MAY 14, 1998

The fourth meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly for 1997-98 was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, May 14, 1998, at 2:00 p.m. Checking or signing the roll as present were 112 voting faculty/academic professional members, 28 voting student members, 1 ex officio member, and 5 nonmembers. President Mark Yudof presided.

I. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 1998-99
Action

Student Senator Jesse Berglund was elected vice chair of the Assembly for 1998-99.

II. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Statement of Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies and Practices
Action

MOTION 1:

That the Twin Cities Campus Assembly approve the following policies to standardize policies and practices for the Twin Cities campus for undergraduate students. The specific language to be acted on by the Assembly is underlined; all other language is explanatory or comment.

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Statement of Standard Undergraduate Academic Policies and Practices

Introduction

[This language accompanied the original report making recommendations for policy changes and was prepared by the Office of Planning and Analysis; the Committee on Educational Policy forwards it with approval.]

The purpose of this report is to propose that many policies and practices for Twin Cities undergraduate students be standardized. There is currently very significant variation across colleges.

This variation confuses and frustrates students.

This variation is a factor in the poor graduation and time-to-completion rates for Twin Cities students, who complete, on average, nearly 30 more credits than what is required for their degree programs.

This variation places great demands on staff in collegiate and central student support offices and on our student information systems, making them more complicated and costly to maintain than they need to be.

This variation is an obstacle to the development of a single undergraduate bulletin for the Twin Cities campus.

The change to semesters is an opportunity to rethink various aspects of our instructional programs. This must include the variation in undergraduate academic policies and practices on the Twin Cities campus. This is a problem now, and it will be even worse on semesters if it is not addressed.

There are 19 colleges/programs offering undergraduate degrees on the Twin Cities campus (counting each allied health program separately). For the 19 Twin Cities colleges/programs:

--   admissions is handled in 19 different ways

--   registration and course entry is handled in 15 different ways

--   some grades and grading issues are still handled in 13 different ways, even with the new grading
        policy

--   student performance is handled in 18 different ways

--   degree requirements and graduation is handled in 16 different ways

There is good reason for some variation in various policies and practices among Twin Cities colleges. But in many cases this variation exists for no apparent reason. It is instead the result of individual colleges and programs, lacking any common direction, doing what they think is best for students. The cumulative result, however, is a situation that is not in any student's best interest, especially those students who transfer from one college to another, only to discover a new and unexpected hurdle.

The Twin Cities colleges and programs have been consulted in developing the proposals presented in this report. Inevitably, if there is to be greater uniformity, there must be compromise where differences currently exist. The overall objective is to create an academic culture for our Twin Cities students that is rigorous, but fair, and far less confusing than what they currently face.

Some current policies and practices are shaped by the unique circumstances of an individual student. **It should be emphasized that each Twin Cities dean has the power to grant exceptions to policies, when special circumstances call for exceptions to be made.** Policies should not be designed for the exception, but exceptions should be granted when appropriate.

The Twin Cities colleges and programs are very different from one another. They each offer unique degree programs and courses. They each have unique facilities to support instruction and research in their disciplines. The faculties of these colleges are also all unique in certain respects, reflecting the character of the various disciplines. This kind of variation is good. It is what defines each college.

Much of the variation examined in this report, however, is not good. It adds nothing to a student's educational experience. It adds nothing of value to a college or program. Some of it is about significant matters (e.g., definitions of satisfactory academic progress). Some of it is just plain silly (e.g., committee names). All of this variation should be eliminated, both for the sake of our students and for the sake of our faculty and staff.

Organization of the Report

The report is organized under the following major headings: admissions, registration and course entry, grades and grading, student performance, and degree requirements and graduation.

Note: There are a number of other Senate and Assembly educational policies closely related to the policies proposed for action in this document. The Committee on Educational Policy assures the Assembly that at some point--it hopes in the not too distant future--these educational policies will be assembled in one place and ordered in a manner that is easily understood and readily accessible to faculty, staff, and students alike.

Admissions

In general, the admission of new high school (NHS) students and the admission of new advanced standing (NAS) students are handled in consistent ways. There is considerable variation, however, for some specific admissions policies and practices, as detailed below.

1.   New High School (NHS) and New Advanced Standing (NAS) Enrollment Targets:

Each college is responsible for proposing to the Admissions Office targets for the admission of New High School and New Advanced Standing students. These proposed targets are subject to the review and approval of the Provost for the Twin Cities campus and the Vice President for Health Sciences.

This effort is to be coordinated by the Director of the Office of Admissions, who works closely with each college.

This does not represent any change in the current policy and practice.

2.   New High School (NHS) and New Advanced Standing (NAS) Admissions Standards:

Each college is responsible for setting the standards that are to be used by the Admissions Office in admitting students to the college. For automatic admission by the campus priority deadline, New High School standards must be expressed by the college in terms of a minimum AAR or SAR score. Each college is also responsible for establishing whatever criteria are to be used for admission after the priority deadline. These standards and criteria are subject to the review and approval of the Provost for the Twin Cities campus and the Vice President for Health Sciences.

This does not represent any change in the current practice and policy.

3.   Conditional Admit: There is some confusion regarding conditional admit, because it is used in two different ways:

(1) Conditional Admit to Matriculate: Strictly speaking, all students are admitted subject to certain conditions (e.g., that they graduate from high school). Conditional admit in this sense means that a student will not be allowed to matriculate (or transfer to the University) unless certain conditions are met. This is the first way in which conditional admit is used, and the conditions vary by college and program (e.g., whether all high school preparation requirements need to be met or whether one or two deficiencies are allowed and, if so, in what areas).

(2) Conditional Admit to Graduate: Conditional admit is also used in a second sense to mean that a student can matriculate (or transfer to the University), but subject to certain conditions that must be satisfied before the student can graduate (e.g., that any deficiencies in satisfying high school preparation requirements are made up). Such conditions are in addition to normal degree requirements.

All colleges shall have a formal, written conditional admit policy that is specific with regard to both the matriculation and the graduation conditions that may be imposed on a student when they are admitted. It must also be clear that these policies apply to students new to the University, not to those transferring within the University.

4.   Readmission: The Twin Cities campus does not have a readmission policy for students who leave school for an extended period.

Undergraduates who have not been granted a "leave of absence" (see #12) and who do not register for two consecutive semesters (in day school or University College, but excluding summer session) shall be placed on "Inactive" status. Following one semester of non-registration, a student shall be sent information regarding both the meaning of Inactive status and the University's Leave of Absence policy. Students on Inactive status will need to contact their college office or the appropriate University College office (for students not wishing to remain active in their current program and not decided about an alternative) for approval to regain Active status before registering for another term.

Students in good academic standing at the time they became Inactive should routinely be allowed to return to Active status.

5.   Transfer Issues: In evaluating the course work of transfer students, some colleges and programs accept "D" grades, while others do not, and some colleges and programs accept courses that others would not.

The evaluation of transfer course work from outside the University is a complicated process. Each college and program is involved in evaluating course work in its disciplines. Whether or not transfer courses meet program or major requirements is a separate issue (see also item 20, D grades).

The Twin Cities campus shall not accept any transfer course with less than a "D" grade. Once a course has been accepted for transfer, all colleges and programs will honor this decision.

6.   Old Program Rules: There is variation among colleges regarding whether students returning to the University are to follow old or new program requirements. The amount of time students may be out without any possible change in program requirements varies by college.

A student who has left the University without a leave of absence for more than two consecutive semesters (not including summer session) will be held to new program requirements upon his or her return. A student returning after only one year out or less shall be allowed to follow the program requirements in effect when he or she was admitted. Exceptions should be made only for students who are returning after a formal leave of absence.

(See also item 12, leaves of absence.)

7.   Sunsetting: Some units do not accept course work if it was taken more than a specified number of years ago (anywhere from five to ten years). In these cases, the content is considered "sunsetted" and a student must retake the course(s) in order to be up-to-date in the discipline. There is some variation in the time limits for sunsetting course work. Currently each unit can set the maximum time limit before a student must retake the course.

