle of June gives the student a tremendous advantage," and "The U of M students are at a disadvantage in the realm of full-time summer employment because of this starting and finishing time of this God-forsaken institution."

While the case for a traditional calendar may not be strong, neither is the case for change necessarily compelling. Only 1 in 6 students and faculty reported disruptions of their activities due to the late ending of spring quarter. Among students, the most frequent problems were not being able to apply for certain jobs or missing vacations and travel opportunities due to the late spring ending date. For faculty, the most frequent problems associated with the calendar were missing conventions and meetings, and interference with research opportunities. While these effects were certainly important to those who experienced them, the survey indicates that the majority of both students and faculty have not suffered such consequences from the calendar. Even though students may be disadvantaged in their job searches, and even though the quality of summer employment was not considered, most of the students who wanted to be employed were employed. Only 1 in 20 students wanted summer employment but could not find it.

Beyond the question of its effect on the employment of students, the current calendar has several positive attributes, neatly summarized by one faculty member, "Christmas falls between quarters; best for Minnesota weather; a quarter system is more adequate or adaptable for curriculum than semesters." Another faculty member added further advantages, "September without classes is a productive time for

course preparation. Early beginning also interferes with professional conventions, meetings and personal summer plans." Additionally, there is the issue of the cost and difficulty of change, as noted by another faculty respondent, "Research and service commitments have been built around the current system. There are always difficulties in allotting time. Changing the system means complicated changes in work timetables for many faculty." Or as another put it, "If you change the current system, I hope you have a compelling reason."

The status quo was supported by both faculty and students with regard to two other aspects of the calendar, the summer sessions and between quarter breaks. Neither the majority of students nor faculty appeared ready to support a change to a single 10-week quarter for the summer session, nor did a majority of either group wish to alter the present arrangement of breaks. For some favoring the current calendar, the time of winter break was an important consideration. A student respondent noted, "It's really nice to be done with the quarter and enjoy vacation," and a faculty member said, "Once the quarter is started, I don't like to see long breaks which occur for some of the other schedules (Christmas)." The minority who did favor alterations in the system of breaks offered numerous, sometimes idiosyncratic suggestions, particularly regarding the addition of new and multiple short breaks such as "more national holidays off," "one to two day breaks after midquarter," "more three day weekends," and "about two days added to the Memorial Day break."

For decisions about the University of Minnesota's calendar, the survey reported here appears to have narrowed the range of possible alternatives. The majority of students and faculty do not wish to have radical alterations made in the number of terms or arrangement of breaks. Instead, they differ in their preferences between the status quo and the most moderate alternatives to the status quo. While the survey data have yielded two clear alternatives, they cannot offer a mandate for one alternative over the other. The choice between the traditional and early quarter systems revolves around questions not addressed by the survey, including: Whose opinions should be given more weight — students or faculty members? Does the number of persons suffering adverse effects of the present calendar justify a change to an earlier start and finish? What would be the monetary and social costs of a change?

JOHN PRINTZ
Chairman

Accepted. Request was made for a breakdown by college unit of the faculty opinion portion of survey. Data are not immediately available; report will be made later.

IV. NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

(10 minutes)

Action by the Faculty Assembly

MOTION:

That the Faculty Assembly approve the slate of nominees to fill two 1979-82 vacancies and one 1979-80 vacancy on the Assembly Committee on Committees as follows (person placing third will fill the one-year term):

Benjamin Bayman, Professor, Physics, Institute of Technology; member, University Appeals Committee on Academic Freedom & Responsibility, 1971-76, chr., 1975-76.

William Boylan, Professor, Animal Science, College of Agriculture; member, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, 1977-78.

Mary Corcoran, Professor, Social, Psychological, and Philosophical Foundations of Education; member, Senate Consultative Committee, 1972-75; Senate Committee on Educational Policy, 1971-74.

John Howe, Professor, History, CLA; member, Council on Liberal Education, 1973-74, 1975-78.

Walter Maier, Professor, Civil & Mineral Engineering, Institute of Technology.

Gayle Yates, Assistant Professor and Coordinator, Women's Studies, CLA

INFORMATION:

The bylaws 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 from 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 1979-80 are:

Paula Berry, Assistant Professor, Family Social Science, Home Economics

Virginia Fredricks, Professor, Theatre Arts, CLA

Pearl Rosenberg, Assistant Dean and Associate Professor, Physical Medicine, Medical School

RICHARD SKAGGS, Chairman

FRANK BRAUN

JOHN DAHLER

MADOLON GOHLKE

IRWIN RUBENSTEIN

Mary Corcoran and John Howe were elected for 3-year terms; Benjamin Bayman, for 1-year term.

