

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Campus Assembly

Campus Governance

2-2-1987

Campus Assembly minutes 02/02/1987

Campus Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly

Recommended Citation

Campus Assembly, "Campus Assembly minutes 02/02/1987" (1987). *Campus Assembly*. 255.
https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/camp_assembly/255

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Campus Assembly by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

The Campus Assembly met on Monday, February 3, 1997 at 4 pm in the Science Auditorium.

I. David Johnson reviewed candidates being considered in the on-going regent selection process. He also discussed Governor Carlson's budget recommendation for a 10% increase in University funding to be used for faculty, technology, and National Merit scholarships.

II. The minutes of the November 18, 1996 Campus Assembly meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Concerning material for the final bulletin under the quarter system, there was no discussion of the proposed revisions (which were primarily editorial) and the full slate of material summarized in the January 14, 1997 memo from Sam Schuman and the Curriculum Committee passed by unanimous vocal vote.

IV. Sam Schuman distributed "Approved Alternatives for Fall Term" and explained that the two choices include start dates that are earlier or later than UMM's proposal. The Curriculum Committee endorsed (and thereby moved that UMM accept) the Early Start date (ES), which would yield a first semester equal in length to the year's second semester (whereas the Late Start date, or LS, would yield a shorter first semester). Discussion followed.

Andy Lopez asked if variance applied to the fall semester only and Schuman confirmed that UMM's spring calendar would match the TC campus. Chris Cole asked Schuman to summarize the advantages of the ES. Schuman noted that, while the State Fair parking issue is irrelevant at UMM, LS would result in the loss of 4 teaching days (which could be an entire week of instruction for some classes) but ES would allow some leisure in scheduling (vacation days and an earlier end to the semester).

Barbara Burke asked about the scheduling of finals and the possibility of an extra vacation day at Thanksgiving. Schuman noted that finals should not end too close to Christmas but stressed that UMM need only pick a start date right now, the rest of the schedule could be worked out later.

Jim Gremmels suggested that if the start date results in UMM faculty teaching 5.5% more than the Twin Cities campus, salaries should be adjusted accordingly. Cole wondered how a semester can include more days off and an earlier completion date. Bert Ahern noted that orientation would be benefited by an ES and a mid-semester break would be possible. Ruth Thielke noted that the spring semester calendar included a mid-semester break.

Ford Brown wondered if snow days wouldn't address the problem of matching semester lengths by shortening spring semester.

Tom Johnson asked whether we are perpetually committed to a specific type of start date once it is selected and Schuman explained that it would be possible to alternate between ES and LS. Chris Cole expressed concern about the loss of family time for faculty who generally work on research all summer and use Labor Day weekend for vacation. Schuman sympathized but suggested that the ES might result in more family time over Labor Day since an already-commenced semester would mean faculty wouldn't be finishing up preparations over the holiday weekend.

Eric Klinger expressed concern about tying the start date to Labor Day, which falls so early some years. Jack Imholte asked whether ES would mean four days for finals whereas LS would mean three and Schuman confirmed.

The Assembly voted to adopt the early start date for fall semester of the 1999/2000 academic year.

V. Next the Assembly considered the proposed Daily Schedule for the semester system. The proposal from the Curriculum Committee was passed without discussion.

VI. The Assembly discussed the By-law Amendment Proposal establishing the Assessment of Student Learning Committee. David Johnson reminded the Assembly of the NCA's shift in emphasis to a faculty-centered plan to assess student learning. Mike Korth suggested the action item was premature and should wait until the Executive Committee had acted to simultaneously reduce other committee work. Bert Ahern countered that the Executive Committee has until the end of the academic year to respond to the Consultative Committee's proposal since the by-law won't take effect until 1997/98. He reminded the Assembly that the call for committee reduction did not require a reduction in Assembly/Adjunct committees and might result in redirecting ad hoc committee work. Fred Farrell acknowledged the advantages of the Student Learning Committee but emphasized the need for restraint in the proliferation of committees.

The Assembly voted to approve the By-law Amendment Proposal.

VII. During senator reports, Tom Johnson invited feedback for the SCEP subcommittee currently considering publishing the results of student evaluations of teaching. Roland Guyotte noted that the Sullivan II proposal was being modified for presentation to the Regents.

VIII. There was no old business. Under new business, President Hasselmo's visit of 2/18 was mentioned and will include an open forum at 3:30 in the Science Auditorium followed by a faculty seminar.

There was no further business and the Assembly adjourned at 4:56 pm.

Rebecca Webb