Departments have the authority to sunset courses. Sunsetting may be done at the departmental level only, and may be done only for courses in the major, or specific prerequisites for the major. Units must clearly describe their sunsetting policies in their admissions materials, and departments must have the approval of

the dean to institute any sunset policies. Students shall be advised individually as to how they are affected by these policies.

8.   Declaring a Major: There is variation across colleges and programs in how students declare a degree program or major. There is also variation within colleges. CLA uses a premajor designation for many students.

There may be variation across colleges in how degree programs and majors are declared. Some colleges admit freshmen who have not declared a major. Some colleges and programs admit only upper division students who must choose a major when they transfer to a college. The procedures required by some departments are too complex and will not work on a semester-based calendar, when students will have only eight terms to make decisions about their education, rather than twelve.

When the University changes to semesters, CLA should abandon its premajor status and move students directly from undecided to major status. The only exception should be for students who plan to transfer to another college (e.g., allied health premajors).

Use of the words "declared" and "undeclared" are preferred to "decided" and "undecided" in connection with selecting a major, in all policies. If premajor status is abandoned, there needs to be a method of indicating the interest(s) of the student in the way that premajor status currently allows. If the student's status or plan is "undeclared," this can be done by use of sub-plans in the student's record. It is important to maintain this information for advising purposes.

All colleges shall review the policies and procedures for declaring a degree program or major within the college. The practice of requiring students to complete prerequisite course work, often in the discipline, should receive the most careful scrutiny, along with the use of other second-tier admissions standards.

Colleges have the authority to determine how students declare a major or degree program.

9.   Second-Tier Admissions Standards for Programs/Majors: Undergraduate students move through their degree programs in different ways. Some are admitted as freshmen to both a college and a major. Others are admitted to a college, but not to a major. Some are admitted to a college (e.g., CLA, General College) with plans to transfer eventually to another college.

Most colleges and some programs and majors have established various second-tier admissions standards for students who want to transfer to the college or declare a major. These second-tier admissions standards take various forms. Sometime a specified minimum GPA is required. Sometimes the successful completion of certain prerequisite courses--courses that sometimes must be taken in a particular sequence--is required. Sometimes the successful completion of certain prerequisite courses with a specified minimum GPA is required. In the absence of any campus-wide policy or procedure, these second-tier admissions requirements have been developed and implemented by each unit. The result is a confusing and frustrating set of expectations that limit student choice and impose additional barriers to graduation.

On quarters, there are a minimum of 12 registration periods when students most commonly change their status (e.g., declare a major, change a major, or transfer from one college to another). On semesters, there are a minimum of 8 registration periods--one-third fewer. On semesters, students will have to make decisions about choice of major and transfer to a different college sooner than is the case on quarters. On semesters, second-tier admissions standards must be very carefully developed and implemented.

All current second-tier admission standards, whether for admission to a college or program or major, shall expire at the end of the 1998-99 academic year, the last year on quarters. Colleges and departments shall

evaluate the need for such standards and develop and propose them to be effective for students matriculating in fall 1999, the first year on semesters. Department standards must be subject to college review and approval. College standards must be subject to review and approval by the Provost of the Twin Cities campus or the Vice President for Health Sciences.

10.   Full-time/Part-time Definitions: There is variation across the campus his how full-time and part-time student status are defined. For example, the minimum credit load required for a student to receive maximum, full-time federal financial aid (e.g., a Pell grant) is 12 credits, while the minimum credit load required for a student to receive a maximum, full-time Minnesota state grant is 15 credits. Although this variation is because of different government policies, not because of different college policies, colleges and programs are inconsistent in how they describe the situation. As a consequence, too many students confuse the 12 credit federal financial aid minimum with what is actually required to graduate in four years (i.e., 15 credits per term).

A student is defined as full-time if he or she is enrolled for at least 12 credits during a semester. Any student enrolled for fewer than 12 credits is defined as part-time. All admissions and registration materials must contain language emphasizing to students that they must complete at least 15 credits per semester to graduate within four years, and all advisors must inform students of the need to complete 15 credits per semester in order to graduate in four years.

11.   Undeclared: This is a "major" status for students who have not declared their major upon admission or for students who are in the process of transferring out of one major or unit to another major or unit. CLA begins putting an OW hold on undecided students with 90+ quarter credits. This is cleared either by seeing an adviser and declaring a major or by affirming that the student is still undecided. Theoretically, given current policies and practices, a student could stay undecided forever. Allowing students to remain in the "undecided" status beyond 60 semester credits is not conducive to timely graduation. Requiring students to declare a major before or upon the completion of 60 semester credits will be even more important with a semester-based calendar.

All freshmen-admitting colleges shall have an undeclared student status. All students shall be required to declare a major or be accepted into a program before or upon the completion of 60 semester credits. Once 60 credits have been completed, a student will not be allowed to register until they declare a major. (The student will be required to declare a major at the end of the term in which they complete 60 or more credits.)

12.   Leave of Absence (LOA): Some colleges have a leave of absence policy for students who decide to leave school and not register for a period of time and who notify the college of their intent. There is variation in requirements for return and whether a student is to follow old or new program requirements.

Colleges and programs are sometimes proactive in recommending that students take a leave of absence or "stop out," usually for personal reasons. This is a very individualistic practice. In recommending that a student "stop out," leave of absence policies and procedures should be used.

There should be a standard leave of absence form for all Twin Cities colleges; the form should have a place for indicating how long the leave of absence will be.

All colleges shall have a leave of absence policy for students who plan to leave school for more than two semesters. Students who follow the policy and whose leave is approved in accord with college policy need not apply for readmission when they return. Colleges may condition readmission on availability of space in a program, and if so, must caution the student that readmission will be conditioned upon availability of space.

All students shall be informed, when they request a leave, whether they will be held to old or new program requirements upon their return. If the leave of absence is for more than two academic years (i.e., four semesters), the student must follow new program requirements.

Registration and Course Entry

13.   Adviser Approvals: A variety of adviser holds are now being used to force students to see an adviser during their initial registration during orientation or during all freshman registration periods or during all lower division registration periods.

Removing unnecessary barriers to a student's academic progress is a laudable aim. However, there is a strongly-felt concern that individuals given responsibility for advising should have the discretion of imposing an "adviser hold" on a student's registration. This holds true at any stage during a student's undergraduate career.

As a way of developing options, for students who wish it, that allow students to reduce formal contact with advisers and accept more responsibility for their academic progress, it might be advisable to set up a pilot "self-advised" track for undergraduates.

There shall be one uniform adviser hold for all units. There shall also be available a hold for use by the major department.

14.   Credit Limits per Quarter: The maximum number of credits allowed before a student needs collegiate approval varies across units, from 18 to 21 quarter credits. A few units now set a minimum credit requirement, usually by default based on required "lock-step" registrations, particularly in specific health science areas. These requirements vary.

The maximum number of credits per semester for which a student will be allowed to enroll without approval is 20. College approval is required for a student to enroll for 21 or more credits in a semester. Units may set a minimum credit enrollment requirement per semester, but only if they provide explicit detail about the requirement in their admissions materials. Colleges are responsible for enforcement of any minimum credit enrollment requirement.

15.   Limited Enrollment Courses: Minimum and maximum enrollment limits can be set for any course section of any kind (e.g., lecture, laboratory, recitation, studio). There is significant variation in how such limits are set.

Most colleges and departments have no policy regarding the cancellation of low enrollment courses.

Enrollment limits in course sections are very necessary, for pedagogical reasons and because of limitations imposed by facilities constraints (e.g., size of classrooms, size of laboratories). All enrollment limits in course sections should be proposed by a department/program head/chair and approved by the appropriate dean.

In the day school, low enrollment courses or low enrollment sections of courses are canceled only by the department offering the course. In University College and Summer Session, low enrollment courses or low enrollment sections of courses can be canceled by the University College and Summer Session administrations, which fund the courses.

Under IMG the difference between the way in which University College and Summer Session and the rest of the University are funded is significantly different. The funding for all campuses and colleges is

directly affected by the tuition revenue they generate. Low enrollment courses and sections can affect tuition revenue, since the instructional staff assigned to them could be reassigned to areas of higher student demand. It is sometimes programmatically necessary to offer low enrollment courses and sections, but such decisions should be carefully made according to the policy of the college.

With regard to this issue, the primary difference between University College and Summer Session and the rest of the University's campuses and colleges is that faculty teaching in UC and Summer Session are usually paid on an overload basis. This is not an absolute difference. Some faculty teaching in UC and Summer Session do so as part of their workload under their regular 9-month or 12-month appointment. Some instruction in other colleges (e.g., the Carlson School of Management) is on an overload basis. Any college may pay faculty on an overload basis.

Each Twin Cities college and University College shall develop a policy regarding the cancellation of low enrollment courses or sections. These policies may allow variation by department within a college or variation by college within a campus.

16.   Prerequisites: Where prerequisites have been set, bulletins and course materials should explain that prerequisites may be enforced. Their purpose is to advise students to take only those courses for which the prerequisites have been met.

Departments and colleges should be selective in determining prerequisites for courses. Prerequisites should not be set for a course except in progressive, sequence courses or where departments can clearly demonstrate that a student will not be able to complete the course successfully without first completing the prerequisite course work.

Where prerequisites have been set, instructors may require that any student who has not taken the specified prerequisites for the course must withdraw. Instructors may, however, grant permission, on an individual basis, for a student to take a course without having taken the prerequisite(s).

In the rare case when a student takes a prerequisite course after successfully completing a subsequent course that required the prerequisite, credit for the prerequisite course will be granted. Colleges and departments, at their discretion, may also allow students to receive credit by examination for the prerequisite course.

 17.   Repeating Course Work: There is no policy stipulating how many times a student may repeat a course and under what circumstances. Some colleges permit a course to be repeated only when a student failed to earn a grade of C or better in the course. Some colleges allow a student to retake a course in which a passing grade of C or better was earned. This is **not** addressed in new grading policy.

SCEP takes the position that the policy on repeating courses adopted in the uniform grading policy should remain University policy, and recommends no change. The uniform grading policy does address the question of whether a student may repeat a course when a grade of C or better was earned: the policy places no restrictions on the circumstances under which a student may repeat a course. (Although it is unclear why anyone would do so, the uniform grading policy does not prohibit a student from repeating a course even though he or she may have earned an A in the course the first time.) The uniform grading policy adopted by the Senate reads as follows:

"In those instances when a college or campus permits a student to repeat a course, (a) all grades for the course shall appear on the official transcript, (b) the course credits may not be counted more than once toward degree and program requirements, and (c) only the last enrollment for the course shall count in the student's grade point average. The preceding sentence of this policy shall not apply to courses using the

same number but where students study different content each term of enrollment; all such courses falling under this provision must be approved by the college."

18.   Auditing Courses: Students auditing a course are required to pay full tuition, but do not take exams or do homework. An auditor is entered on the class roster (grade report), is counted as filling a seat in a controlled entry course, and is counted in an instructor's student contact hours. The rules for auditing course work are fairly rigorously enforced at the undergraduate level. A few units allow students to retake a previously audited course for a grade.

The number of students who take previously audited courses for credit is probably very small. Students who wish to "scope out" a class before taking it for credit--a practice we certainly wish to discourage--are much more likely to sit in on it without registering than to register as an auditor. In contrast, there are instances in which students may change academic plans such that they need to take a previously audited course for a grade. Overall, the policy is best written with the latter type of student in mind, rather than the former.

The rules for auditing course work should be rigorously enforced at all student levels. A student shall be allowed to take a previously audited class for a grade.

Grades and Grading

19.   S/N Grading Base Issues: Most units do not allow S/N grading in program and major course work unless the S/N grading system is preset by the unit for a specific course. Some units set a quarterly limit such as one S/N course for freshmen and two S/N for sophomores. There is inconsistency in what colleges say in bulletins about how many credits can be taken S/N.

According to Senate policy, the maximum number of S/N credits allowed to a student is 25% of degree-qualifying residence credits.

No unit shall allow S/N grading in program and major course work unless the S/N grading system is preset by the unit for specific courses. For a student who completes only the minimum number of 30 credits in residence, no more than 8 may be taken S/N. For other students it is 25% of the number of credits they take in residence at the University (any campus).

20.   "D" Grades: Currently, there is variation in whether D grades are allowed in major course work. Some units use A/B balance and others require C or above grades in major course work.

All units shall require a C- or better in each course in the major.

Student Performance

Academic Progress, Academic Probation, and High Academic Achievement: Colleges and programs use different systems for monitoring academic progress, different probation systems and holds for students who are in academic difficulty, and different systems for recognizing students who perform with distinction. This is the area where there is the greatest and most significant variation among collegiate units and programs.

There are different systems of monitoring academic progress, all of which are used in slightly different ways. There are different ways of using the probation system. There are different systems for recognizing high academic achievement. Within a single college one way of monitoring academic progress is sometimes used to identify students in academic difficulty, while another way of monitoring academic progress is used to identify students who perform with distinction.

There is no compelling reason for different colleges to use different systems. It is confusing to students as they move from one college to another. This is an area where there are also high systems costs because of all of the different kinds of reports that must be run every quarter and at the end of each academic year.

All colleges and programs should use the same standards and systems for monitoring academic progress, the same academic probation system, and one of two ways of recognizing high academic achievement. Academic progress, academic probation, and academic honors are discussed separately below.

SCEP's recommendations follow.

21.   Academic Progress: All colleges and programs require students to maintain satisfactory progress. The federal Department of Education also requires the Twin Cities campus to make sure that students receiving federal financial aid maintain satisfactory progress. The campus-wide definition used by the Office of Scholarships and Financial Aid (OSFA) recognizes some of the differences among colleges (e.g., it will use a GPA higher than 2.00 for students in those colleges that require a higher standard). Academic progress is also monitored to identify students who perform with distinction.

Colleges and programs use three different systems to monitor academic progress: i) GPA, ii) coefficient of completion, and iii) honors points.

Most colleges use only quarterly and cumulative GPA to monitor academic progress, either for purposes of identifying students in academic difficulty or for purposes of identifying students who perform with distinction.

Six colleges use coefficient of completion to monitor academic progress. Coefficient of completion is a measure of the percentage of course work that a student completes successfully. For example, if a student attempts 15 credits and completes 9 credits successfully with a grade of C- or better, then the student's coefficient of completion is 60 percent (i.e. 9/15). Most of the colleges that use coefficient of completion use it in conjunction with GPA. CLA is the only college that uses just coefficient of completion to monitor academic progress, although CLA uses it only to identify students in academic difficulty. CLA uses GPA to identify students who perform with distinction.

Those colleges that use coefficient of completion, use it in different ways (e.g., the value of the coefficient of completion required for satisfactory progress varies and the way in which withdrawals are handled varies). The exact formula used in CLA is: (credits graded A, B, C, S)/(credits graded A, B, C, S, D, F, N, I). The expectation in CLA is that a student will complete at least 75 percent of the credits attempted each academic year (first summer session through spring quarter).

Coefficient of completion can be a more lenient way of judging satisfactory academic progress than using just GPA. For example, a student who takes four 4-credit courses and completes three with a grade of C and one with a grade of F will have a coefficient of completion of 75 percent, which is satisfactory in CLA, but a GPA of less than 2.0, which is not satisfactory in most colleges.

The honor point system is an academic progress system that is used only by the Carlson School of Management (CSOM). Students earn honors points for each grade received (i.e., 2 for an A, 1 for a B, 0 for a C, -1 for a D, and -2 for an F. A student is placed on probation when he or she accumulates so many negative honors points.

The new University Grading Policy requires that a student's GPA for a term and cumulative GPA must be calculated at the end of each academic term.

Student progress shall be monitored by the college of enrollment after each term as well as annually. Term monitoring is based solely on GPA. The annual review may also include coefficient of completion in conjunction with GPA.

Coefficient of completion shall be defined campus-wide as: (credits graded A, B, C, S)/(credits graded A, B, C, S, D, F, N, I). Coefficient of completion shall be a standard University report available to any academic unit that wants to use it in monitoring academic progress. Plus or minus modifiers are dropped in determining coefficient of completion.

22. **Academic Probation:** Students who are not making satisfactory academic progress are initially placed on probation and may eventually be suspended. Most colleges have agreed to move to the "P" system. This is a probationary system that includes three holds: P1 (warning), P2 (contract), and P3 (suspension). There is some variation in how colleges use the "P" system, in part because of how they monitor academic progress. Some colleges and programs do not use the "P" system and continue to use old N holds or their own college specific holds. Some colleges and programs do not use holds when a student is placed on probation or suspended. University College does not currently recognize the holds put on suspended students.

SCEP concluded that the three-step probationary system was too complicated, and recommends instead the following simplified academic probation system.

All colleges and programs shall use the following probationary system. A student will be placed on probation if either the term or the cumulative GPA is below 2.0. A student remains on probation until both the term and the cumulative GPA is 2.0 or above. A student remains on probation if the term GPA is below 2.0, irrespective of whether the cumulative GPA is above 2.0. A student is suspended if, while on probation, the cumulative GPA is (or goes) below 2.0 and the term GPA is below 2.0 for two consecutive semesters.

A student on probation will have a hold placed on his or her record and must see an adviser in order to register and will be issued an override from the adviser in order to register at the queued time. A student on probation must complete a contract for academic performance, developed by the college of enrollment, and will not be allowed to register for subsequent terms unless the student's academic adviser and college office are satisfied that satisfactory academic progress is being made. If the student meets the terms of the contract, and the term and cumulative GPA are at least 2.00, the student will be removed from probation. If the contract goals are met but the cumulative GPA is still less than 2.00, the student will remain on probation. If goals are not met, the student will be suspended.

When suspended, a student is no longer in the program and cannot register for University courses for one full academic year. University College recognizes the probationary holds and does not allow students to register without the approval of their college. Following the suspension period, a student must petition the college to return according to a defined collegiate petition process. Students who are out for a longer period of time (i.e., three or more semesters) must follow the same procedures.

Upon return to the unit after petitioning to reenter, all units shall use a hold and contract for the purpose of monitoring the student's performance. If the student does not successfully complete the contract, he/she shall be suspended again, but then shall be required to reapply for admission, rather than petition to reenter.

Students may appeal suspension decisions to the college's Student Scholastic Standing Committee (SSSC). Readmission after a year's suspension is not automatic. To be readmitted, a student must petition the SSSC in writing and show evidence of changes in circumstances that demonstrate that the student will succeed in an academic program.

23.   Dean's List: There are various ways of recognizing high achievement on the Twin Cities campus. Most colleges and programs have a dean's list to recognize students at the end of each quarter. The dean's list system includes a quarterly transcript notation that recognizes high quarterly GPA. Not all colleges and programs have a dean's list and for those that do the required GPA varies. The College of Education and Human Development does not have a dean's list. It instead sends "good progress" letters to students completing 12 or more credits with a GPA of 3.75 or above. These letters, however, are not noted on a student's transcript.

All colleges and programs shall publish each term a dean's list, consisting of students who achieved a 3.67 GPA or higher and who completed a minimum of 12 credits (including University College credits). There will be a transcript notation for each term that a student achieves the dean's list.

24.   Student Scholastic Standing Committee (SSSC): All colleges and programs have a committee to which student academic progress issues are referred. The names of these committees vary slightly. In order to assist students in understanding where these issues are dealt with, SCEP recommends a uniformity in names.

All colleges shall use the same name: Student Scholastic Standing Committee (SSSC).

Degree Requirements and Graduation

25.   GPA Requirement for Graduation: There is some variation in the GPA required for graduation (e.g., some colleges only require a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.00 in courses in the college or courses in the major program).

The cumulative GPA required for graduation shall be 2.00, and shall include all, and only, University course work.

26.   Special Requirements: Some colleges and programs set other requirements or conditions in addition to the minimum GPA requirement. Human Ecology, for example, requires a GPA of 2.5 in the major program. CLA sets a limit on the number of D's, even if a student's GPA is greater than 2.00. Agriculture requires a coefficient of completion of .75.

A student who is admitted to a degree program or major and who completes all campus, college, and program requirements with a minimum GPA of 2.00 in the major and a cumulative GPA of 2.00 shall be allowed to graduate. Additional standards or conditions shall not be imposed.

27.   Residency Issues: There is some variation in how the University's residency rule is applied. Some colleges require that a minimum number of credits be taken in the college. Among colleges that have such a requirement the number of credits varies. Some colleges and programs require that the last 30 credits must be taken while the student is enrolled in the college or program.

Residency is a University requirement that should not vary by college or program. Colleges and programs must adhere to University Senate policy. This requires that in order to earn a degree at the University, a student must complete a minimum of 45 credits at the University and that the student's last 30 credits must be at the University. For semesters, this will be 30 and 20 credits, respectively.

Residency should not solely be in the University. It is reasonable to expect that some minimum number of credits for a degree should be taken while the student is enrolled in the college in which that degree is offered. With residency in the University, it would be possible for a student to graduate with very few courses taken from the University department offering the major.

In order to complete a degree at the University, a student must take a minimum of 30 semester credits offered through the University, including 24 credits taken after admission to the major or program and taken from the college offering the major or program.

28.   Deadlines/Dates for Graduation: There is variation in how much notice a student must give of her or his intention to graduate.

The Office of the Registrar shall set the date by which a student must notify the University of intention to graduate.

29.   Types of Electives for Graduation:

a) Some colleges and programs set restrictions on the kinds of courses that students can use as electives.

Generally, electives should be just that--courses that students are free to elect or choose. The Committee on Educational Policy, however, believes that certain restrictions are appropriate, and sets them out in the proposed policy. The limit is based on the current practices of the colleges (although the specific credit limits vary slightly from college to college). It is also appropriate for advisers to influence a student's choice of electives, but there should not be rules that actually restrict a student's choice.

b) Special Course Usage

Colleges and programs commonly set maximum credit limits on four kinds of courses: i) applied music courses, ii) physical education courses, iii) ROTC courses, and iv) tutoring/study skills courses. Following discussion with the Senate Consultative Committee, it was agreed that policy could be set for three of the areas, but that language governing ROTC courses needed further consideration, in order to avoid conflict with applicable federal regulations.

c) Bracketing Course Work

Bracketing is the practice of not including a course in the calculation of a student's GPA and not counting the course as satisfying any degree requirements, including electives. Brackets are put around such courses on a student's transcript. Hence the name. This is a manual process.

Bracketing is used for two separate and distinct purposes:

Repeated courses: When a student repeats a course, all prior attempts are usually bracketed and only the most recent attempt counts. Some colleges instead bracket all but the highest grade.

Programmatic: Some colleges bracket course work that they do not want included as part of their degree programs.

The new grading policy stipulates that when a course is repeated, only the most recent attempt counts and all prior attempts and grades are bracketed.

No more than 6 semester credits from physical education, study skills, or applied music (in any combination) will count toward a student's degree, unless the credits are a required part of the student's

program requirements. This provision does NOT mean a student may count 6 credits of physical education, 6 in study skills, and 6 in applied music; it establishes a TOTAL of 6 credits from all three areas combined as the number that will count toward a degree.

No department or college may bracket the courses of another department or college. Any course that carries University credit in one department or college must carry University credit in all other University departments and colleges, as an elective, at minimum, including all transfer course work that is accepted when a student is admitted. Some courses which carry University credit may not count toward college or department/program degree requirements, or may, if a student changes programs, exceed the limit of 6 credits from the fields identified in the preceding paragraph, and thus not count toward the degree.