V. 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 year. He/she shall be eligible for re-election.

JOSEF ALTHOLZ

Chairman

Richard Kottke was elected.

VI. REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE, INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (20 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics establish procedures for conducting investigations of alleged improprieties on the part of athletes or staff members.

INFORMATION:

The undersigned were appointed by President Magrath as members of an *ad hoc* committee to consider the following motion presented to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly on 1 February:

"That it shall be the policy of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly that, where student violations of National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) Rules are alleged, the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics shall not conduct investigations or take any action, nor shall reports concerning the allegations be disseminated to Big Ten or NCAA officials or the public, until guilt or non-guilt has been established by the Campus Committee on Student Behavior."

It is our opinion that this proposal would not be effective in facing the very vexing problems which arise with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the Intercollegiate (Big Ten) Conference when our athletes and coaching staff are accused of violations of their rules. Because of the highly public nature of allegations of misbehavior directed at the athletic departments, because of the organizational relationship of the University to the Conference and the Association, and because of the philosophy and complexity of the Conference and Association rules governing enforcement procedures, it is our recommendation that the Campus Committee on Student Behavior (CCSB) not be involved in proceedings, the sole purpose of which is to evaluate and decide the eligibility of athletes for future intercollegiate competition. It is the judgment of the *ad hoc* Committee that the philosophical perspective governing the relationship of the athlete to the institution, the Conference, and the Association, as well as the procedural mechanisms and penalty structure of those organizations, are wholly incompatible with the philosophy and practice of CCSB.

The Campus Committee on Student Behavior views its role as an educational one and has no prescribed penalties for misconduct while the Conference and Association are quite rigid in their approach. Moreover, what might be a "crime" to the Conference or the Association might be considered a normal act of human civility for any other student or staff member. As Professor Martin Snoke, Chairman of the Campus Committee on Student Behavior, and Mr. Neil Bakkenist of the Special Counseling Office have pointed out, very real differences exist between the approaches taken by the Conference and Association and by CCSB in handling infractions of their respective behavioral codes, differences in disciplinary approaches grounded in divergent goals and philosophies.

The Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) is charged with conducting our relations with the Conference and the Association. This now involves determining eligibility and has been understood to include examination of alleged violations of the athletic code; it should continue to include both duties. There is need for ACIA to establish procedures for conducting investigations of alleged improprieties on the part of the athletes and the staff. The Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics should set forth in documentary form the procedures to be used in conducting investigations of such allegations. That document should include provisions for the appointment of an *ad hoc* subcommittee of ACIA to oversee the investigation, the use of trained professional staff, and such guarantees of fairness and procedural "due process" as accord with the philosophy of the University and the rules of the Conference and the Association. The safeguards for the individuals must be clearly established; however, the *ad hoc* Committee was impressed by the limited extent to which the University can provide protection to

students or staff under the terms of the membership obligations of the Conference and the Association and is concerned that all students and staff be fully informed of these limitations so that no false expectations of protection be entertained.

We are assured that the Special Counseling Office and CCSB will be available to help with the establishment of the procedures. The document when drafted should be submitted to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly for consideration and approval.

STUART FENTON, Chairman
GARY ENGSTRAND
MARION FREEMAN
THOMAS FULTON
JAMES OESTERLE
AUKE TELLEGEN

A motion to suspend the rules to reconsider the original motion presented at the February 1 Assembly meeting was defeated, 60-33. Because a quorum did not exist, no further action items were voted on.

VII. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE ELECTION

INFORMATION:

In the recent election to fill 1979-82 vacancies on the Assembly Steering Committee, Robert Brasted and Marcia Eaton were elected. Continuing members on the committee include: George Blake (1977-80), Fred Morrison (1977-80), Richard Purple (1977-80), Vera Schletzer (1978-81), and L. E. Scriven (1978-81).

MARILEE WARD
Clerk of the
Assembly

Accepted

VIII. ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING & RELATIONS

CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE

INFORMATION:

The Assembly Committee on Academic Standing and Relations approved the development of a cumulative grade point average that will appear on the academic record of each student and that will follow the last quarter entry on the record. The recommendation for this action came from the Twin Cities Registrar's Advisory Committee as a result of requests from a number of college units. It is viewed as a useful tool for honors organizations, athletics, and student discounts. (It should be noted that Law School and General College will use a numerical average.)

ISABEL HARRIS
Chairperson

Accepted

IX. OLD BUSINESS

None

X. NEW BUSINESS (15 minutes)

Please feel free to use this agenda item to comment on a topic you believe is of general interest to the Assembly. It is not to be confused with the University Senate's "Questions to the President." This entry in the agenda may be used to raise specific issues, concerns and/or ideas of general interest. A motion is not required. In this way, the Business & Rules Committee wishes to remind the Assembly that all ideas presented to the body need not flow from a committee.

None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Appendix I
ATTENDANCE OF ELECTED MEMBERS
1978-79

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly held three regular meetings during 1978-79

FACULTY	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Adams, Carl R.	0	0
Anderson, Robert K.	0	3
Awad, Essam A.	2	1
Baizerman, Michael	2	0
Bakdash, Bashar	1	0
Bales, Kent R.	2	0
Barber, Donald	2	0
Beck, Robert	3	0
Benjamin, Roger	3	0
Berscheid, Ellen	1	0
Blackmore, John	2	0
Blake, George	1	0
Bloedel, James R.	3	0
Bloomfield, Victor	2	0
Borich, Patrick J.	0	1
Bouchard, Thomas J.	2	1
Brasted, Robert	3	0
Brothen, Thomas F.	3	0
Brown, Alan	3	0
Brown, David M.	0	1
Busch, Robert	0	0
Cardwell, Vernon	2	0
Cavert, H. Mead	3	0
Chambers, Clarke	1	2
Clark, John P.	2	1
Collins, Terry	2	0
Cooper, Laura	2	0
Corcoran, Mary E.	2	1
Dahlstrom, Helen M.	1	1
Davis, H. Ted	1	0
Desborough, Sharon	2	0
Donchenko, Adele K.	2	0
Drage, Charles	2	0
Dykstra, Robert	2	1
Ederer, Grace Mary	3	0
Egan, Ellen	3	0
Egertson, Kenneth	1	2
Eicher, Joanne	2	0
Ellefson, Paul	2	1
Erickson, W. Bruce	2	0
Evans, Samuel	0	0
Fenton, Eleanor	3	0
Finch, Martin	1	0
Fredricks, M. Virginia	2	1
Freier, Phyllis S.	2	0
Frenkel, Albert W.	1	0
Garetz, Floyd K.	1	0
Gatewood, Lael C.	2	0

Goldstein, Richard	2	1
Goodman, Lawrence E.	3	0
Gore, Warren	2	1
Grosch, Audrey	2	1
Ham, George	3	0
Hammond, Jerome	2	0
Hanley, Mary	1	1
Hansen, Evelyn U.	2	0
Hansen, L. Sunny	0	3
Hardy, Robert	2	0
Hein, Andrew J.	3	0
Henderson, Lavell M.	2	1
Henricks, Lewis	3	0
Herman, William	3	0
Hexter, Robert	0	0
Hirschbach, Frank D.	1	1
Hobbie, Russell	2	0
Holt, Robert T.	2	0
House, Peggy A.	3	0
Hoyt, John S.	2	0
Hurwicz, Leonid	3	0
Isbin, Herbert S.	2	0
Johnson, Paul E.	0	0
Josal, Wendell	2	1
Kahn, Donald	3	0
Kelly, Richard	3	0
Keynes, Harvey B.	resigned	
Klaurens, Mary K.	3	0
Lee, E. Bruce	3	0
Lindsay, Malcolm I.	0	0
Liu, Benjamin	1	1
Lueschen, William E.	0	0
MacEachern, Donald	3	0
Mansfield, Elaine	2	1
Mantis, Homer	3	0
Meadows, Garland K.	3	0
Meyers, Susan S.	2	1
Miller, Daniel	3	0
Moller, Karlind	3	0
Mooney, Harold M.	2	0
Morris, Howard	0	3
Moulton, Robert D.	3	0
Munson, Shirley	3	0
Murphy, Paul L.	1	0
Olson, William G.	1	1
Osier, Donald	3	0
Overmier, J. Bruce	2	1
Pankake, Marcia	3	0
Pearsall, Thomas	0	2
Penn, Misha	0	0
Poppele, Richard E.	3	0
Prager, Stephen	2	1
Prince, James T.	3	0
Rathburn, Robert C.	0	0
Root, Michael D.	2	1
Sawchuk, Ronald	3	0
Schofield, William	0	1

Schwartz, Samuel	1	0
Schwartzberg, Joseph	2	1
Shively, W. Phillips	3	0
Simmons, Roberta	2	0
Southall, Geneva H.	3	0
Spector, Janet	1	1
Speidel, Michael	2	1
Spelsberg, Thomas C.	0	0
Spencer, Robert	2	0
Steinmann, Martin	0	0
Storvick, David	2	1
Stuthman, Deon	3	0
Sugnet, Charles	0	1
Sullivan, Constance	1	0
Swan, Patricia	1	1
Tellegen, Auke	2	0
Toth, Louis	3	0
Touchberry, Robert W.	3	0
Turner, John E.	1	1
Usenik, Edward	0	1
Walker, Paul	2	0
Wallace, John	1	0
Ward, Gilbert	2	0
Ward, Jean W.	3	0
Warner, William H.	2	0
Welch, Wayne W.	1	1
Wharton, Keith	2	1
Wirt, Robert D.	0	0
Zaidi, Mahmood A.	2	0
Zimmerman, William Jr.	0	0

STEERING COMMITTEE

Zaidi, Mahmood, Chr.	2	1
Blake, George	1	0
Morrison, Fred	3	0
Purple, Richard	3	0
Robinett, Betty	0	0
Schletzer, Vera M.	3	0
Scriven, L. E.	0	0

STUDENTS

Abendroth, Jeanne	2	0
Allen, Tracy	0	*
Basiago, Steve	1	0
Bates, Julie	2	0
Berman, Mark	3	0
Bevard, Lise C.	3	0
Boche, Susan J.	1	0
Carlson, Paul	2	0
Carlson, Ron	0	0
Carlson, Scott	1	*
Christian, Mike	1	0
Costello, Helen	1	0
Delaney, John	0	*
DeSautel, T. Darla	0	1
Duane, Michael	3	0
Ellis, Kathi	0	0
Erickson, Kathleen J.	3	0

*Did not serve a full term

Gray, Teri	1	0
Hartley, Steve	0	*
Henry, Mary	0	0
Hollinger, Lynda	1	*
Hovind, Al	0	*
Hvass, Jeanne	0	0
Kulzer, Timara	2	0
Kvam, Caroline	0	*
Lake, Robert	0	*
Landwehr, Julie M.	2	0
Lawson, David	1	*
Linden, Rick	1	0
Lowell, William	1	*
McGowan, Perry	1	0
Mjolsness, Brad A.	1	0
Mollenhoff, Lori	1	0
Morrison, Eric D.	2	0
Mudge, Rex	0	0
Nelson, Myron	1	0
Pasvogel, Tab B.	0	0
Piunkett, James M.	1	0
Pribyl, Sue	1	*
Schwartz, Lori J.	0	1
Simmons, Greg	0	*
Smith, Shelly	0	*
Taylor, Joel K.	1	2
Thomas, Dianne	0	0
Unser, Stanley	2	0
Urbanski, John	1	*
Weis, John	2	0
Wilke, Dick	2	0
Will, Tom	1	*

STEERING COMMITTEE

Carlson, Steve	3	0
Cooke, Dick	2	0
Eckman, Pat	2	0
Kottke, Rick	3	0
Sands, Elizabeth	3	0

**MARILEE WARD
Clerk**

*Did not serve a full term

ABSTRACT

The third meeting of the year of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was called to order at 3:20 p.m. by Kenneth Keller, professor of chemical engineering and materials science and vice chairman of the Assembly, in Nicholson Hall auditorium. Minutes of the last meeting and additions of students to committees were approved.

1979-80 Calendar Amendment. Eleanor Fenton, associate dean, continuing education and extension and member of the Calendar Committee, introduced a motion to start the first summer term next year one day later than approved earlier by the Assembly. It would reduce the session to 23 days, she said, but with spring quarter finals concluding on Saturday, the Housing Office would be confronted by insurmountable problems with a Monday opening. The Assembly approved the motion.

1980-81 Calendar. Ms. Fenton proceeded to the calendar for 1980-81, the outlines of which she pointed out were similar to previous calendars, with 50 instructional days in the first quarter, 49 in the second and third, 23 in the first summer term and 25 in the second. That calendar was approved without dissent. She explained that the committee did not want to make any changes until results of a current calendar survey were in.

A third item, presented by Ronald Matross, student life studies and planning, was a summary of the finding of that calendar survey of students and faculty members. The two areas of interest were the effect of the calendar on activities of faculty members and students, such as travel and employment, and opinions on calendar matters. He said both preferred the quarter system, but a plurality of students preferred an earlier start-earlier finish, while a plurality of the faculty favored the present calendar. Kent Bales, associate professor of English, said it would be useful to show a comparison of data for those whose principal responsibility was teaching with those whose primary work was not in teaching. Mr. Matross said the study indicated there was not much difference between the two. He added that those who had had some experience with other alternatives to the present calendar were more inclined to favor a change. Robert Holt, professor of political science, requested data on the faculty similar to that provided for students on opinions as to calendar matters, providing a breakdown by college unit. Mr. Keller asked that the information be provided in the minutes. Ms. Fenton reported that an ad hoc committee on the calendar had been appointed by Henry Koffler, vice president, academic affairs, and that Mr. Bales' concerns should be passed on to it.

Committee on Committees Election. Richard Skaggs, associate professor of geography and chairman of a nominating committee to fill forthcoming vacancies on the Committee on Committees, reported six names from which three would be elected by the Faculty Assembly. He expressed appreciation to faculty members who had assisted by providing names and to committee members for their efforts. Ballots were then distributed; Mary Corcoran, professor, social, psychological, and philosophical foundations of education, and John Howe, professor of history, were elected to 3-year terms, and Benjamin Bayman, professor of physics, was elected to a 1-year term.

Election of Vice Chairman. Fred Morrison, professor of law and member of the Senate Consultative Committee, reminded the Assembly that the vice chairman of the Senate sat ex officio on that committee, and the vice chairman of the Assembly was an ex officio member of its Steering Committee. He nominated Richard Kottke, current Steering Committee member and TCSA speaker, as an experienced member of both committees, and he indicated he would propose Betty Robinett, professor of linguistics, as a candidate for the same position in the Senate. Steve Carlson, student, who opposed a faculty-nominated candidate, said he would modestly propose his own name, and the nominations were closed. Mr. Kottke was elected by paper ballot.

Intercollegiate Athletics ad hoc Committee. Stuart Fenton, professor of chemistry, had been appointed chairman of the ad hoc committee proposed in Assembly

action at its last meeting. The Assembly had approved the naming of the committee to decide whether the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) should conduct investigations and make reports of alleged violations of National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) rules before the allegations have been heard by the Campus Committee on Student Behavior (CCSB). Mr. Fenton said his committee found that there was a serious problem in terms of protecting athletes and the University. However, after considering the proposal for CCSB hearings, it decided that, due to important differences in disciplinary approaches and in philosophy between CCSB and the NCAA, ACIA should establish a set of rules that would guarantee the right of fair play. Dick Wilke, student, contended that in the past ACIA had frequently given in to pressures from national organizations and he maintained that better protection would be provided to athletes by the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs (ACSA) or CCSB. Mr. Fenton countered that in his opinion past problems had developed because there had been no established University procedures. Deon Stuthman, associate professor agronomy and plant genetics, asked what would happen to the procedures once they were developed. Mr. Fenton said they would be brought to the Assembly. Mr. Kottke, speaking for the departed Steve Carlson, who had made the original motion to designate CCSB as the hearing body, moved to reinstate the Carlson motion. A motion to suspend the rules to take up that proposal was defeated 60 to 33. There was a call for a quorum count; 96 members were present, and the chair ruled that no further votes could be taken. He said that the first part of the May 17 University Senate meeting would be given over to consideration by Twin Cities Campus Assembly members of the matter.

Steering Committee Election. Results of election of faculty members to the Steering Committee for next year were reported. Robert Brasted and Marcia Eaton were elected by the total faculty.

Cumulative Grade Point Average. The report of development of a cumulative grade point average was reported by the Academic Standing and Relations Committee. Asked when it would be used, Keith Wharton, professor and assistant dean of agriculture and committee member, said it was being calculated at the present.

Registration of Student Organization. The policy and procedures in the registration of student organizations remained the only action item on the agenda. Because it was submitted too late for general circulation before the meeting, Mr. Keller ruled that it, too, would be considered at the special meeting of the Assembly on May 17.

The Assembly then was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor