

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS ASSEMBLY MINUTES

November 18, 1982

The first meeting of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly was convened in 25 Law Building, Minneapolis campus, on Thursday, November 18, 1982, at 3:15 p.m. Checking or signing the roll as present were 124 voting members of the faculty, 45 voting members of the student body, 6 members of the Council of Academic Officers, and 10 nonmembers.

President C. Peter Magrath presided.

I. MINUTES FOR APRIL 29

Action (3 minutes)

Approved

II. ASSEMBLY OFFICERS

Action (3 minutes)

The chairman of the Twin Cities Campus Assembly has designated the following as officers for 1982-83:

Parliamentarian—John Cound
Abstracter and Clerk—Marilee Ward

Approved

III. SCHEDULED MEETINGS DURING 1982-83

Information

Twin Cities Assembly meetings are scheduled as follows: November 18, January 27, and May 5.

Accepted

IV. COMMITTEES OF THE ASSEMBLY, 1982-83

(These are in addition to those approved at the April 29, 1982, Assembly meeting)

Action (5 minutes)

EDUCATIONAL POLICY Faculty Robert Beck, Carol Carrier, Jerome Gates, Lael Gatewood, Nils Hasselmo (ex officio), Roberta Humphreys, F. Gerald Kline (chr.), Robert McCollister, Betty Robinett (ex officio), Michael Root, Gloria Williams. Students: Fritz Herrmann, Michael Keck, Jerry Kohns, Martin Smith

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS Students: James Anderson, Shirley Holm, Daniel Priebe, Richard Slagle, Bruce Thorpe

RECREATIONAL SPORTS Faculty: Adele Donchenko (chr.), Allen Goldman, Roger Harrold (ex officio), Pat Mueller (ex officio), Dennis Simon, Thomas Stinson, Donald White. Students: James Anderson, Steven Feig, John Nettle, Gregory Sebald, James Urlick

STUDENT AFFAIRS Faculty: Louvain Arndts, Shirley Clark, Terence Cooper, Donald Kahn, Jean Kintgen-Andrews, Timothy Knopp, Robert Ross (ex officio), Eileen Sivert, Martin Snoke, Clare Woodward (chr.), Donald Zander (ex officio), Candido Zaroni. Students: Mary Anderson, Rose Givens, Julie Iverson, Jeffrey Johnson, Michael Keck, Mark Lacy, Marisa Mackey, Chici Ogolo, Anita Ratori, David Sternal, Benjamin Weber, 2 to be named

BUSINESS & RULES Faculty: John Cound (ex officio), Bright Dornblaser, David Giese (chr.), Richard Purple, Marilee Ward (ex officio). Students: Christina Anderson, Mary Anderson

CONVOCACTIONS AND THE ARTS Faculty: William Hathaway, Judith Jellison, Esther Neeley (ex officio), Edward Savage, Linda Shapiro, Ross Smith (ex officio), Mel Waldfogel, Jonathan Wirtschafter (chr.). Students: Stephan Ansolabehere, David Dahlgren, Richard Schwartz

HONORS PROGRAMS Faculty: F. R. Akehurst (chr.), John S. Anderson, John Bell (ex officio), Stephen Blake (ex officio), Marjorie Cowmeadow (ex officio), Saari Csallany, Glen Holt (ex officio), James Jensen (ex officio), Fred Shideman, John Wallace (ex officio), Paul Weiblen, Eugene Wright (ex officio). Students: Paul Dueffert, Sharon Giorgini, Brian Thornton

UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS Faculty: Harold Angle, Phil Bomersheim (ex officio), Paul Cashman (chr.), John Clausen, Al Linck (ex officio), Hamilton McCubbin, Douglas Menikheim (ex officio), Rosemarie Park, Robert Patrick (ex officio), Elton Wolfe. Students: John Paulson, Kerry Sheehy, 1 to be named

STUDENT BEHAVIOR Faculty: Nick Barbatsis (ex officio), William Charlesworth, Mary Dempsey, Margaret DiBlassio, Guy Gibbon, Ted Kellogg, Barbara Knudson, Warren Loud, Ian Maitland, Garland Meadows, Peter Olin, Larry Rolsen, Marilyn Rossmann, Donald Slack, William A. Smith, David Wark (chr.). Students: Peg Brown, Patrick Gaughan, Sharon Giorgini, Susan Granquist, David Gross, Kenneth Hayes, Jessica Nelson, Kathryn Peterson, Ellen Pufahl, Benjamin Weber

Approved

INFORMATION:

CALENDAR Faculty: Thomas Benson (ex officio), Eleanor Fenton (ex officio), Sam Lewis (ex officio), Konrad Mauersberger, Peter Robinson, David Thompson, Willard Thompson (ex officio), Donald Vesley (chr.), Mary Young. Students: Christina Anderson, Richard Linden, Scott Scovel

HOUSING Faculty: Neil Bakkenist (ex officio), Joan Leigh (chr.), Rodney Loper, Sarah McBride. Students: Staci Leigh, Steven Pederson, Scott Singer, David Sternal, Don Straub

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS Faculty: Ruth Aberwald, Betty Hackett (ex officio), Robert Kudrle, K.S.P. Kumar, Barbara Lee (ex officio), Karen Lukas (ex officio), Michael Paige (ex officio), Andrea Scott (ex officio), James Sentz (chr.), W. Albert Sullivan. Students: Debra Goodwin, Kari Langenberger, Anita Ratori, Don Straub, Minh Tong

PLACEMENT SERVICES Faculty: Ellen Betz (ex officio), Thomas Hummel, Barbara Killen (chr.), John F. Miller, Kathleen Peterson, Lee Ponto, Jan Windmeier. Students: David Dahlgren, Debra Goodwin, Wendy Harms

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES Faculty: Thomas Benson (ex officio), Bernadine Feldman, Stuart Fenton, Dorothy Goss, Norman Kerr (chr.), Mary Klaurens, James Preus (ex officio), Aloysius Quebbeman, Kay Reyerson, Gail Thoen. Students: Susan Granquist, Katherine Gray, Renee Kostner, Marisa Mackey

TRANSPORTATION & PARKING Faculty: Frederick Beier, C. Luverne Carlson (ex officio), Robert Jordan, Robert McCaa. Students: Steven Feig, Scott McKusick, Nancy Nyberg, Patricia Webster. Civil Service: James Burak, Jerome Larson (chr.)

UNIVERSITY HEALTH SERVICES Faculty: William Anderson, Thomas Beaumont, Elaine

Behthack, Marion Freeman (ex officio), Donald Hunninghake, Barbara Lee, Jeffrey Monroe, Paul Rupprecht (ex officio). Students: Elizabeth Bonney, Ross Bram, Daniel Brown, Margaret Ellenbecker (chr.), Jeffrey Goodrich, Steven Johnson, Carrie Rethwill, Paul Scalisi, Bonnie Warhol, Margaret Weglinski. Civil Service: Carol Ostrow

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS Alumni: Lee Ann Biersdorf, David Mona, Charles Zimmerman

STUDENTS AFFAIRS Alumni: James Brandt, Alice Brownlee

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Faculty: Margaret Davis (82-85), Virginia Gray (co-chair) (80-83), Russell Hobbie (co-chair) (81-84), James Houck (80-83), Phillip Tichenor (82-85), Mahmood Zaidi (81-84). Students: Jane MacDonald, Nancy Nyberg, (student chair), Dick Schwartz

STEERING Faculty: M. Virginia Fredricks (81-84), Phyllis Freier (82-85), John Howe (81-84), Douglas Pratt (80-83), Paul Quie (80-83), Wesley Sundquist (82-85), Patricia Swan (chr.) (80-83), John Turner (ex officio). Students: Anne Hunt, Julie Iverson, Dave Lenander (student chair), Rick Linden, Kathy Watson

Accepted

V. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

COACHES/FACULTY INTERACTION

Report (5 minutes)

Professor Charles Walcott, chair, will report on the investigation of problems concerning the interaction of varsity athletic coaches and members of the faculty.

See Abstract of the discussion.

VI. STEERING COMMITTEE

HIGHLIGHTS OF 1982-83 ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Many interesting and important items will be discussed within committees of the Assembly this year. Some of these will result in reports and/or motions on the agenda of the Assembly later in the year. Among the items currently being examined by committees of the Assembly, as well as the name of the committee(s) involved, are the following:

- Recreational Sports Committee reorganization (Recreational Sports, Committee on Committees)
- Funding for Women's Intercollegiate Athletics program (Intercollegiate Athletics)
- Review of academic progress of student athletes (ACIA)
- Evaluating the new Cooperating Fund drive (Social Concerns, Faculty Affairs)
- Establish 1984-85 Twin Cities calendar (Calendar)

PATRICIA SWAN
Chair

Accepted

VII. CALENDAR COMMITTEE & ALL-UNIVERSITY SPECIAL CALENDAR COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT, 1981-82

Members of the committee were Donald Vesley (chair), Arnold Caswell, Eloise Jaeger, Peter Robinson, Scott Scovel, Katie Susag, David Thompson, Willard Thompson; ex officio members Tom Benson, John Felipe, Eleanor Fenton, Elizabeth Grundner, Sam Lewis, and

John Malmberg. For service on the All-University Special Calendar Committee, the following persons were added: John Gander, Stephen Granger, Harry Hogenkamp, Anthony Kuznik, Roger Upson; ex officio members Gerald Allen and Gary Sheldon.

I. INTRODUCTION

The issue of potential calendar changes has been debated periodically at the University for many years. On a national basis, there has been a trend toward early-start semesters, and data provided by the National Association of College Stores indicate that almost 2/3 of the nearly 3,000 institutions surveyed are now on an early-start semester or 4-1-4 schedule compared to about 25% on quarters.

In recent years, at the University of Minnesota, the issue has been raised several times. In 1977, President Magrath appointed a Special Calendar Question Committee to review the energy implications of the calendar. That committee concluded that feasible calendar changes would have only a very minor impact on energy consumption and recommended no change on that basis. In 1978, a very excellent survey (the Mattross study) was conducted concerning the popularity of an early-start calendar. In this study, a plurality of the student body (but not the faculty) was found to be in favor of an early-start. For both students and faculty, a 2 to 1 majority favored quarters over semesters. The 1980-81 calendar committee again discussed the issue and conducted a survey of 29 institutions relatively similar in size and function to the University of Minnesota. Among those institutions, a large majority are on the early-start semester system, including several in the process of changing to that system. Meanwhile, in 1980, the Law School adopted a change to early-start semesters and the Duluth campus had initiated an early-start quarter system in 1979.

The 1981-82 academic year was marked by a further attempt to consider fundamental changes in the University calendar. Consideration was given to the following: a) a change to an early-start, early-finish quarter-based calendar, b) a change from a quarter-based system to a semester-based system, and c) a move toward a uniform, all-campus calendar semester-based but with flexible modules. Because these issues are of major concern to all operating units of the University, the *modus operandi* of the debate was to solicit opinions and potential impacts from all segments of the University community. When the focus changed to include consideration of an all-campus calendar, the Senate Consultative Committee expanded the Twin City Campus Committee into an all-University Special Calendar Committee with representation from the out-state campuses. The results of the committee deliberations are presented in this report. In addition, the calendar approved by the Twin Cities Campus Assembly on April 29, for the 1983-84 academic year is presented.

II. THE 1983-84 CALENDAR—TWIN CITIES CAMPUS

The calendar presented to the Twin Cities Campus Assembly on April 29, 1982, and unanimously approved is contained on page 26 of those minutes.

III. THE EARLY-START, EARLY-FINISH ISSUE

The University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus calendar has for many years been a traditional quarter model, with a late September start and a mid-June finish, followed immediately by two five-week summer sessions. The exception has been that professional schools have been free to modify that model to suit their unique requirements. Thus, the Medical School, the Dental School and more recently, the Law School, have not adhered to the same calendar as the other Twin Cities units. That freedom to deviate from the norm would, however, obviously cause serious difficulties if extended beyond a few self-contained professional schools, as it would seriously hinder any cross-fertilization of educational opportunity for students seeking a broader education.

One major advantage of the traditional quarter system is that fall quarter ends just before the traditional Christmas holiday, allowing for a natural break before winter quarter. The holiday interval has been one major drawback to traditional semester systems, wherein that break comes inopportunistically before the end of fall semester. That has been one of the major factors in the tendency of semester based institutions to start in August. By the latest reckoning, 54% of all four-year colleges and universities are on the early semester system and only 5% on traditional semesters. Another 10% report being on an early start

4-1-4 modified early semester system*. It can be argued that the educational mission should not be governed by quirks in the calendar. However, traditional holidays are firmly entrenched in American culture and institutions of higher education have little choice but to structure their calendars accordingly.

With a majority of institutions nationwide initiating the academic year in late August and finishing in mid-May, it has been purported that the late September start and mid-June finish disadvantage students competing for summer or postgraduate jobs. Based largely on that premise, the Calendar Committee sought to determine University sentiment for an early-start calendar. The premise was that no mention be made of a switch to semesters because that is a separate and potentially more threatening issue which could be explored later. The unsettled financial situation of the University in the 1981-82 year, with major retrenchment in the offing, did not appear to be an opportune time to propose a major structural change.

Thus, the first questionnaire sent to all deans, directors and department heads in December of 1981 made no mention of a change to semesters but sought opinions only on an early-start quarter system (fall quarter to start the Wednesday after Labor Day). It should be noted that the University of Minnesota-Duluth branch had initiated an early-start quarter system several years previously, (1979).

About 100 responses were received to the initial inquiry and the results are summarized in Appendix I. While there appeared to be considerable sentiment for an early-start, there were objections to several aspects of that calendar, primarily the interruption of winter quarter by the extended Christmas break. There was also concern over lack of any working days between fall and winter quarters, making grading and preparation for new courses more difficult. Additionally, many faculty view the pre-class September period as a very valuable time for travel and other professional activities. Still another early-start problem cited was that of a parking and traffic conflict with the State Fair. That issue proved to be even more of a problem in a subsequent plan which presupposed a late August start.

Not surprisingly, the major factors cited in favor of the early-start were improved job opportunities and conformance with the schedules of other institutions and with primary and secondary schools in the area. It should be noted that actual statistics on the impact of a late-finish schedule on student jobs are lacking. In fact, several letters were received from vegetable canning companies citing their need for student help, particularly during the August-September period, when University of Minnesota students are now available while others are not. They implied that several thousand student jobs are at stake.

Closely related to the dissatisfaction with the interruption of winter quarter was the implication that an early-start might be desirable if coupled with a change to semesters. A significant number of respondees specifically raised that issue, which prompted the committee to explore a potential change to semesters despite the misgivings cited earlier. It was apparent that there was significant sentiment for such a change and that any attempt to start early while retaining the quarter system would be broadly opposed.

IV. THE SEMESTER, VS. QUARTER ISSUE

A second questionnaire was distributed in February specifically to seek reaction to an early-start semester plan. At the same time, it was recognized that a change to semesters implied a major educational issue even more than a calendar issue, and the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) was appraised of our activities so that other appropriate input could be obtained. Because the educational issue was considered to be both paramount and system-wide, a special Calendar Committee was appointed by the SCC to explore the entire issue. This move was also prompted by the implicit, potential advantage of a uniform system-wide calendar. Again, more than 100 responses were received and tabulated by the committee (see Appendix II). The responses indicate that the University community is split about equally between those favoring semesters and those favoring quarters. It should be emphasized that this tabulation does not represent a formal vote or a scientific poll. Opinions were solicited from all interested parties and all responses were tabulated. Some responses represent detailed departmental views, while others were hastily scribbled notes from individuals. Nonetheless, a definite pattern emerges wherein

*See Calendar Committee Report 1980-81

the quarter system tends to be favored by programs which are more technical and applied or laboratory oriented, while the semester system is favored by those which are primarily theoretical or humanistic. Many colleges and units are internally divided on the issue.

The major arguments cited on both sides present few surprises. From the educational perspective, those favoring semesters mention the greater depth, more time for reading and researching term papers, less fragmentation of programs, and more opportunity for student-instructor interaction. Those favoring quarters cite the greater flexibility and variety of courses available to students and the greater flexibility for faculty both to teach and to pursue research of scholarly activities.

From the financial and administrative perspective a major argument recognized in favor of semesters is the cost saving which would result from fewer registrations and final examination periods. The impediments to conversion center on the significant time investment inherent in major curriculum redesign. Another impediment cited is the space constraint (particularly in laboratory courses) which would result from having to accommodate the same number of students in courses now taught in all three quarters, if the year were restricted to two semesters.

V. THE FLEXIBLE LENGTH COURSE PROPOSAL

From the previous survey, it was evident that there was major support for both the quarter system and the semester system and that sound pedagogical arguments could be presented on either side. The committee next decided to test the waters on a proposal which might have the flexibility to meet the needs of both camps. The flexible academic calendar has not gained wide acceptance nationally and is obviously fraught with complexities. A few institutions have attempted this innovation with advantages and disadvantages apparently dictated primarily by unique local circumstances.

For the third time, the committee solicited comments via deans, directors and department heads, this time relative to a flexible schedule. By this time, the committee had been expanded as previously indicated to include out-state campus representation, and opinions from those campuses were actively solicited. The proposal suggested two 15-week semesters, one starting the Wednesday after Labor Day and ending just before Christmas, the second from mid-January to early May. Within the semesters, alternative shorter courses of 5, 7½ or 10 weeks could be offered with credit proportionally assigned based on the 15-week semester. One unavoidable feature of this system is the loss of set-aside final exam periods due to the varied course ending dates. In this memo, the committee asked for responses to a number of specific questions about utilization of such a calendar. Again, a large number of replies was received.

In general, respondees who favored the semester system saw the new proposal as a mechanism for achieving that objective, while those who favored quarters predicted that it would lead to chaos and confusion. Even those who projected it as a means to initiate semester courses tended to be concerned about the loss of the set-aside exam week and also about the potential impact of different schedules in different academic units on the ability of students to take courses outside of their major fields. In general, the committee concluded that the prospects of initiating an innovative types of flexible course length calendar was threatening to and unpopular with a majority of faculty who responded.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The 1981-82 Calendar Committee sought to continue the exploratory process relative to calendar changes through the mechanism of actively soliciting opinion relative to such changes from all interested parties. The process provoked a vigorous response but revealed only that there is nothing approaching a consensus as to which system is preferable and little enthusiasm for a complex compromise.

The committee acquiesced to the idea that a substantive case for a change would have to be made to warrant the disruptive process of change. In essence, the committee concluded that there was insufficient dissatisfaction expressed with the present calendar to instigate a recommendation for change and, similarly, conclusive evidence of the advantage of or necessity for a change has not emerged from our deliberations. In effect, every educational, administrative, or financial argument for early-start or for semesters seems to be countered by an equally valid argument for the status quo. Thus, although a majority of U.S. institutions of higher learning are now semester based, the size, diversity,

and unique characteristics of the University of Minnesota may dictate that our needs do not lend themselves merely to following the majority, at least at this time.

It should be emphasized that responsibility for setting the University calendar is clearly established in a memorandum from President Magrath dated February 6, 1980. This memorandum emphasizes the primacy of academic priorities in setting the calendar and emphasizes that responsibility has been delegated to each campus by the University Senate (November 29, 1973, and May 30, 1974). It also indicates that final authority for setting the University calendar resides with the president.

It was the committee's conclusion that, while no change could be recommended at this time, it would be worthwhile to continue to search for some mechanism whereby the legitimate concerns of the advocates of both longer and shorter teaching modules might be met. Toward this end, the special all-University Calendar Committee has not been disbanded and could seek to explore additional alternatives during 1982-83.

Alternatively, central administration could call for a formal faculty vote on the issue as has been done at other institutions or could mandate a change through administrative decree. It is not likely that the issue can permanently be put to rest and indeed it is probably a healthy condition which fosters periodic renewed debate. In the dynamic world of higher education, change is inevitable and indeed necessary for survival. However, the University should remain as a citadel of rationality and change should not be wrought only for the sake of change. Perhaps sometime in the future a time will come when abandoning our traditional quarter system in favor of some alternative model will emerge as the rational thing to do. It is the opinion of this committee that such a time has not yet arrived.

Appendix I

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Major Impacts Mentioned in Response to Inquiry About Early-Start Calendar Fall Quarter, 1981

Total Number of Responses: ~90-100	# of responses mentioning
A. Reasons for early start quarter system	
1. Improved job opportunities & related factors	16
2. Conformity with primary & secondary schools & with other higher education institutions	8
3. Conformity with athletic (football) schedule	1
4. Move toward uniformity within University units	1
B. Reasons against early start quarter system	
1. Splitting of winter quarter not educationally sound	43
2. Short-break (no working days) between fall and winter quarter	11
3. Loss of September time for meetings, travel, etc.	11
4. Need for administrative changes (altered 'B' appointments, earlier deadlines, etc.)	6
5. Space scheduling problems	3
6. Loss of beneficial field trip time in the spring	2
7. Non-availability of fairgrounds parking immediately after the State Fair	2
8. Conflict with Jewish holidays	1
9. Placing of spring break too early (still winter in Minn.)	1
10. Financial aid checks for students tied to state or federal fiscal year would be issued too late in school year	1
C. Impacts which do not <i>clearly favor either early start or</i> <i>present system</i>	

1. Timing of and length of break periods surrounding summer session	13
2. Impact on overseas exchange programs	3
D. Responses which clearly indicated favoring or not favoring the early start calendar. (Note: Many replies listed impacts without indicating support or non-support.)	
1. Definite support	23
2. Seem to favor early start, but only if tied to move toward semester system. (Note: two respondees indicated <i>opposition</i> to semesters.)	27
3. Definitely opposed to early start (based on early start quarter system mentioned).	19

Appendix II

TWIN CITIES CAMPUS CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Survey on Semester Impacts—Winter, 1982

UNIT	Pro Semester	Pro Quarter	Equivocal
Liberal Arts	21	7	5
Institute of Technology (includes Architecture, Math, etc.)	5	3	3
Education	1	5	1
Athletic Department	2	0	0
Business and Management	3	8	2
St. Paul campus	5	18	1
Medical Sciences	2	6	3
Extension	0	0	3
Summer Session	0	0	1
Other Twin Cities (UWW, Gen. Coll., etc.)	5	3	2
Students	0	1	1
Coordinate campuses	0	0	1
Service units (non-academic)	4	0	3
TOTALS (125 responses)	48	51	26

Relative Frequency of Major Arguments

A. PRO SEMESTER	Frequency
1. Educational Reasons:	
Greater depth	23
More time for term papers, research projects, etc.	7
Less fragmentation of programs—weed out weak courses	4
More interaction of student-instructor	4
Opportunity for total curriculum review	4
More time for students to recover from poor start	2
Would result in fewer incompletes	1
Would facilitate educational innovation	1
2. Financial and Administrative Reasons	
Cost savings due to fewer registrations, exam periods, etc.	17
More time to implement department administrative changes	2
Would coordinate with majority of other higher educational institutions	2

B. PRO QUARTER

1. Educational Reasons

Greater all-around flexibility	13
Faculty opportunity to concentrate on research for one quarter, teach for two	9
Greater variety of courses for student to select	9
Courses would be "artificially" extended under semesters (additional time not needed)	6

2. Administrative and Cost Reasons

Time and cost required to initiate the change (curriculum redesign)	22
Required courses taught three times per year would have to accommodate the same number of students in two sessions—space and time difficulties	3
Possible loss of students who need flexibility (part-time working students, etc.)	3
Administrative difficulties for programs currently "accredited" for quarter	2

DONALD VESLEY
Chair

Accepted

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

none

IX. NEW BUSINESS

(10 minutes)

none

X. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

NOMINATING COMMITTEE, FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE

Action by Faculty Assembly (5 minutes)

The Committee on Committees appoints the following as members of a nominating committee to name candidates to fill, by the election procedure, 1983-86 vacancies (three 3-year terms) on the Faculty Assembly Steering Committee. The Faculty Assembly Steering Committee forms the Twin Cities membership of the Senate Consultative Committee. The appointments to the nominating committee must be ratified by the Faculty Assembly: Vernon Cardwell (chr.), Iris Charvat, Mary Corcoran, Martin Dworkin, and William Flanigan.

VIRGINIA GRAY
RUSSELL HOBBIE
Co-Chairs

Approved

XI. ADJOURNMENT

ABSTRACT

Preceding the regular meeting in 25 Law Building there was a brief orientation session for new members of the Assembly led by Patricia Swan, professor of food science and nutrition and chair of the Steering Committee. She delivered a welcoming message and encouraged participation in the affairs of the Assembly and the Senate, including the committees of those bodies. David Lenander, chair of the Student Steering Committee, pointed out that senators were in a position to learn about the mission of the University and the role of consultation in the life of the University. John Turner, Regents' professor of political science and vice chair of the Assembly and Senate, stressed that the Senate had proved to be an important factor in the decision-making process and that consultation with the Senate often assisted central administration in setting policy.

The Assembly was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President C. Peter Magrath. Minutes of the last meeting, officers, the year's meeting schedule, and committee memberships were ruled as approved by the president.

Men's Intercollegiate Athletics, coaches/faculty interaction. Charles Walcott, associate professor of political science and chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, reported on the findings of a subcommittee consisting of Professor Sander Latts, Dean Robert Stein, and himself that had been investigating interaction of varsity athletic coaches and members of the faculty. The subcommittee had discovered little that would cause trouble, aside from a case of a faculty member being prevailed on to award a grade before assignments had been completed. However, it was agreed, he said, that addition to the academic advising and counseling capability of the men's athletic department would be an important step to be taken. He went on to report that Vice President Hasselmo had recently completed a plan for monitoring academic progress of men athletes.

Nominating Committee, Faculty Steering Committee. Virginia Gray, associate professor of political science and co-chair of the Committee on Committees, presented names of those to serve on a nominating committee to fill next year's vacancies on the Steering Committee. The Assembly approved the slate.

All other reports were received for information, and the Assembly adjourned at 3:30 p.m., after which the University Senate convened.

MARILEE WARD
Abstractor