

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES

May 16, 1991

The fourth meeting of the Twin Cities Assembly for 1990-91 was convened in 25 Law Center on Thursday, May 16, at 2:30 p.m. Checking or signing the roll as present were 123 voting faculty/academic professional members, 29 voting members of the student body, 2 ex officio, and 7 nonmembers. Shirley Zimmerman, vice chair, presided.

I. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS, 1991-92 **Information**

In the recent election to fill faculty/academic professional vacancies on the Assembly Committee on Committees, Subir Banerjee (IT) and Michael Steffes (Medical School) were elected for 3-year terms; Edward Cushing (CBS) was elected for a 2-year term; and Carl Adams (Management) and Jean Montgomery (CLA) were elected for 1-year terms. Geoffrey Maruyama (Education) continues his membership.

Accepted

II. STEERING COMMITTEE **EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE** **LIBERAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE REPORT** **Action (30 minutes)**

MOTION:

That the Twin Cities Campus Assembly adopt the recommendations of the May 6, 1991, Report of the Task Force on Liberal Education (as enumerated in the Appendix of the Final Report) and calls on the administration of the University to implement them. The administration is requested to report annually to the Assembly no later than the second meeting of spring quarter each year on progress in implementing the recommendations.

WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Steering Committee
KIM MUNHOLLAND, Acting Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

Proposed Amendment 1

MOTION:

That the proposal for "Designated Themes of Liberal Education" (Sections II.E and II.F; points 16-21 in the Executive Summary) be deleted.

COMMENT:

All of the themes in II.E are good things, which we hope students would study. Unlike the "Diversified Core Curriculum" and "Fundamental Skills and Competencies" (Sections II.C and II.H), however, they are not basic, essential parts of a liberal education. The diversified core and fundamental skills provisions give students skills and perspectives that will apply, both now and later in their lives, to the study of *all sorts* of important things, including

those listed in II.E. Many other good things, also essential to living a good life, could also have been listed in II.E, but are not. Examples include sexual ethics, comparative religion, and economics. Students will wrestle with these and other problem areas now and throughout their lives. A liberal education provides them with the *tools* to address such problems, but the precise selection and timing with which students address them should be allowed more choice than it is in the proposed requirement.

Proposed Amendment 2

MOTION:

That the proposal for the "New-Student Colloquia" (Section II.B; point 2 in the Executive Summary) be made available to all entering students, but not required.

COMMENT:

The colloquia as described: "A major product of the colloquia for each student should be a written statement of educational goals and a preliminary plan for meeting those goals. Each statement should be the subject of close conversation between students and instructor and should also involve presentation and dialogue among peers. Although such statements are likely to become obsolete as students gain experience and change intellectual directions, they should be viewed as a serious first attempt at developing a personal educational strategy" will be valuable for many entering students, and should certainly be made available; but a significant number of well-oriented entering students will see them as an unproductive hoop to be jumped through. In particular, students transferring to the University a couple of years into their studies may not find the colloquia helpful. And the well-prepared, well-motivated students that Commitment to Focus intends to encourage will include a number who would be turned off, rather than on, by this approach.

**W. PHILLIPS SHIVELY
SAM KRISLOV
CLA Senators**

The two amendments were defeated and the original motion was approved.

III. STEERING COMMITTEE

COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION

Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend Article III of the Bylaws of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly to establish a Council on Liberal Education by inserting a new Section 2 (and renumbering existing sections) as follows:

2. COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION

The Council on Liberal Education has responsibilities for baccalaureate degree requirements for those who graduate from the Twin Cities campus of the University.

Membership

The Council on Liberal Education shall be composed of faculty, undergraduate and graduate student representatives, and academic advisors, a majority of whom shall be faculty members. Faculty members shall be appointed by the provost, in consultation with the deans and with the faculty members of the Assembly Steering Committee, and shall be drawn from colleges and schools of the Twin Cities campus, including those units offering the baccalaureate degree and other appropriate colleges, and the professional schools. Faculty members shall serve three-year terms. Student members shall be appointed by the provost in consultation with the student members of the Assembly Steering Committee. Student members shall serve two-year terms. The chair of the Council shall be designated by the provost and shall be a faculty member.

For its inaugural period, one third of the faculty members shall be appointed for one-year terms, one third shall be appointed for two-year terms, and one third shall be appointed for three-year terms. All subsequent appointments, except for vacancies, shall be for three-year terms.

Duties and Responsibilities

- a. To review and approve or disapprove all proposals for courses designated for the diversified core curriculum.
- b. To formulate the procedures for 1) proposing courses to be added to, and 2) deleting courses from, the diversified core curriculum.
- c. To establish and regularly review the criteria for courses which will be considered for designation for the diversified core curriculum.
- d. To establish criteria for courses which will carry the special designators (international perspectives, cultural diversity, citizenship and public ethics, environmental education, and writing intensive) and to review and approve courses which will carry the special designators.
- e. To regularly review for their effectiveness the distribution requirements and skills and competencies requirements for all baccalaureate degree candidates.
- f. To advise the provost on implementation of recommendations concerning liberal education requirements.
- g. To foster continuing discussion among the faculty about issues of liberal and undergraduate education.
- h. To recommend to the Steering Committee and to the provost such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.
- i. To submit an annual report to the provost and to the Assembly.

COMMENT:

One of the recommendations of the report of the Task Force on Liberal Education is its call for the creation of the diversified core curriculum, courses which should meet certain criteria and which, when established, will constitute the body of courses from which all undergraduates would select in order to fulfill the general education requirements for the baccalaureate degree. The creation of the diversified core curriculum, however, presumes a body which can review and approve courses proposed for that core and which, over time, can make recommendations to the Assembly concerning the number and kind of courses to be required for a degree.

The task force thus calls for the creation of a new committee of the Assembly, the Council on Liberal Education, which would not only have specific responsibility for the diversified core curriculum courses but also for undergraduate liberal education degree requirements generally.

The membership on the council is intended to reflect the heavy responsibilities that will rest with the undergraduate degree-granting colleges but also to recognize the interests and responsibilities of the professional school faculty in undergraduate education.

It seems certain that the workload of the Council on Liberal Education will be heavy. It will probably have to consider, annually, several dozen applications for additions to or replacements in the diversified core curriculum; it will have the responsibility for reviewing and ascertaining the effectiveness of the distribution requirements as well as the skills and competencies requirements, and it will have the responsibility for establishing and reviewing the criteria and procedures for approving courses for designation as part of the diversified core curriculum. The council will require substantial staff support from the Office of the Provost.

Approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy 4/25/90.

WARREN IBELE
Chair

The motion was recommended to the Assembly Steering for redrafting following acceptance of three amendments: to insert "undergraduate and graduate" to describe student representatives; to insert "and other appropriate colleges" to describe eligibility of faculty members to serve; and to include academic advisors among those eligible to serve.

IV. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
ADMINISTRATORS IN ASSEMBLY
Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

That the Constitution, Article II, Section 1. Membership, be amended to define administrators who are eligible to serve in the Assembly as follows: (additions are underlined; deletions, crossed out) 1. " . . . ~~The Twin Cities campus members of the Council of Deans~~ academic officers with class titles 9302-9329 shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members." (of the Assembly)

COMMENT:

There is no longer a group known as the Council of Deans; however, the above definition will include those individuals who have traditionally served as ex officio members of the Assembly.

INFORMATION:

The Committee on Committees has the authority to require the resignation from Assembly committees of any person who accepts a primary appointment, acting or permanent, as a major central administrative or collegiate officer (9302-9329 class titles). An appointment is considered primary if it is 50 percent or more time.

WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Steering Committee
MARIO BOGNANNO, Chr.
Committee on Committees

The amendment was approved by 110 affirmative votes and will be brought back at the next meeting for a second reading to fulfill the requirement of a majority of the membership at two meetings.

V. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
COMMITTEE IN COMMITTEES RESPONSIBILITIES
Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:

To amend the Bylaws, Article III, 2a, Duties and Responsibilities of Committee on Committees, to provide for representation of certain constituencies as follows: "The Assembly Steering Committee may determine that a committee of the Assembly will benefit from representation from a non-eligible constituency of the University. Upon such determination, Committee on Committees shall select an additional voting representative from said constituency for placement on the appropriate committee for a term of one year."

COMMENT:

Committee on Committees has received several inquiries from ineligible academic staff (academic professionals and academic administrators) questioning how they may become involved in the work of the Assembly and its committees. The Office of the President and the Assembly Steering Committee have also raised this question.

The Assembly Constitution treats academic administrators (class titles 9302-9329) as non-voting ex officio members of the Assembly and its committees. They administer the

policies adopted by the Assembly as initially framed by its committees. Moreover, the President presides over the affairs of the Assembly, giving focus to the views of academic administration. Academic staff with appointments in non-collegiate units (e.g. Athletics and Student Affairs) and who do not hold class titles 9302-9329 are ineligible for any direct participation in the work of the Assembly and its committees.

It is the case that academic staff from ineligible units in the University may have ideas and expertise that ought to add significantly to the work of the committees of the Assembly. Thus, upon Assembly Steering Committee determination, the Committee on Committees should be empowered to make said voting appointments to the appropriate committee(s). Precedence exists for such an innovation. For example, alumni and civil service representatives currently serve on the Intercollegiate Athletics and Support Services Committees.

**MARIO BOGNANNO, Chr.
Committee on Committees
WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Steering Committee**

Approved, with 103 affirmative votes.

VI. CALENDAR, 1993-1994

Action

Fall Quarter, 1993	(50*)	
September 23	Thursday	Fall Quarter classes begin
November 25-26	Thursday-Friday	Thanksgiving holiday—no classes
December 3	Friday	Last day of instruction
December 4-5	Saturday-Sunday	Study days
December 6-11	Monday-Saturday	Final examinations
Winter Quarter, 1994	(49*)	
January 3	Monday	Winter Quarter classes begin
January 17	Monday	Martin Luther King holiday—no classes
February 22	Tuesday	Precinct Caucus Night
March 11	Friday	Last day of instruction
March 12-13	Saturday-Sunday	Study days
March 14-19	Monday-Saturday	Final examinations
March 21-25	Monday-Friday	Spring break
March 25	Friday	University holiday
Spring Quarter, 1994	(49*)	
March 28	Monday	Spring Quarter classes begin
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day holiday—no classes
June 3	Friday	Last day of instruction
June 4-5	Saturday-Sunday	Study days
June 6-11	Monday-Saturday	Final examinations
Summer Session I, 1994	(25*)	
June 13	Monday	First CEE summer session classes begin
June 14	Tuesday	First summer session classes begin
July 4	Monday	Independence Day holiday
July 19	Tuesday	Last day of instruction/final exams
Summer Session II, 1994	(25*)	
July 21	Thursday	Second summer session classes begin
August 24	Wednesday	Last day of instruction/final exams

* = number of instruction days

1993-94 HOLIDAYS (TOTAL: 11)

July 5, 1993	Monday	Independence Day observed
September 6	Monday	Labor Day
November 25	Thursday	Thanksgiving
November 26	Friday	Floating Holiday
December 23	Thursday	Floating Holiday
December 24	Friday	Legal Observance of Christmas
December 31	Friday	Legal Observance of New Years's Day
January 17	Monday	Martin Luther King Day
March 25	Friday	Floating Holiday
May 30	Monday	Memorial Day
*(Unassigned)		(One personal floating holiday)

*applies to civil service and nonacademic bargaining unit employees

WARREN IBELE, Chr.
Steering Committee
KIM MUNHOLLAND, Acting Chr.
Educational Policy Committee

Approved

VII. SUPPORT SERVICES COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1990-91

The 1990-91 academic year was indeed an active one for this committee. The duties of the committee are "to review policies and administration of all support services on the Twin Cities campus; to serve in an advisory capacity to the administration of such support services; and to involve interested persons and groups in its deliberations where appropriate." As such, the committee has engaged in the following activities:

1. The committee first became familiar with the Report of the Task Force for Review of Twin Cities Support and Service Units and the recommendations contained therein. A number of support units were contacted and asked to supply mission statements as well as to comment on any progress vis-à-vis the recommendations concerning their unit by the task force. Committee members were assigned the task of reviewing the progress made by these separate units (Personnel, University Police, Support Services, Business Services, and Student Support Services).
2. The committee asked for briefings by several support unit representatives. Roger Forrester reported on recent activities in Personnel and detailed progress made by that unit regarding the task force recommendations. This unit has revised its mission statement, is beginning to put together an advisory committee, and is working toward simplification of the job evaluation questionnaire. The committee asked for a briefing by Dean Harold Miller, Continuing Education and Extension, regarding the integration of the CEE and Student Support Services records. Efforts are underway to coordinate these activities via a committee staffed by personnel from both student support services and CEE. Susan Markham reported to the committee regarding the problems and issues facing the University regarding safety and security.
3. The committee responded to a request from the Senate Consultative Committee to form recommendations concerning the composition and membership of advisory committees associated with various support service units. A memo summarizing these recommendations was written and the SCC was briefed by Arvey during the month of March.
4. The committee heard and reviewed the recommended parking rate increases. The briefing was conducted by staff members of Support Services. The committee voted to support these recommendations.

5. The committee asked the Acting Director of Safety and Security, Paul Tschida, to provide a briefing concerning safety and security issues on the Twin Cities Campus.

Recommendations for 1991-92:

1. The committee should continue to take a leadership role in the evaluation of safety and security issues in conjunction with administration. This is consistent with the recommendations made last year.
2. Greater efforts should be made to coordinate the review and recommendation process of the committee with the ongoing considerations and recommendations of other committees. That is, the Support Services Committee seems to operate somewhat in a vacuum from other committees and decisions which have considerable impact on support services (e.g., budget cuts, decreases in operational services, etc.). Perhaps one mechanism is to have the chair of the this committee also attend the SCC or Finance and Planning Committee meetings.
3. Greater involvement is needed by top administration officials in Finance and Operations. Each of the support service units are dealing with policy issues in a somewhat separate fashion. It would be helpful to have a representative (e.g. Bob Erickson or Nick Lafontaine) from Finance and Operations serving as an ex officio member of the committee.
4. The committee should review the request for proposal process as it works within the University system.
5. The committee should continue to identify new issues needed attention for review and recommendations.

Committee members during 1990-91 were faculty members Marjorie Cowmeadow, Arthur Erdman, Richard Goodrich, Dorothy Loeffler, and Richard Arvey (chr.); civil service member Robert Silvagni; student members Dana Klipsch, Mark Vitelli; and ex officio members Neil Bakkenist, Clint Hewitt, James Preus, Tim Delmont.

RICHARD D. ARVEY
Chair

Accepted

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

none

IX. NEW BUSINESS

none

ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by its vice chair, Shirley Zimmerman, professor of family social science, in 25 Law Center.

Liberal Education Task Force Report. Warren Ibele, professor of mechanical engineering and chair of the Steering Committee, reminded the Assembly that the report had been before it on two previous occasions and would come to a vote at the present meeting. His committee had passed a resolution expressing appreciation to task force members for a job well done and enthusiastically endorsing the goals outlined in the report. It recognized that considerable resources would be required, both in terms of money and faculty, staff, and teaching assistant time, and it looked forward to implementation as those resources became available. He then moved suspension of the rules in order to permit task force members to participate in the discussion; the Assembly approved.

John Howe, professor of history and chair of the task force, opened the discussion by recalling that over 20 years ago the Assembly had approved a set of liberal education distribution requirements and thus taken an initial step toward describing the kind of liberal education University students should have. The Assembly was being asked to approve a renewed and expanded set of policies that would be appropriate to the times. He said that virtually every institution was participating in both a contemporary and historical debate over the changing meaning of liberal education. The current recommendations were the product of over a year of intensive work and represented the best judgments of a large and diverse task force, following advice and counsel offered by countless faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Throughout the process the task force had consulted widely, solicited advice, and held meetings; each recommendation had been debated both as an individual policy and as an element of a full and balanced liberal education agenda—an agenda appropriate to all undergraduates on the Twin Cities campus.

As the final report indicated, the task force sought to renew and strengthen many enduring and traditional elements of liberal education and thus the development of the diversified core and its call for making more purposeful students' explorations of broad fields of knowledge and for engaging students in the research and creative enterprises that characterized the University. But 1991 was simply not 1971. Though much had continued, much had changed—the fields of knowledge taught, the social makeup of the faculty, the educational goals of students, and society's claims on the University. Thus the report had gone beyond the formulation of 20 years ago to build into the liberal education agenda what was described as the four designated themes. Recommended was a broad, balanced liberal educational agenda for the 1990s and beyond, challenging to the students by laying out for them a more purposeful definition and description; challenging to the faculty to provide the courses and educational support and oversight that would be required; and challenging to college deans and central administrators to work with the faculty to see to its implementation.

In closing, Professor Howe pointed out that there was not often an opportunity to strengthen significantly something as fundamental to the University as the liberal education of all of the undergraduates, but the opportunity was at hand.

Professor Ibele moved for adoption of the report, including a call to the University administration to implement it. He said it should be borne in mind that the report could not possibly please everyone; the task force had worked hard to reconcile various views, but it did find itself working within the limitations of the number of credits that a student might reasonably be expected to take and also within the confines of available resources. He hoped that everyone would be aware that no document under such circumstances would likely be perfect.

W. Phillips Shively, professor of political science, rose to present two amendments. He spoke of his high regard for the work of the task force and added that the proposals from Professor Krislov and himself had not been undertaken lightly. He said that under the old system students had been able to find unusual ways to satisfy the distribution requirements, and he credited the task force with developing a sensible set of provisions by devising imaginative ways of increasing the basic intellectual skills of the students.

Speaking to their first amendment, he proposed to delete the section on designated themes of a liberal education, with which he had a basic pedagogical and tactical, almost philosophic, disagreement. His recommendation was not based on any opposition to education in the themes—in fact, he said the theme with which he was most sympathetic was that of cultural diversity. However, he maintained that all of the themes had a different relationship to liberal education than the diversified core and the training and skills which the report put forward and which would provide students with methods and ways of thinking—perspectives that would apply to all sorts of problems that they would be dealing with. The more specific problems such as those in the four themes, he suggested, should be approached in ways that would offer more flexibility in choice. He hoped, if the amendment were approved, that the Steering Committee would treat the vote as a decision to recommit, and seek out ways of developing more flexible procedures. Shawn Towle, student, objected to consideration of the motion on the grounds that it would change fundamentally the intentions of the task force.

At this point, the Assembly voted to consider the Shively-Krislov motion. Professor Howe spoke in opposition, maintaining that omission of the themes would have drastic implications and would alter the character of the educational guidance provided by the report. He emphasized that the section had been carefully considered and had been the subject of intensive debate within the task force and with colleagues across the University. He maintained that the issues were of broad and enduring consequence, and they invited examination from a variety of perspectives while promising to involve an expanded number of faculty in the broad agenda of liberal education. They offered opportunities for students to make connections between their formal study and the world in which they lived, and each of the themes had been identified as being of special concern to the educational mission of the University in policy statements such as the President's Undergraduate Initiative.

Hans Weinberger, professor of mathematics, supported the amendment on the grounds that the themes included propaganda for the state religion, which he observed had been variously identified as secular humanism or warm, fuzzy liberalism. He said that one of the tenets of the state religion was that a public university had no business preaching any religion to students and even less business requiring students to listen to the preaching. He maintained that the assignment for which the task force had been established was negated by inclusion of the themes, which were pure propaganda devoid of any intellectual content.

A motion to extend debate by 10 minutes was then approved. Carlos Pijoan, associate dean, large animal clinical science, also favored the amendment because it would leave options open; the themes could be offered but not required, and other themes explored in the future. Lisa Albrecht, assistant professor, General College, spoke in opposition. She said a false dichotomy would be created if the designated themes were separated from the diversified core. She maintained that the report was cognizant of future demographic trends, and she observed that within the next 50 years people of color would be in the majority in the United States. Roland DeLattre, professor of American studies, was astonished at Professor Weinberger's perspective; he said the substance of the recommendations was carefully spelled out and would not be devoid of intellectual content. In fact, he said, the proposal was offered in such a way that the objectives could be met by a wide variety of strategies, and the faculty was being encouraged to address itself to the issues in a variety of contexts. He maintained that high school students coming to the University on the whole were not past the need for instruction in diversity, international perspective, citizenship and public ethics, and environmental education.

Sam Krislov, professor of political science and co-sponsor of the amendment, emphasized that he and Professor Shively were saying that the theme section needed more work, more alternatives—such as aesthetics, political effectiveness, law as an instrument. Nothing about the four themes made them paramount and unique, and he suggested it was not unreasonable to ask the task force or some other group to come up with a more comprehensive list, since there appeared to be no hurry. Another faculty member opposed the amendment and suggested that the entire package could be reviewed more frequently than every 20 years.

Edward Cushing, professor in the College of Biological Sciences, favored the amendment. While agreeing that the themes were worthy of study, he suggested a requirement of six courses that explored issues of national and international concern, but left those issues specifically undefined. He held that the University could change very rapidly by adapting to the perceived societal needs as they arose.

Discussion time was extended by 10 minutes by a vote. Elaine Tyler May, CLA associate dean and task force member, was horrified that the Assembly, working in a very limited time frame, would undo thousands of faculty, student, and staff hours of work. She said the report did not totally satisfy each member of the task force but everyone agreed that the best compromise had been reached in the final draft. It was hard to hear their efforts trivialized, insulted, and outraged, and that to start chipping away at a document that had taken over a year to create would destroy its integrity. She pointed out that the task force itself was a diverse group and had wrestled with all of the issues raised during the present debate, and she urged that the Assembly come on board as an institution and try a plan that was new, different, and challenging.

Professor Shively argued that the Assembly was not being asked to put another document in its place, that the efforts of the task force were not being trivialized, but the Assembly was being asked to authorize the Steering Committee to set in motion a process to consider more flexible and more broad, general ways of achieving the same ends. Such matters were entirely appropriate for Assembly debate and action. Shawn Towle, student, pointed out that the proposed Council on Liberal Education would be the body to implement provisions of the report. Martin Dworkin, professor of microbiology and task force member, denied the courses would be devoid of intellectual content. He emphasized that the report stated that options for change should be made available and it urged that students be given a sense that there were certain questions that were important. The report, he said, did not necessarily tell the faculty or students how to respond to those questions.

Professor Pijoan said he was amazed that a task force member would suggest that the Assembly not consider a matter and just vote "yes." The amendment was simply suggesting that there were more issues than those identified and that there should be an "open door." Marsha Eaton, professor of philosophy, asked the task force if it would be consistent with the description of the Council on Liberal Education that the Council could from time to time identify and make additions to the themes, coming back to the Assembly to have them approved. Professor Howe said that was true, that the Council would act in an entrepreneurial way to see that the diversified core curriculum was developed and was sufficient in its reach, and it would oversee the development of curriculum in connection with the specified themes. In the process it would track the development of the implementation of the policies, and bring recommendations back to the administration and to the Assembly. The first Shively-Krislov amendment was then defeated 48 to 62.

A motion to extend the time by 10 minutes was approved, and Professor Shively proposed an amendment to make the proposed new-student colloquia available, but not required, for all entering students. He recognized the usefulness of orientation for many students, but suggested that some of the better prepared, better motivated students could be turned off rather than turned on by such an approach.

Professor Howe opposed the amendment, citing the experience of a task force staff support person who spoke highly of a colloquium in which he had participated at Carlton. It helped him get oriented to the academic expectations of the institution, to think about why he was there, and to consider the general education directions he would want to pursue. Professor Howe said the colloquia envisioned should be very valuable for students who had a wide variety of reasons for coming, different degrees of preparation, and many times not understanding the academic expectations of the University and the logic of the distribution requirements. Otherwise, they would confront them as obstacles or matters not to be taken very seriously. He pointed out that the report called for several pilot studies to try different kinds of colloquia for new entering freshmen, and other kinds for transfer students. Aric Nissen, student, favored the motion on the grounds that all students would not need the colloquia and should have the choice.

Karen Seashore Louis, associate professor of educational policy and administration and task force member, opposed the amendment, indicating that there appeared to be an assumption that students would make the appropriate choices early in their educational career. In her experience, where the graduate program had a colloquium associated with its many students would ask, "Why do I have to take this dumb course?" and yet when they were finished with it, they expressed appreciation for its content. A motion to extend the time for 5 minutes failed, and the amendment was defeated, 49 to 65, and the original motion approved.

Council on Liberal Education. Professor Ibele commended the Assembly for its spirited debate; he noted that as the year wore on the meetings had become increasingly feisty. He then introduced a proposal for establishment of a Council on Liberal Education proposed by his committee, a version that was slightly different from that appearing in the original docket. He explained that in discussion with those to be involved in the administration his committee had decided that the section on membership should be somewhat less proscriptive in designating numbers of faculty and students from various parts of the University.

Cathrine Wampach, associate professor, General College, called attention to what appeared to be exclusion of General College by referring to those units that offered the baccalaureate degree. Professor Ibele accepted a friendly amendment to add "and other appropriate colleges." Solomon Deressa, academic advisor, University College, noted the absence of academic advisors, who would be working with students on a day-to-day basis, from the membership list. The time for debate was then extended by vote for 5 minutes.

Professor Ibele was asked why the committee decided to be non-specific with regard to the membership. He said the point was the committee wanted to be as inclusive as possible by selecting the faculty and student body broadly to get the best talent. Jeff Winker, graduate student, suggested as a friendly amendment that both graduate and undergraduate students be designated. Professor Ibele then incorporated language to recognize both friendly amendments; the Deressa proposal was approved, and that language was added.

Professor Shively asked whether the Steering Committee would consider taking the legislation back to redraft it in light of the discussion, and he moved to recommit. His motion was seconded and approved.

Administrators in Assembly. Professor Ibele presented a "housekeeping" item to update language describing administrators eligible to serve in the Assembly. Professor Krislov asked "in the interests of elegance and aesthetics" whether the 4-digit classification number could be eliminated or at least be used only in a footnote. Mario Bognanno, professor of industrial relations and chair of the Committee on Committees, recalled that many years ago a group called the Council of Academic Advisors had sat in the Assembly; then came the Council of Deans; and finally the President's Cabinet, the Council of Undergraduate Deans, and a breakfast club of Graduate Deans. In desperation his committee had turned to the classification numbers. "The President, as a 9301, is a voting member of this body, but 9302, the vice president, is not." A motion to extend the time of debate failed; the vote was taken twice and yielded 110 in favor; as a constitutional amendment the legislation would be brought for a second reading at the next meeting.

Committee on Committees Responsibilities. Professor Bognanno introduced an amendment to the bylaws to provide for representation of certain constituencies on committees. He said there were groups in the University community that could not stand for Assembly membership and not serve on its committees, but who could provide valuable expertise. There was no discussion and the amendment was approved, with 103 voting for it.

Calendar. Professor Ibele presented the academic calendar for 1993-94 after moving for suspension of the rules, the calendar having been distributed at the door. He said various units of the University had requested that it be acted on at the present meeting. Tim Wolf, student, protested the continuing practice of a late start, late out, calendar, recognizing, he said, it was a futile gesture. He suggested that the Assembly try to get out of the old habit; it placed the students at a great disadvantage. The calendar was then approved. Professor Ibele was asked what the big hurry was; he said he wished he knew, and with that the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor

ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS, 1990-91

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly met four times during 1990-91.

(fm = forfeiture of membership for nonattendance)

FACULTY	Attended	Notified Clerk of Nonattendance or Alternate Attended
Albrecht, Lisa	4	0
Amershi, Amin	1	2
Anderson, Gary	4	0
Argento, Dominick	3	0

Bache, Robert	2	1
Bailey, Fredric	2	0
Bantle, John	2	0
Barbara, Paul	0	3
Bauer, Jean	2	2
Befort, Stephen	1	0
Berman, Hyman	4	0
Berryman, Glenn	3	0
Boss, Pauline	3	1
Bouchard, Thomas	2	1
Brenner, Mark	4	0
Brewer, Maria	3	1
Bruininks, Robert	1	2
Brunning, Richard	2	0
Buchwald, Henry	4	0
Burk, Thomas	3	1
Burkhart, Ann	2	1
Busta, Frank	3	1
Caplan, Arthur	0	3
Cardozo, Richard	2	2
Carr, Robert	3	0
Charvat, Iris	4	0
Cheng, H. H.	4	0
Chervany, Norman	3	1
Clayton, Paula	3	1
Crisham, Patricia	4	0
Cunningham, William	3	1
Cushing, Edward	4	0
Davison, Mark	3	1
DeLattre, Roland	3	1
Deressa, Solomon	3	1
Downing, Bruce	3	1
Dworkin, Martin	3	1
Dykstra, Robert	4	0
Eaton, Marcia	4	0
Egan, Ellen	4	0
Eidman, Vernon	4	0
Feigal, Robert	3	0
Ferrieri, Patricia	1	3
Foreman, Gertrude	4	0
Frohrib, Darrel	4	0
Gaston, Judith	4	0
Geisser, Seymour	2	2
Giebink, G. Scott	2	1
Giese, Clayton	4	0
Gillmor, Donald	3	0
Goldstein, Richard	4	0
Halley, J. Woods	3	1
Hamilton, David	2	2
Hammerschmidt, Dale (fm 4/91)	0	0
Hicks, Dale	1	3
Hogenkamp, Henricus	3	1
Hostetter, Margaret	0	4
Hsu, Mei-Ling	3	0

Humphreys, Roberta	2	1
Jacob, Harry	3	0
Jain, Naresh	3	0
Joeres, Ruth-Ellen	2	2
Johnson, Carol	2	1
Johnson, Dennis	3	1
Kagan, Alan	3	1
Kareken, John	1	1
Kaveh, Mostafa	3	1
Kegler, Stanley	1	1
Keierleber, Dennis	3	1
Kelly, Richard	2	2
Kersey, John	0	3
Kittleson, David	3	0
Kitts, James	3	1
Kobluk, Cal	2	1
Krislov, Sam	4	0
Larsen, Phil	4	0
Laslett, Barbara	1	3
Le, Chap	3	0
Light, Paul	2	0
Lipowitz, Alan	3	0
Liu, Benjamin	3	0
Louis, Karen	4	0
Marshall, Byron	2	1
Martin, Frank	2	0
Maruyama, Geoffrey	3	0
McClary, Susan	3	0
McKeever, Patrick	3	1
Miller, Carol	4	0
Miller, Frank	3	0
Montgomery, Jean	4	0
Moon, Roger	3	0
Newell, Kathleen	3	1
Newstrand, Lois	2	2
Oegema, Theodore	3	1
Pijoan, Carlos	3	0
Popkin, Michael	3	0
Poppele, Richard	3	1
Ramsey, James	4	0
Rasmusson, Donald	3	1
Reed, Peter	3	0
Robertson, Paul	0	3
Robinson, Julia	2	1
Rohrer, Richard	2	2
Schlotthauer, John	0	3
Serfass, Robert	4	0
Shapiro, Alan	4	0
Shapiro, Burton	4	0
Shier, Thomas	4	0
Shively, W. Phillips	4	0
Siegel, Gerald	4	0
Simmons, Michael	3	1
Skinner, Gail	1	3

Smalley, Jared	4	0
Sonkowsky, Robert	2	2
Soulen, Thomas	3	1
Staba, John	3	1
Stavrou, Theophanis	3	0
Stein, Marvin	4	0
Stelson, Kim	4	0
Stuthman, Deon	4	0
Sutton, Vernon	2	1
Swanson, Bert	3	1
Thompson, Theodore	4	0
Tirrell, Matthew	2	0
Towle, Howard	2	1
VanEssendelft, William	4	0
Vercellotti, Gregory	2	2
Wallace, John	1	1
Walsh, Thomas	3	0
Wambach, Cathrine	4	0
Wangensteen, O. Douglas	4	0
Warren, Barbara	3	1
Weckwerth, Vernon	4	0
Weinberger, Hans	4	0
Weich, Wayne	3	1
White, James	4	0
Williams, Carolyn	4	0
Wirtschafter, Jonathan	2	0
Yust, Becky	4	0
Zimmermann, William	3	0

FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE

Collins, W. Andrew	3	0
Deinard, Amos	3	0
Ibele, Warren	4	0
Kerr, Norman	4	0
Overmier, J. Bruce	0	4
Scott, Thomas	2	2
Striebel, Charlotte	2	0
Zimmerman, Shirley	4	0

STUDENTS

(Some students' forfeiture of membership is due to neglecting meetings in MSA.)

Alexander, Ryan	2	0
Binstock, Alan	3	1
Brekke, Jon	2	1
Bull, James	1	1
Bussert, David (apptd. 2/91)	2	0
Caver, Giles	1	1
Cross, Blaine	4	0
Dryke, Elizabeth	3	0
Dummann, Brian	3	0
Fust, Sue	4	0
Gackstetter, Gary	3	0
Gaskin, Norm (resigned 2/91)	1	0
Gilleskie, Gary	3	1
Hagestuen, Kristen	3	0
Handberg, Michael	2	1

Helgeson, Ryan (apptd. 2/91)	1	0
Heuer, Randy	3	0
Holtz, Douglas	2	0
Huisken, Tim (apptd. 1/91)	1	1
Jacobsen, Robert	4	0
Jensen, Erik	3	0
Johnson, Elizabeth (resigned 1/91)	0	0
Jordan, Paul (fm 3/91)	0	0
Koelsch, Claire	1	2
Kowalski, Kim	1	1
Lee, David	3	0
Lee, Peter (apptd. 4/91)	1	0
Lempe, Glenn (resigned 12/90)	0	0
Lillquist, David	3	0
Liveringhouse, Mark	2	0
Lory, John	3	0
Manresa, Tabitha (apptd. 3/91)	2	0
Mueller, Lori	3	0
Nissen, Aric	4	0
Ochoada, Orlando (apptd. 2/91)	2	0
Pham, Sandra	3	0
Rasmusson, Wendy (resigned 3/91)	2	0
Reynolds, Fiona	3	0
Rossi, Doug (fm 4/91)	1	0
Sage, Adora (resigned 1/91)	0	0
Sauter, Carrie	1	2
Schlueter, Marceen (apptd. 1/91)	0	1
Schmechel, Steve (apptd. 4/91)	2	0
Schrepfer, Brenda	1	1
Soukup, Steve	3	0
Steen, Jon (apptd. 3/91)	2	0
Thomas, Megan	2	0
Toepel, Ross (apptd. 2/91)	1	0
Tolbert, Denise	4	0
Warweg, Chris (apptd. 5/91)	1	0
Welter, Diane (resigned 1/91)	0	0
Wesson, Jennifer	1	0
Wikstrom, Jan	3	0
Williams, Kyle (fm 3/91)	0	0
Williams, Lorraine (apptd. 2/91)	1	1
Williamson, Tracy (resigned 1/91)	0	0
Winker, Jeff (apptd. 1/91)	2	0
Wolf, Tim	4	0

STUDENT STEERING COMMITTEE

Dittel, Bonnie (apptd. 2/91)	1	1
Ellison, Steve (resigned 1/91)	1	0
Morse, Timothy (resigned 1/91)	1	0
Sutter, Erin (apptd. 1/91)	2	0
Swick, James	3	0
Towle, Shawn	4	0
Velure, Christine	3	0