<div align="right">

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

</div>

DISCUSSION:

Professor Laura Koch, chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), recalled for senators the Assembly discussion of this item from the April meeting. SCEP has been reviewing undergraduate policies across the 19 Twin Cities colleges and noticed that there is great variation among colleges. This has created confusion for students and programming changes with the new PeopleSoft system. Professor Koch stressed that even if the policies are approved, deans will still have the authority to grant exemptions.

Following the last Assembly meeting and discussion within SCEP, the policy on prerequisites was modified to reflect concerns previously raised. The policy on types of electives for graduation has also been modified. In the earlier proposal, ROTC courses were included. Since there is some confusion as to whether ROTC is a separate program, however, it has been removed. SCEP will be reconsidering the ROTC issue in the future.   A credit limit was also added for physical education, study skills, and applied music courses, except when they are part of a major program.

One senator expressed concern that under the "prerequisites policy" an instructor could ask a student to withdraw from a class midway through the term because the student had not taken the appropriate prerequisite.   The senator encouraged SCEP to modify the policy to require that instructors ask for a withdrawal the first day of class so that the student can receive a refund of his/her tuition or have sufficient time to enroll in another course for that term. Professor Koch replied that there is no way for the instructor to know by the end of the first class whether or not a student has a specific prerequisite. Furthermore, there is a policy in place regarding returning registration fees to students.

With no further discussion a vote was taken and the motion was approved by a majority of members present and voting.

<div align="right">

APPROVED

</div>

MOTION 2:

That the Twin Cities Campus Assembly approve the following delegation of authority:

The Assembly delegates to the Committee on Educational Policy authority to make changes in these policies, subject to the following provisions. First, all such changes shall be reported to the Assembly at its next meeting. Second, no such changes will be effective until after the changes have been reported to and ratified by the Assembly.

COMMENT:

There is concern about how readily these policies can be amended, and that requiring approval by the Assembly is a laborious and time-consuming process. The Council of Undergraduate Deans has recommended proposing this language.

<div align="right">

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

</div>

DISCUSSION:

Professor Koch reviewed Motion 2 and opened the floor for discussion. Several senators were uncomfortable with granting a committee the authority to make future changes to the policies without approval by the Assembly. This is a deviation from Senate and Assembly practice.   It seems more appropriate, they said, to have the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) approve changes and then have the Assembly vote on them at its next meeting.

Professor Koch said that could be problematic if SCEP votes to change a policy and the changes are implemented and then the Assembly votes against the changes.

A number of people argued in favor of Assembly ratification of changes before implementation. They said the governance process should be preserved and that it is on the Assembly floor where students and faculty have an opportunity to voice their opinion.

A SCEP member noted that since the rules are so detailed, different conditions might arise that would require swift action. Most changes he thought would be minor procedural ones.

Professor Koch was asked to clarify whether the motion means that when the change is "reported" to the Assembly, it has the authority to overrule the change? "Yes," she replied. " The Assembly always has the right to overrule itself and amend its own policies."

A friendly amendment was then made and accepted to change the last line of the motion to:

> **"Second, no such changes will be effective until after the changes have been reported and ratified by the Assembly."**

A senator challenged whether this language was necessary since the Assembly always has the authority to overrule.

A second motion calling for leave to amend the proposal was approved. The following motion was then proposed:

> **To add the following language:**
>
> **"If the Assembly decides by two-thirds vote of those present and voting that a proposal brought to it is significant enough for a vote by the Assembly, the proposal will then be debated by the Assembly."**

A senator said that this motion seems to go against the point of the original motion, which is to save time. A vote was taken on the amendment and it failed.

Because the time for discussion of this item had expired, a motion to extend the debate by five minutes was made and seconded, but was not approved.

The vote was then taken on the original motion, as amended by the friendly amendment, and was approved by a majority of those present and voting.

APPROVED

[Motion 2 includes the amended language.]

III. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Proposed Schedule for the Twin Cities Campus
Action

PREAMBLE

The Assembly Committee on Educational Policy (ACEP) and the Provost for Arts, Sciences, and Engineering appointed a subcommittee last year (Winter 1997) to consider complaints that arose from students taking courses on both the Minneapolis campus and the St. Paul Campus. The complaints related to the students' inability to move between the two campuses and take courses in a timely manner; a number of faculty reported that it was disruptive to have students enter classes late or leave early in order to get to or from a class on the other campus. Prior to fall 1996, the class schedules on the two campuses were staggered; that staggering ended at the request of a number of faculty, staff and administrators on the St. Paul campus, primarily because the St. Paul campus was losing a class hour during the day. The request was granted by ACEP.

The "staggered class" subcommittee considered numerous options regarding the scheduling of classes as well as transportation issues and issues related to semesters, and actually walked the campuses and rode the buses in order to judge the amount of time it takes to get different places.

ACEP has concluded that there are two options the Assembly might consider for the Twin Cities staggered class schedule, but wishes first to confirm that staggered class starting times are desired. As a result, three motions are offered.

Motion 1 affirms that staggered class starting times should be implemented. If Motion 1 is defeated, Motions 2 and 3 are moot.

Motions 2 and 3 are the two different options that ACEP has identified as reasonable alternatives. A majority vote in favor of Motion 2 will render Motion 3 moot. If Motion 2 does not receive a majority, then the Assembly may proceed to vote on Motion 3. If neither Motion 2 or 3 receives a majority, but Motion 1 is adopted, ACEP will need further advice from the Assembly on how to proceed.

MOTION 1:

To adopt a staggered class schedule for the Twin Cities campus.

DISCUSSION:

Professor Laura Koch, chair of the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP), presented the motion to stagger the class schedule for the Twin Cities campus.

She was asked about the practice at UW-Madison and replied that Madison has a 7:45 start time. She was not sure, however, of the amount of time between their classes.

Has there been any discussion with the transportation office and the unions regarding a 7:45 start time, and what time would support staff be required to start? Professor Koch said the transportation representatives have been active participants in the discussions. They assured SCEP that they had talked to the MTC and adjustments could be made. The committee has not talked with the unions regarding a 7:45 start time.

With no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion was approved by a majority of members present and voting.

APPROVED

MOTION 2:

To approve Option I, as follows:

OPTION I

Period	East Bank/West Bank	Saint Paul
I	7:45-8:35	8:15-9:05
II	8:50-9:40	9:20-10:10
III	9:55-10:45	10:25-11:15
IV	11:00-11:50	11:30-12:20
V	12:05-12:55	12:35-13:25
VI	13:10-14:00	13:40-14:30
VII	14:15-15:05	14:45-15:35
VIII	15:20-16:10	15:50-16:40
IX	16:25-17:15	16:55-17:45

NOT APPROVED

MOTION 3:

To approve Option II, as follows:

OPTION II

0 (optional)		7:25-8:15
I	8:00-8:50	8:30-9:20
II	9:05-9:55	9:35-10:25
III	10:10-11:00	10:40-11:30
IV	11:15-12:05	11:45-12:35
V	12:20-13:10	12:50-13:40
VI	13:25-14:15	13:55-14:45
VII	14:30-15:20	15:00-15:50
VIII	15:35-16:25	16:05-16:55
IX	16:40-17:30	17:10-18:00

APPROVED

COMMENT:

1. These schedules allow 15 minutes passing time within each campus

2. Cross-passing time is 45 minutes from Minneapolis to St. Paul, and 50 minutes from St. Paul to Minneapolis. To manipulate the schedules so the time between classes is less leads to the situation that the period is acceptable for students going one way, but becomes unacceptable the other.

3. The East Bank/West Bank start time is earlier as that is a transit hub for students coming commuting to the University. Many students leave from the East Bank for St. Paul.

4. This allows both campuses the full allotment of class periods during the day, although the St. Paul classes would run until 6:00 p.m. if Option II were adopted. The option of a zero-hour is also provided for St. Paul with Option II.

LAURA COFFIN KOCH, Chair
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

With the approval of Motion 1, Professor Koch reviewed the scheduling options outlined in Motions 2 and 3. There are two concerns at this time, she said. One is whether extra time in the day is needed for classes as the U changes to semesters. This will be an issue, she said, because classroom space will be lost due to construction projects. A second concern is that students do not favor the 7:45 start time and might not register for classes that start that early.

Several student senators confirmed that they would avoid a 7:45 start time and would prefer having classes into the evening. They felt that Motion 3, with a 7:45 start time for St. Paul, would affect fewer students. Many voiced the opinion that early morning lecture classes were not desirable. One senator said ROTC students and athletes would also be disadvantaged by an early start time.

Given the student opinion on the early start time, other senators inquired about the affect of a later school day on extension classes. In response, Professor Koch said the University is trying to create a seamless curriculum, where day and night classes are equal. Therefore, they would continue as they are now.

At this time, the vote was taken. Motion 2 failed and Motion 3 was approved as the schedule of choice.

CONSENT AGENDA
Action

Agenda Items IV. and V. are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature and are offered as a "Consent Agenda" to be taken up as a single item with one vote. Any item will be taken up separately at the request of a senator. As bylaw amendments, 91 votes are required for approval.

IV. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
Assembly Steering Committee Membership

MOTION:

To amend the Assembly Bylaws, Article III., Section 7, Steering Committees, as following: (new language is <u>underlined</u>; language to be deleted is ~~struck out~~)

ARTICLE III. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

7. STEERING COMMITTEES

. . . .

Assembly Steering Committee

Membership

The Assembly Steering Committee shall be composed of 7 (or possibly 8) elected members of the faculty, 5 elected undergraduate and graduate/professional students, and the vice chair of the Assembly. The numbers of undergraduate and graduate/professional students on the Student Steering Committee shall be as follows:

~~1993-94~~	~~4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional~~
~~1994-95~~	~~3 undergraduates, 2 graduate/professionals~~
~~1995-96~~	~~4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional~~
1996-97	3 undergraduates, 2 graduate/professionals
1997-98	4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional
<u>1998-99</u>	<u>3 undergraduates, 2 graduate/professionals</u>
<u>1999-00</u>	<u>4 undergraduates, 1 graduate/professional</u>
<u>2000-01</u>	<u>3 undergraduates, 2 graduate/professionals</u>

COMMENT:

The amendment extends the present pattern of Twin Cities student representation on the Assembly Steering Committee through 2001.

<div align="right">
VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
</div>

V. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Restructuring the Assembly Committee on Committees

MOTION:

To amend the Assembly Bylaws, Article III, Section 1, Committee on Committees, as follows: [new language is underlined; language to be deleted is struck out]

ARTICLE III. TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

1. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Assembly Committee on Committees appoints members of certain committees of the Assembly and advises the Assembly Steering Committee on the committee structure of the Assembly. The faculty/academic professional representatives shall serve as the Faculty Assembly Committee on Committees and the student representatives shall serve as the Student Assembly Committee on Committees.

Membership

The Assembly Committee on Committees shall be composed of the elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional and student representatives from of the Twin Cities campus to the Senate Committee on Committees. It shall be composed of 6 elected faculty/academic professional members and those students of the Senate Committee on Committees elected from the Twin Cities campus, but not exceeding four. Faculty/academic professional members must have served as members of the Assembly within the last five ten years.

A special faculty/academic professional nominating committee, appointed by the Faculty Steering Committee and approved by the faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly, shall nominate twice as many faculty/academic professional candidates for the committee as are to be elected each year. These candidates shall be announced in the Assembly docket for the last regular meeting of the academic year. Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by the petition of 12 faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly, provided that the petition is in the hands of the clerk of the Assembly the day before the Assembly meeting. At the last regular Assembly meeting of the year, the faculty/academic professional representatives of the Assembly shall elect by secret ballot two members of the committee for three-year terms. No faculty/academic professional member is eligible to serve more than two consecutive full terms. In the case of a tie, the chair of the Assembly shall cast the deciding vote.

Student members shall be elected in accordance with the rules outlined in Article III, Section 2, of the University Senate Bylaws.

The elected representatives of the undergraduate students shall be elected by the Minnesota Student Association, according to procedures determined by the Minnesota Student Association. The elected representatives of the professional/graduate students shall be elected by the Graduate and Professional

Student Assembly, according to procedures determined by the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Students shall serve a one-year term and are eligible for re-election.

The chair of the Senate Committee on Committees shall serve as the chair of the Assembly Committee on Committees. In the event the chair is from another campus, the Assembly Committee on Committees shall elect a chair from among its members.

Duties and Responsibilities

a.   To forward annually to the Assembly for approval names of faculty members, academic professionals, students, and chairs it recommends for appointment to those committees of the Assembly specified in the Bylaws of the Assembly. The committee shall give consideration to 1) representation from the various units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the faculty/academic professional or student member currently is serving; 3) the principle of rotation of committee assignments; 4) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, and student members; and 5) expressions of interest in committee service offered by faculty, academic professionals, and students. In addition, the committee shall select members of the Assembly for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Assembly and its committees. The committee also shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, sex, and academic rank in constituting committees.

e̶ b.   To review annually the committees of the Assembly and recommend to the Assembly Steering Committee any changes in committee structure, charge, or membership which it deems appropriate.

g̶ c.   To recommend to the Assembly Steering Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

h̶ d.   To submit an annual report to the Assembly.

Faculty Assembly Committee on Committees

The chair of the Assembly Committee on Committees shall serve as the chair of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Committees.

Duties and Responsibilities

a.   ~~Faculty/academic professional members shall~~ To furnish the full committee a slate of faculty/academic professional committee nominees~~, and student members shall furnish the full committee a slate of student nominees~~ for review and recommendations.

b.   To solicit annually from each newly elected faculty/academic professional member of the Assembly a list of Assembly committees on which the member of the Assembly is serving or has an interest in serving.

c.   To conduct a survey, at least every three years, of faculty/academic professional interest in serving on committees of the Assembly and make a summary of this study available to the Assembly.

d. To request annually from deans, directors, and department heads a list of faculty/academic professional members who they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.

f. To select an additional voting representative from a non-eligible constituency of the University for placement on the appropriate committee for a term of one year, if the Assembly Steering Committee determines that a committee of the Assembly will benefit from such representation.

g. To recommend to the Student Assembly Committee on Committees and the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

Student Assembly Committee on Committees

The chair of the Student Senate Committee on Committees shall also serve as chair of the Student Assembly Committee on Committees unless that individual is from an outstate campus. In that event, the Student Assembly Committee on Committees shall elect its chair from amongst its members. The term of office shall be for one year and the chair shall be eligible for re-election to that position.

Duties and Responsibilities

a. To furnish the full committee a slate of student committee nominees for review and recommendations. Consideration shall be given to 1) representation from the various colleges and units when appropriate; 2) the number of committees on which the undergraduate student or graduate/professional student member currently is serving; 3) the recommendations of the respective committee chairs, faculty, academic professional, undergraduate student and graduate/professional student members, and the presidents of the respective Twin Cities student associations; and 4) expressions of interest in committee service offered by undergraduate students and graduate/professional students. In addition, the committee shall select Twin Cities student senators for committee membership when appropriate to encourage communication between the Student Senate and the committees and shall strive to assure full and adequate representation by race, gender, and class rank in constituting committees.

b. To solicit annually from each newly elected Twin Cities member of the Student Senate a list of Assembly committees on which the senator is serving or has an interest in serving.

c. To request annually from the Twin Cities student association presidents a list of students whom they believe have the requisite interest and experience to serve on specific committees.

d. To recommend to the Faculty Assembly Committee on Committees and the Assembly Steering Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

COMMENT:

The above amendments reflect revisions requested by the Student Committee on Committees to more clearly identify the duties and responsibilities of the Student Committee on Committees and to clarify the selection process for the student members. Parallel amendments to the Senate bylaws appear on the University Senate agenda.

VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION:

The Consent Agenda as presented was approved with 98 in favor and 0 opposed.

APPROVED

[End of Consent Agenda]

VI. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION
Action by Faculty and Academic Professional Members

MOTION:

That the Faculty Assembly approve the following slate of nominees to fill one 1998-99 vacancy and two 1998-2001 Twin Cities faculty/academic professional vacancies on the Committee on Committees:

ONE-YEAR TERM

NANCY HERTHER, Associate Librarian, Reference and Consultation Services, University Libraries. University Senate member: 1995-98.

MARY JO KANE, Associate Professor, Kinesiology & Leisure Studies, College of Education and Human Development. University Senate member: 1994-97. Committee participation: Professional Studies Provostal Consultative Committee, 1996-98 (Chair 1996-98).

THREE -YEAR TERM

JOHN ANDERSON, Professor, Biochemistry, College of Biological Sciences. University Senate member: 1992-95. Committee participation: Library Committee, 1994-97.

GAIL PETERSON, Associate Professor, Psychology, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1994-97. Committee participation: Facilities Management Subcommittee, 1995-99; FCC-Nominating Committee, 1997 and 1998.

NAOMI SCHEMAN, Professor, Philosophy, College of Liberal Arts. University Senate member: 1982-85, 1991-93. Committee participation: Educational Policy Committee, 1986-88; Equal Employment Opportunity for Women Committee, 1994-97 (Chair 1995-97).

BILLIE WAHLSTROM, Professor, Rhetoric, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences. University Senate member, 1995-98. Committee participation: Council on Liberal Education, 1991-97; Judicial Committee, 1993-96, 1997-2000.

INFORMATION:

The Twin Cities Campus Assembly Bylaws specify that the Assembly shall elect by written ballot at its spring quarter meeting faculty/academic professional members to fill vacancies on the Assembly Committee on Committees from a slate of candidates provided by a special nominating committee. Other candidates may be nominated by petition of 12 members of the Assembly. Petitions to nominate candidates not on the 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.

The elected Twin Cities faculty/academic professional members of the committee whose term continue at least through 1998-99 are:

<div align="center">

Emily Hoover, College of Agricultural, Food, and Environmental Sciences
Karen Karni, Medical School
Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Institute of Technology

</div>

<div align="right">

W. ANDREW COLLINS, Chair
CATHERINE FRENCH
M. JANICE HOGAN
TONI McNARON
THEODORE OEGEMA

</div>

DISCUSSION:

With no discussion, the slate of nominees was approved. Following the approval of the slate, Professors Mary Jo Kane, John Anderson, and Naomi Scheman were elected by paper ballot.

<div align="right">

APPROVED

</div>

<div align="center">

VII. FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
1998 Classroom Management Recommendations
Information

1998 Classroom Management Recommendations
<u>with target dates</u>
(These recommendations draw heavily upon the 1995 Classroom Study)

</div>

1.   Create a Coordinator for classroom management
<u>Appoint, designate, or hire a single individual who will be responsible for the coordination of the management of the entire scope of these recommendations.</u> This person would be responsible for coordinating the activities of the units currently involved in classroom management activities, should be

given authority over all aspects of classroom management so that s/he can make a final decision if consensus between the coordinated units is not achievable, must have sufficient budget to accomplish the tasks of classroom management, will report to the Office of the Executive Vice-President and Provost, and should be focused on classroom management and not fragmented by additional duties at the University. For this position to be effective, it is critical that the individual in it be included in all discussions about classroom management issues. The Office of the Executive Vice-President and Provost is responsible for creating and filling this position and should report back to the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning on its progress. Target date for having this Coordinator in place is July 1, 1998.

2.   Create an advisory mechanism
Develop a mechanism within SCEP and Facilities Management Subcommittee to provide advice to the Coordinator on issues concerning classroom management. Rather than develop a parallel system for input into classroom management issues, the current governance structure should be used. Because issues range from educational policy to facilities management to finance and planning, SCEP and Facilities Management Subcommittee (which reports to the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning) appear to be the best candidates for this responsibility. It is likely that both committees will need to devise a mechanism to get appropriate input from faculty, staff, and students that exceeds that possible from the membership of their committee. For example, to ensure appropriate input into design standards for technology upgrades, representatives from Media Resources, Information Technology, and departments/colleges already heavily invested in technology should be part of a working group providing input, advice, and counsel. To insure that this advisory system provides feedback in a timely manner, the Coordinator (mentioned in recommendation #1 above) should be an ex officio, non-voting member of each Senate committee. Target date for having mechanism in place is October 1, 1998.

3.   Train faculty to use technology
Develop a systematic method of training faculty to use the technology that is or will be placed in classrooms. Establish a program to train faculty to use both existing and future technological equipment. This program should include broad training for the development of presentation materials that maximize the potential of the technology and enhance the student learning experience and specific training relating to the equipment in specific classrooms. Some of this already exists (e.g., within the Digital Media Center and Room Scheduling), but it is currently inadequate for our needs. This program may be assigned to an existing office but is to be overseen by the Coordinator. It should be noted that the broad training should be provided on an on-going basis during the year, but the specific training is likely to be concentrated at times before the academic term begins as faculty prepare to use specific assigned classrooms. Target date for a pilot program is September 1, 1998. Full implementation target date is August 1, 1999.

4.   Establish an immediate contact system
Develop an immediate-response classroom help/support service to respond to maintenance, support, and service issues encountered by faculty and instructors in their daily classroom use. A central contact point should be established for all classroom problem calls. (This does not preclude local/regional support activities.) Target date for implementation is September 1, 1998.

5.   Consider reorganization
Consider reorganization of the various units involved in all aspects of classroom management. It may be structurally more efficient for the various groups involved in room scheduling, maintenance, repair, upgrade, training, response, etc. to be organized in a different way. This should be studied. Target date for recommendation from such a study is July 1, 1999.

6.   Define standards
Provide a base-line quality standard and define a higher level of support service for users of classroom technology that promotes the use of effective, appropriate technology for instruction and learning in the

classroom. These standards can be used to improve the quality of the existing facility to support the learning modalities of today. They should be based on the types of classrooms generally in existence at the University and similar institutions of higher education. Some initial work is available in the 1995 Classroom Study, so this should be used as a starting point for discussion. Implementation target date is March 1, 1999.

7.   Provide a plan and adequate funding to implement and maintain standards
Upgrade all University classrooms to the defined baseline of quality. Establish and fund a five-year capital improvement program to achieve this objective. This recommendation was put on a 5 year time frame in the 1995 study. The Capital and Supplemental Requests will make an impact on this recommendation, so it should be reviewed now that the legislative budget process is complete. Target date November 1, 1999.
- Fund the improvement of all classrooms to an acceptable level of physical condition and functional capability.
- Maintain all classrooms at the defined baseline of upgraded quality to ensure they remain in acceptable condition.
- Make a parallel funding commitment for management and operations, to ensure these classrooms are fully utilized.

Establish and fund a five-year capital improvement program to broaden the availability and upgrade the quality of educational technology and related resources in classrooms. Target date November 1, 1999.
- Develop a systematic method of upgrading technology in classrooms to enhance teaching.
- Develop a strategic plan for technology enhancement that will provide cost-efficient access to classroom technology as needs of collegiate programs dictate.
- Develop a comprehensive program for improvements, funding, service, support and training to maximize the use and value of these resources.

Increase and stabilize the level of funding for the maintenance, repair, and operational support for classroom technological equipment. This funding should exist in normal allocations, not be add-ons to the budget as in the current Legislative Request. Target date July 1, 2000.

Develop a road map to the future by initiating a process to explore and develop innovative new learning environment models. New classroom models will need to be created to take advantage of new information technology and the evolution of teaching methods coming from new discoveries about how learning occurs. New types of classrooms, more responsive to evolving needs, will supplant current classrooms over time. Target date December 1, 1999.

8.   Monitor the progress of the following recommendations from the 1995 Classroom Study which are already in progress. Coordinator, along with Advisory Group, should make new recommendations as appropriate. Target date for initial review is November 1, 1998.

> **Automation of scheduling**
> This is in process, but should be monitored for effectiveness.
>
> **Upgrade Maintenance and Housekeeping Services**
> The 1995 Study recommended an increase in the level of funding for the maintenance and repair of classrooms, rescheduling of the majority of maintenance and repair and housekeeping services delivery to non-class hours, and upgrading of the standard of maintenance / housekeeping service. The progress of these recommendations needs to be reviewed.
>
> **Utilization Policy**
> The 1995 Classroom study recommended weekly room hour usage goals of 32 hours per week based on 45 daytime hours per week with a station utilization of 65 percent be established. It also suggested that there was an excess of classrooms based on these recommended standards. These standards should be reviewed as the University converts to semesters, with new policies and

standards adopted as necessary so that the classroom need and supply are balanced. Once these are adopted, steps must be taken to ensure that both policies and standards are clearly understood and followed. A recommendation to reduce or increase the number of classrooms may be a result of this review.

9. **Review or reconsider** **the following recommendations from the 1995 Classroom Study for validity and accuracy.** Two recommendations in the 1995 Classroom Study (to centralize scheduling of all classrooms and to evaluate utilization of meeting and conference rooms) are controversial and should be reviewed to determine if the University community wishes to address these items. If yes, the Coordinator, along with Advisory Group, should initiate the discussion. Target date for initial review of the recommendations (not suggesting that any action will result from this review) is January 1, 1999.

Summary of recommendations, target dates, and responsible authority

Recommendation	Target Date	Responsible Authority
1. Create a Coordinator for classroom management	July 1, 1998	Office of Executive Vice-President and Provost
2. Create an advisory mechanism	October 1, 1998	University Senate (SCEP and Facilities Management Subcommittee)
3. Train faculty to use technology	Pilot: September 1, 1998; Full: August 1, 1999	Coordinator and Advisory committees
4. Establish immediate contact system	September 1, 1998	Coordinator
5. Consider reorganization	July 1, 1999	Coordinator and Advisory committees
6. Define standards	March 1, 1999	Coordinator and Advisory committees
7. Provide a plan and adequate funding to implement standards	1999-2000	Coordinator and Advisory committees
8. Monitor the progress of recommendations from the 1995 Classroom Study which are already in progress	November 1, 1998	Coordinator and Advisory committees
9. Review or reconsider recommendations from the 1995 Classroom Study for validity and	January 1, 1999	Coordinator and Advisory committees

accuracy		

Background:

One focus of the Facilities Management Subcommittee this year was Classrooms and Classroom Management. For discussion of this issue, additional members of the University community were brought together with subcommittee members. These additional members represented units of the University that are involved in classroom management (e.g. Room Scheduling/Registrar, Facilities Management, Media Resources, etc.)

The ensuing discussions, and these recommendations, focused on the Twin Cities campus' general-purpose classrooms that are currently centrally scheduled. While many of the recommendations highlight technology in the classroom, it was understood by the members of the discussion group that general purpose classrooms must serve a large variety of teaching and learning styles and that rooms need to be flexible to support these different styles.

These recommendations were unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning on April 28, 1998.

JANE PHILLIPS, Chair
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

FRED MORRISON, Chair
FINANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

IX. NEW BUSINESS

NONE

X. RECESS

[At this time, the University Senate was convened and Item XI. on the Assembly agenda was taken up at the same time as Item I. on the Senate agenda.]

XI. ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE
BUSINESS AND RULES SUBCOMMITTEE
Amending Procedures
Action

PREAMBLE

Over the years the University Senate and Twin Cities Campus Assembly have experienced considerable difficulty in securing the required attendance at its meetings to adopt constitutional and bylaw amendments. Important legislation that oftentimes receives overwhelming support from those senators present and voting has been left unapproved due to the stringent voting requirements. The proposal to establish a Twin Cities Undergraduate Curriculum Committee last year serves as an example of this problem. It received overwhelming support at each of several meetings at which it was presented, but failed to receive the required number of votes for passage at any one meeting.

In view of this ongoing problem, the Business and Rules Subcommittee was asked by the Senate Consultative Committee to examine the voting practices of other institutions as well as *Robert's Rules of Order*, the parliamentary authority for the Senate and Assembly. The Subcommittee learned that the requirements for amending the Senate and Assembly constitutions and bylaws are not only inconsistent with other institutions but are strongly discouraged by *Robert's Rules of Order*. The above amendments reflect the more commonly used practice of other institutions and conform to the recommendations in *Robert's Rules of Order*.

The Senate Consultative Committee/Assembly Steering Committee endorses the recommendations of the Business and Rules Subcommittee, as outlined in the motion, and encourages the Senate and Assembly to adopt the proposed changes. Parallel amendments to the Senate constitution appear on the Senate agenda.

As a constitutional amendment, 120 affirmative votes are required at one meeting for approval, or 91 affirmative votes at each of two consecutive meetings.

MOTION:

To amend Articles VI. and VII. of the Assembly Constitution as follows: [additions are <u>underlined</u>; deletions are ~~struck out~~]

ARTICLE VI. AMENDING PROCEDURE

An amendment to this Constitution shall be approved ~~either~~ by a two-thirds ~~majority of all voting members of the Assembly~~ <u>vote of the senators present and voting</u> at a regular or special meeting <u>of the Assembly</u>, or by a majority of ~~all voting members of the Assembly~~ <u>those senators present and voting</u> at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting; and provided the proposed amendment has been distributed, in writing, to the persons and in the manner provided in Article II, Section 5, for distribution of the Assembly agenda, at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed amendment. An amendment shall be effective following approval by the Assembly and by the regents.

ARTICLE VI. BYLAWS

The Assembly may enact or amend its Bylaws by ~~majority vote of the total membership of the Assembly~~ <u>a two-thirds vote of the senators present and voting at a regular or special meeting of the Assembly, or by a majority of those senators present and voting at each of two meetings, the second of which shall be the next regular meeting, and</u> provided the proposed change has been submitted, in writing, to each member of the Assembly at least ten days prior to the date of the vote on the approval of the proposed change.

<div align="right">VICTOR BLOOMFIELD, Chair
ASSEMBLY STEERING COMMITTEE</div>

DISCUSSION:

Professor Victor Bloomfield presented the motion to amend the Assembly Constitution. He drew senators attention to the rationale and information outlined in the preamble and added that the stringent rules the Senate and Assembly have imposed upon themselves have often resulted in ineffective or inappropriate outcomes. For example, in the case of the Curriculum Committee, the Educational Policy Committee (SCEP) ended up forming a Curriculum Subcommittee. In an area as important as the curriculum, SCEP believed it ought to be a function of the general governance structure, appointed in accordance with Assembly rules, and not a product of a single committee.

One person inquired why the Senate and Assembly have such strict amending procedures. However, an answer was not forthcoming since the procedures were put in place so many years ago.

Another person thought the focus should be on filling vacant seats, not making it easier to pass legislation.

It was reported that at the Student Senate meeting earlier in the day several students expressed the opinion that since they hold the minority position in the Senate/Assembly, their voice will be marginalized if this motion is approved.

Professor Bloomfield reminded senators that safeguards have been retained in the amending procedures to ensure that all senators receive advance notice of pending legislation. If a senator cannot attend the meeting, s/he would have ample time to find an alternate to attend in his/her place.

A senator then said that this should not be a faculty/student issue, since faculty are sympathetic to student concerns and needs. Approval of the motion would bring the Senate and Assembly amending procedures into alignment with other higher education institutions and with *Robert's Rules of Order*. Moreover, all would benefit in that important legislation that receives overwhelming support, but in the past has been left unapproved, such as the establishment of a Curriculum Committee, would pass under the revised proposal.

Professor Bloomfield was asked whether the Subcommittee had discussed the inclusion of a requirement that a certain number of students be in attendance at the time of voting, and he said there had not.

The vote was then taken and 83 voted in favor of the motion (the negative votes were not counted). The motion required 91affirmative votes to pass.

NOT APPROVED

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Martha Kvanbeck
Clerk of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly