

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1969

3:30 P.M.

MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

The voting membership of the Senate totals 209 including the President and 208 elected members. For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (105) must be present. Constitution changes require advanced publication and 140 affirmative votes. Bylaw changes require 105 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of members present and voting. The members of the Administrative Committee are ex officio nonvoting members of the Senate.

All members of the faculty who hold regular appointment as defined in the Regulations Concerning Academic Tenure may be present at Senate meetings and are entitled to speak and to offer motions for Senate action, but may not vote.

Members of standing committees who are not faculty, including student members, may be present at a meeting of the Senate during such time as a report of their committee is under discussion and may participate in such discussion, but shall not have the privilege of making motions or of voting.

A special section will be provided for the seating of such faculty and such members of standing committees.

Provision has been made for the University News Service to send the Senate Docket to the news media in advance of each meeting and to arrange a news conference at the close of each meeting with the vice chairman and others he may designate.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be ~~circulated~~ during the meeting. Members will please check their names to indicate their presence. If the list misses you, please stop afterward to check your name. The roll, after adjournment, will be on the rostrum.

An attendance record for nonmembers will also be circulated and will be on the rostrum after the meeting.

As voted by the Senate, a summary of the attendance of members elected for the current academic year will be included in the June minutes.

NOT FOR RELEASE PRIOR TO THE SENATE MEETING

Year 1968-69

No. 9

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA THE SENATE DOCKET May 22, 1969

Your Committee on Business and Rules respectfully presents the following matters for consideration:

I. MINUTES OF APRIL 10 AND APRIL 24, 1969

Reported for Action

II. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

1. Reported for Action

Programs for low income and disadvantaged students. Mr. Lukermann discussed financial needs for the low income and disadvantaged students developed by the Administrative Task Force for Special Programs, including those of the University tutorial-study group program, New Careers Extension, HELP Center programs, and Community Extension programs. He indicated that private sources would be sought, and that the University Consolidated Fund was a possibility. Mr. Shepherd then moved:

That there be placed on the Senate docket an action item calling for: (1) the inclusion of the University of Minnesota Student Aid Fund in the Minneapolis Campus Consolidated Fund Drive and identified as a separate line item, and (2) the other campuses of the University to seek appropriate means to respond to the program.

Inclusion of this item would permit faculty and staff to contribute funds to support direct aid to students on the basis of financial need. The motion was seconded and approved.

2. Reported for Information

Honors Committee report. Mr. Ziebarth, acting chairman of the Committee on University Honors, requested approval to poll the Administrative Committee by mail on two Outstanding Achievement Awards in order to make the Regents' docket of May 9. He explained that health was a factor in one instance. The motion to approve a poll by mail was seconded and approved.

Legislative report, current status. Mr. Wenberg summarized recent legislative developments, including recommendations for four new Regents and the outlook for support for general maintenance and for specials. Mr. Learn announced that data for formulating the 1971 building request would be required in the form of a programmatic statement by the deans early next fall, and a room-by-room statement of needs by January 1, 1970. The goal, he said, was to have the information available by February 1 so there would be at least a month to develop cost estimates. He suggested that the deans consider appointing programmatic planning committees, and added that Administrative Committee members would receive a letter shortly indicating more specifically the information required.

Legislative report, tuition rates. Mr. Moos reported on the recent Regents' suggestion that a tuition increase may be necessary, and Mr. Wenberg said that a meeting later in the week would take place involving students, Regent Chairman Lester Malkerson, Representative Rodney Searle (chairman of the House Education subcommittee), and himself. Mr. Sahlstrom noted that an increase at the Technical Institute would seriously affect enrollment there. Mr. Wenberg concluded by reporting tuition levels at other Big Ten institutions and their recently proposed or enacted increases.

Legislative report, future data needs. Mr. Smith reported that experience this year in developing data for the legislative session showed that other additional types of information would be needed in 1971. He indicated that these data would include development of differential costs of instruction for lower and upper divisions, graduate and professional, as well as data on faculty effort and output, and teaching loads (with an indication of the relationship of research and graduate instruction). He pointed out that total faculty cooperation would be imperative next year, and that the policy body would be the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning.

MARLEE WARD
Secretary

III. SENATE COMMITTEES 1968-69

1. Reported for Action

Senate Committee on Student Affairs: Add: David Estrin. Delete: Robert Desnick.

IV. REPORT OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

1. Reported for Action

The Consultative Committee recommends to the Senate the following slate of six candidates, three of whom are to be elected to fill vacancies on the Senate Committee on Committees:

NEAL AMUNDSEN
MARY CORCORAN
JEANNE LUPTON
WALLACE RUSSELL
BURNHAM TERRELL
JAMES WERNITZ

The two candidates receiving the highest number of votes will serve for three years. The one receiving the third highest number of votes will serve for one year.

JOHN DARLEY
Chairman

V. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Proposal to encourage individual student initiative in planning programs of independent study and to broaden opportunities available for such study

The Council on Liberal Education notes increasing interest on the part of students and faculty in providing opportunities for students to plan, as an integral part of their undergraduate education, a course of study and research beyond the prescriptive confines and coverage of a specific course or series of courses. Such a course of study and research would be beneficial to a student for at least three reasons. First, it would enable him to plan and to carry out study and research projects — designing the approach and methodology, doing the work, and synthesizing the product — without the constraints of a prescribed outline or reading list. Second, it would help to make him aware of the wide range of study and research opportunities outside the classroom, laboratory, or library. Third, it would enable him to note and to investigate certain problems in their natural or social settings. To provide opportunities for undergraduate students to engage in such study and research seems to require changes in existing credit regulations. The Council recommends, therefore, that, subject to the controls described below, undergraduate students be permitted to earn up to fifteen credits towards a degree by completing independent study and research projects on or off campus. The Council also recommends that each collegiate unit make any changes necessary within the collegiate structure to count these fifteen credits towards each student's degree without increasing the number of credits normally required for graduation. Suggested regulations concerning registration for such work, provision of advice and counselling, supervision and monitoring of the work are described below. A small administrative staff would be needed to make the program effective, but the proposal relies on supervision and monitoring through faculty holding their appointments in other collegiate units. The program is designed to explore and probe the values, the difficulties, the costs, and the appeal of such a method of education. For this reason, the Council suggests that the program be undertaken for a period of two years, and that the experience be reviewed before the end of that period.

The educational objectives of such programs

Traditionally we have believed that graduate students must justify their claim to an advanced degree through demonstration of ability to undertake independent study and research, but that most undergraduate students are not ready to do such work. To be sure, we encourage and require undergraduate students who are candidates for an honors degree to engage in a certain amount of independent study and research, but we do not consider most undergraduate students capable of such an effort. We assume that they have not yet mastered the factual material, the techniques of research, and the methods of reasoning as well as expression that are required for independent work in their major field of study. We are slowly beginning to realize that these traditional beliefs and assumptions are mistaken and harmful. They tend not only to stultify the initiative, the inventiveness, and the creativity of the undergraduate student, but also to limit seriously the potential of his learning environment.

At present, certain kinds of off-campus learning experience are made available to University of Minnesota students in particular programs. A survey recently undertaken by the Center for Curriculum Studies indicates the existence of the following off-campus study programs: student teaching, field trips, clinical practice, internships, practice industrial employment, independent study, and foreign study. Off-campus student teaching programs are based primarily, if not exclusively, in various courses offered in the College of Education. Students practice-teach under supervision in selected elementary and secondary schools. Field work is offered in conjunction with many different courses in various colleges of the University. In fact, that report gives detailed descriptions of all those off-campus study programs that have been mentioned. University College can approve programs involving extensive independent study. General College makes provision in several of its programs for credit for experience outside the classroom. The Living-Learning Center proposal involves significant innovation as regards the encouragement of independent study. But it is evident, as the report of the Center for Curriculum Studies concludes, that, aside from practice teaching, none of the off-campus study programs encompasses a large number of students. Neither do many of these programs encourage the student to formulate research problems and to design his own methods of investigating and solving them.

It is unproductive — perhaps futile — to try to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable kinds of off-campus learning experience. The motivation of the particular student, the manner in which the proposed project fits into his whole academic program, and other factors can make acceptable what might otherwise appear unacceptable. Since it is difficult to compare one research project with another, it seems desirable to insure the academic content of such research through registration, supervision, and monitoring of individually proposed projects rather than to define and legislate in advance as to what kinds of projects are creditable and what kinds are not.

Existing University machinery

Colleges have long awarded credit for the completion of independent research projects listed in bulletins under such headings as "Independent Research," "Directed Study," and the like. But regulations have restricted the number of credits a student could earn in this way in any one quarter, and have not permitted the range and extent of programs foreseen under this proposal. New Independent Study regulations in CLA have made it possible for students to earn the credits listed for a course without having to attend class, to do day-to-day assignments, or to take regular examinations. A student electing to earn credits for a listed course by independent study can demonstrate his mastery of the subject-matter by taking the regular course examination or by submitting a research paper. The latter method, which requires the instructor's consent, may be both little known and little used. Nevertheless, a few students — with faculty guidance and cooperation to assist their own ingenuity — have pieced together fifteen-credit research projects involving their own off-campus investigation. Some of these projects have required the consent of faculty members to the submission of a paper for credit in more than one course; others have required the consent of faculty members to letting a student earn credits for a listed course by independent study, as well as satisfy the requirements of the course by submitting a research paper instead of taking the regular examination.

Students registered in University College have been able to propose independent research projects involving as many as fifteen credits, but registration in University College entails 190 rather than the standard 180 credits for graduation.

One of the existing programs permits the student to receive credits for work much of which involves independent research and study overseas. Students participating in SPAN (Student Project for Amity Among Nations) register for Foreign Study 161-162 during both the first and second summer sessions. A student can earn twelve credits — six for each course — upon submitting a satisfactory paper about the results of the study and research he does overseas during an eight-week period. In order to satisfy the requirements of the two courses, however, the student is engaged in preparation for one year before he leaves for overseas study, and in writing for a substantial period after his return. It is worth noting that in this program the students (some twenty to thirty at present) plan much of their work on their own, as they propose the topics and methods of research, outline topic categories and prepare bibliographies, but that they are also continuously guided and supervised by advisers.

Nature of changes in University machinery needed

Since a few ingenious students have already been able to arrange such fifteen-credit research projects under existing regulations, it is clear that no radical changes of policy are involved. The perceived need, however, is to provide further encouragement for such projects, to establish counselling and advisory services for interested students, to help students find faculty members interested in supervising and monitoring such projects, and to simplify the registration and the awarding and acceptance of credit.

In order to simplify registration, it is proposed that University College list, with an appropriate course number, an independent, off-campus, out-of-classroom undergraduate study course offering from three to fifteen credits. Subject to the registration and approval procedures outlined below, students would be permitted to register for this course without having to fulfill the requirement of an additional ten credits for graduation through University College, and would graduate from their college of registration rather than from University College.

Disclaimers concerning the proposed changes

To avoid misunderstandings that might make it difficult to implement the program, we offer two explicit disclaimers:

- a. The University cannot reimburse the students for special expenses they will incur in following a planned course of off-campus study. Each student will register and pay fees for independent research as for a regular course, and he will meet from his own resources all expenses (e.g., travel and living expenses) necessary to the pursuit of his work.
- b. The University can provide no assurances that problems of scheduling, caused by an absence from the campus, can be resolved at the individual convenience of the participating students. Thus it will be particularly important that each participating student plan and carry out his independent-research project so that it does not conflict with other independent-research projects or with necessarily rigid scheduling arrangements.

Proposed method of implementing this pilot project

The objectives of the proposed project would be to:

- a. encourage and counsel students in the drawing up of independent-research proposals;
- b. secure one or more faculty members willing to serve as advisers and monitors of the study proposal, credit being derived under the University College registration from their evaluation of the work product;
- c. provide assistance in negotiating programs with the college committees involved;
- d. provide facilitative services to bring together faculty members and students interested in attempting such experiences;
- e. help secure information concerning travel, housing, and other problems.

At present University College is not staffed to provide the kinds of assistance and administrative organization indicated above. To fulfill the objectives of this program, at least one member would have to be added to the existing administrative staff. This new staff member would be under the supervision of Dean Vaughan, Chairman of the University College Advisory Committee. That Committee would be responsible for making all policy decisions involving the project; and it would be empowered to review, at its discretion, individual programs submitted for credit under these regulations. It would be asked to review the experience under this project and report to the Senate before December 31, 1971.

The day-to-day responsibility for considering, refining, and accepting proposals would be delegated to the administrative staff. Students would submit written independent-research proposals or seek advice about preparing such proposals. Where necessary, these proposals would be revised with the help of the staff. These proposals should be developed in sufficient detail to show the student's undergraduate program to date; an outline of the proposed balance of that program; the objectives of the student; the way in which the proposed independent research would fit into, supplement, build upon, or otherwise enrich his degree program; an outline of the proposed independent research; the nature and organization of the work or other experience to be involved; the proposed time framework for such independent research; the availability, if any, of outside supervision, assistance, or monitoring of the experience; the nature of the proposed product — e.g., research paper, evaluative report of the experience involved, preparation of research model, instructional materials, and so on; the credit requested for such project (limited to a maximum of fifteen credits); the faculty member or members prepared to monitor such independent research and to decide upon the amount of credit to be awarded for it; the consent of his regular academic adviser; and the deadline for submission of the proposed product.

Where requested, the staff would attempt to locate faculty members prepared to counsel students and to supervise their programs. The Council on Liberal Education urges the colleges to recognize faculty participation in this program as service for an all-University committee and as such to be reflected, where possible, in the faculty member's overall assignments.

The University College will keep a record of all proposals submitted to it and thereafter will monitor the progress of the proposed programs through periodic appropriate consultation with the faculty members and students involved.

Collation of information on independent research performed under existing collegiate programs

The Council on Liberal Education recognizes that a number of independent-research programs will be offered and undertaken without any need of involvement or contact with University College. In order to further the objectives of this project and to permit an appraisal of the various off-campus research programs available to undergraduate students, it urges all colleges to designate a committee or an individual faculty member to report to University College such information on independent-research programs and their evaluation as will contribute towards the development of an overall report at the end of the two year period.

Recommendation for Action

With the approval of the University College Advisory Committee, the Council on Liberal Education recommends that the University Senate adopt the following resolution:

RESOLVED THAT:

1. University College is empowered to grant credits, not to exceed fifteen for any one student, for independent undergraduate study done outside the confines of formal course work.
2. All colleges of the University offering the associate or baccalaureate degree, are urged insofar as possible to make provision for a student to earn up to fifteen credits through off-campus work accredited by the University College.
3. The foregoing provisions are intended to authorize a pilot-study program. The authorization hereby established shall lapse on and after December 31, 1971, unless the Senate otherwise decides. Participation in the pilot-study shall be limited to one hundred students.

DONALD K. SMITH
Chairman, Council on
Liberal Education

VI. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

1. Reported for Action

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy recommends to the Senate approval of the proposal for a School of Statistics as representing a reasonable next step in the development of Statistics and Applied Statistics.

2. Reported for Action

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy recommends that the Senate approve the following Statement of Policy and forward this statement to the President and the Board of Regents with the recommendation that this statement be adopted as University policy on classified research projects.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

ARTICLE 1. The University of Minnesota shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or a grant which would restrain the University from disclosing (1) the existence of the contract or grant; (2) the identity of the sponsor or the grantor and, if a subcontract is involved, the identity of the prime contractor if the results of the research must be reported to the sponsor, grantor, or prime contractor; and (3) the purpose and the scope of the proposed research in sufficient detail: (a) to permit informed discussion concerning the wisdom of such research within the University, and (b) to inform colleagues in immediate and related disciplines of the nature and importance of the potential contribution of the disciplines involved.

ARTICLE 2. The University of Minnesota shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or a grant, even though it meets the requirements of Article 1, if the contract or grant limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results or specifically permits retroactive classification, except for reasons found compelling by the University community through the review process outlined in Article 4.

ARTICLE 3. The above policy shall apply to any research under a contract or grant which does not limit the full and prompt public dissemination of results at the time the research is undertaken by the University but becomes so limited thereafter. As soon as this occurs, the contract or grant, and the disposition of the results of the research obtained under such contract or grant, shall be re-evaluated under the provisions of Article 4.

ARTICLE 4. (a) The Director, Research Contract Coordination, or some other designated University official, shall report to the Senate Research Committee every proposed research grant or contract which meets the requirements of Article 1 but limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results. If this officer is not certain whether a particular research proposal requires the Senate Research Committee's recommendation, he shall submit the proposal to this committee for its determination.

(b) The Senate Research Committee shall recommend to the Senate acceptance or rejection of every proposed contract or grant which limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results during fall, winter and spring quarters, in sufficient detail to permit informed discussion of the recommendations made. In addition, the Committee shall report on any problems encountered in implementing this Policy.

In performing its functions hereunder, the Senate Research Committee shall be authorized to seek the advice and assistance of ad hoc subcommittees competent to pass on the particular matters that may be involved. If some other University committee also has jurisdiction in a particular case, nothing in this Statement of Policy shall deprive it of that jurisdiction.

(c) The University Senate shall review the recommendations of the Senate Research Committee and forward its own recommendations to the President. All proposals which are to be submitted for Senate evaluation shall be accessible to members of the University community (the faculty and students) in sufficient detail to permit informed evaluation and discussion.

ARTICLE 5. The University shall not make available any of its facilities for which permission is required to any individual, group, or organization for research which violates this Statement of Policy. Exceptions may be made through the review procedure outlined in Article 4.

ARTICLE 6. The above policy shall not apply to (1) research by faculty members on leave from the University or serving as consultants, or (2) research which involves (a) the collection of confidential personal opinions

and attitudes or other information pertaining to the individual persons or business entities, or (b) the analysis of the characteristics or uses of proprietary devices or substances, provided that the results of such research may be published freely in the aggregate or used to guide the design of broader research activities.

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy is concerned that the Policy Statement on Secrecy in Research not be evaded by individuals or groups through relationships with organizations whose research activities do not conform with the policy. However, the issue is too complex, within the time and given the information available, to be included in this document. Therefore, the Committee moves that the Senate request the Senate Research Committee and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to establish a University Task Force to examine all formal relationships which may exist between the University and other agencies in which research is conducted which would be forbidden under the University Policy Statement on Secrecy in Research and report to the Senate no later than winter quarter 1970 the facts developed by the examination, with appropriate recommendations for Senate action.

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy recommends that the Senate charge the Senate Research Committee (or an appropriate subcommittee comprising faculty and students) to inquire into, and report back information concerning, proprietary or governmental contracts or grants in support of research at the University, the results of which may be detrimental to human life or welfare. In addition, the Committee should examine the desirability of the funding of any University research or other activities by the Department of Defense or similar agencies.

Addenda to the docket may be submitted by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy prior to the meetings of the Senate on May 22.

MINORITY REPORT

Several significant differences exist between the following policy statement and the one recommended by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. Attention is called to Articles 2, 5, and 6 in the statement which follows. Following action as outlined in Article 2, any member of the University community who feels that the Senate Research Committee has improperly or unjustly applied the policy of this document may appeal the actions of this committee to the University Senate where a simple majority can approve, modify, or reverse the decision of the committee. This is not explicitly stated but we assume that any member of the University community has this recourse as a matter of right, in regard to the actions of any Senate committee.

Further, nothing in the policy statement *recommended for action* by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy deals with the formal relationships between the University and research organizations. In the statement given below nothing is meant to imply that the University wishes to curtail the activity of North Star Research and Development Corporation in its legitimate efforts to contribute to the economic growth of this region. It is simply the intent of this document formally to dissociate the University from such organizations so that any activity which these organizations might undertake which was not consistent with free and open inquiry would not reflect improperly on the University. As indicated in Article 7 all faculty members may, as individuals, choose to participate in the activities of such concerns. In addition, any members of the administration or the Board of Regents may, as individuals, contribute to the growth and sustenance of such concerns. However, this participation on the part of faculty, administration, and Regents should be permitted only insofar as it does not imply a formal association between the organization in question and the University.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

ARTICLE 1. The University of Minnesota shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or a grant which limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results of the research, or which would restrain the University from disclosing (1) the existence of the contract or grant; (2) the identity of the sponsor or the grantor and, if a subcontract is involved, the identity of the prime contractor, if the results of the research must be reported to the sponsor, grantor, or prime contractor, or if the use of the funds is unspecified; (3) the purpose and the scope of the proposed research in sufficient detail to permit informed discussion concerning the wisdom of such research within the University. Enforcement of this article shall be as outlined in Article 2.

ARTICLE 2. The Director, Research Contract Coordinator, or some other designated University official shall screen all proposed research grants or contracts, and shall submit to the Senate Research Committee every proposal which in his judgment does not fulfill the requirements set forth in *Article 1*. If the Senate Research Committee concurs in this judgment, it shall inform the proposed principal investigator and the grantor agency as to how the proposal is in violation of University policy. It shall also indicate how the proposal could be modified so as to conform to University policy. The Senate Research Committee shall recommend to the President that proposals which finally do not conform to policy as stated in this document shall be rejected.

The Senate Committee shall also report its recommendations to the University Senate and shall submit to the University Senate an annual summary of its activities and any problems encountered in implementing this policy.

In performing its functions hereunder, the Senate Research Committee shall be authorized to seek the advice and assistance of ad hoc subcommittees competent to pass on the particular matters that may be involved. If some other University committee also has jurisdiction in a particular case, nothing in this Statement of Policy shall deprive it of that jurisdiction. All stages of the process shall be completely accessible to any interested member of the University community.

ARTICLE 3. The above policy shall apply to any research under a contract or grant which does not limit the full and prompt public dissemination of results at the time the research is undertaken by the University, but becomes so limited thereafter. As soon as this occurs, the contract or grant shall be re-evaluated under the provisions of Articles 1 and 2. All information obtained under such conditions shall be considered unclassified.

ARTICLE 4. The University shall not make available, under any circumstances, any of its facilities to any individual, group, or organization for research which violates any University Research Policy.

ARTICLE 5. The University of Minnesota shall have no formal relationships or ties* involving research with organizations (such as the North Star Research and Development Corporation) whose activities do not adhere to the policy outlined in this document.

ARTICLE 6. University staff or members of official University bodies are not to be allowed to serve in consulting capacities or on boards of directors or in any other capacities in any organizations which carry out research in violation of University Research Policy, *when such appointments will imply a formal association* with the University.*

ARTICLE 7. The above policy shall not apply to (1) research by faculty members on leave from the University or serving as consultants, or (2) research which involves (a) the collection of confidential personal opinions and attitudes or other information pertaining to the individual persons or business entities, or (b) the analysis of the characteristics or uses of proprietary devices or substances, provided that the results of such research may be published freely in the aggregate or used to guide the design of broader research activities.

MARTIN DWORKIN
R. S. HOYT, Chairman

* "Formal relationships or ties" or "formal association" are meant to include those situations where there is specific reference to the University of Minnesota, or to one of its divisions, in documents which define or outline the activities or structure of the organization in question.

VII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

Reported for Action

The adoption of the revised Constitution and Bylaws (previously distributed) for the Twin Cities Assembly is proposed.

JAMES HETLAND
Chairman

VIII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT

SCHOLASTIC STANDING

Reported for Action

PROPOSED CHANGE IN SECOND RESTRICTION, PASS-NO CREDIT GRADING

Three restrictions were placed on Pass-No Credit grading by the enabling legislation adopted by the Senate on March 9, 1967. The restrictions are as follows:

To maintain the integrity of the grading system, the proposed Senate action does set three all-University restrictions upon college plans.

First, P must be used in conjunction with N.

Second, in mixed courses where a student may select either grade scale, the selection must be made at the time of registration and may not be changed. Without such a provision, students would use the P-N scale to escape a low final grade and thereby both subvert the meaningfulness of the grade point average and prevent the use of P-N grading for the purposes intended.

Third, no student may receive a Bachelor's degree unless at least 75 per cent of his degree-qualifying residence credits carry grades of A, B, C or D.

Experience gained in monitoring the experimental P-N grading system indicates that the second provision is unnecessarily restrictive and that some flexibility should be allowed in the changing of registrations from or to the P-N system after the quarter has begun.

Observing that restrictions on changing grading systems are much more severe than restrictions on total changes of registration, the Committee on Student Scholastic Standing recommends that a student be permitted to change his grading system registration *through the first week of classes*. This could permit the student to gain information about courses helpful in making a decision about the appropriate grading system but would not violate the basic provision of the Senate legislation that a student not use the P-N grading system simply to avoid a low grade. A great deal of registration modification goes on in the first week of each quarter. Modification of grading systems ought to be included among the possibilities.

The Committee on Student Scholastic Standing, therefore, recommends that the second restriction be modified to read as follows:

Second, in mixed courses where a student may select either grading scale, he is permitted to change his grading system registration through the first week of classes.

JOHN GOODING
Chairman

IX. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS Reported for Information

PROPOSAL FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON CAMPUS DEMONSTRATIONS

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

One conclusion of the President's Commission on Campus Demonstrations [hereinafter Commission] was that a primary function of a university is to provide a forum for the free exchange and criticism of ideas. To this end, the university, and the student, faculty, and administrative citizens thereof, must maintain an environment in which the free exchange of ideas and debate may take place unimpeded. Accordingly, members of the academic community must be free to organize, discuss, pass resolutions, distribute leaflets, circulate petitions, picket and take any other lawful action, as guaranteed under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. At the same time, it must be recognized that the university's basic functions of teaching and research, and the administrative activities supportive thereof, must be preserved, and activities by individuals or groups cannot, in the name of free speech, be allowed to disrupt or substantially interfere with these activities.

The purpose of the Commission was to develop a standard, striking a balance between these two, sometimes competing interests. Developing formal procedures for implementing this standard was not deemed within the purview of the Commission's charge and such action was deferred for consideration by the appropriate university bodies.

The Senate Committee on Student Affairs is charged primarily with the supervision and regulation of student groups and to a lesser extent, individuals. It was requested by the Office of the President, in consultation with other groups, to develop procedures for the implementation of the Commission's Report. The standards and procedures suggested hereinafter are the product of that request and are deemed equally applicable to recognized student groups and cases of individual violation of the Demonstration Policy.

Implementation of the Demonstration Policy, as applied to individuals or groups, may be viewed as involving several distinct stages: the first is the specification of the standard and its operative effect; the second involves an investigation to determine whether or not a violation of the standard occurred and thereafter a *trial-type hearing* to fix responsibility of the individuals or groups charged with violating the standard; and, when a violation of the standard is found and responsibility is ascertained, the imposition of appropriate sanctions.

I. STANDARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION — DISRUPTION

Any standard requiring a balancing of competing interests must, of necessity, be somewhat vague. As the Commission determined, each member of the academic community is presumed to be capable of determining for himself, objectively, whether or not his conduct is inconsistent with the rights of others. While ultimate responsibility for adherence to any standard must rest with the individual or group in question, this adherence is properly subject to review.

The Commission suggested that the standard for assessing the propriety or impropriety of a demonstration was "DISRUPTION" . . . a demonstration which disrupts or substantially interferes with the orderly process of the teaching or research program, or which disrupts the routine of the office of an administrator is condemned by the Commission. Disruption may be viewed as activity fundamentally incompatible with even the minimal conduct of the normal, on-going university processes. What is inherently disruptive in a given situation will be a factor of judgment in the circumstances of the particular case. Accordingly, some discretion and latitude must be allowed in assessing whether a disruption has taken place.

The Commission resorted to examples as illustrative of "disruption." It suggested that distribution of leaflets or concerted activity in the classroom which occurred in such a manner as to interfere with the teaching processes could be construed as disruptive. Similarly, individual or organized activities, which, by virtue of their geographic location, either conflict with the teaching process, or, by reason of a combination of proximity and noise produced the same result, could be disruptive. Beyond that, it was suggested that conduct which rendered the orderly operation of an administrative office impossible, as by blocking entrance or egress or by removing the furniture, could be found to be disruptive. It should be emphasized that disruption requires a substantial interference and not merely minor inconvenience.

Since a definition of disruption is incapable of precise refinement, short of cataloging all the myriad potentially disruptive situations, the Commission suggested that, ultimately, discretion would have to be placed in the administrative officers or faculty members present in a given instance, and responsible for making the determination. The exercise of such discretion must be judged according to certain standards, however, and clearly relevant factors in the assessment of any demonstration as disruptive would include, but not limited to: a) the number of persons involved; b) the nature of the conduct involved; c) the announced intention or purpose of the demonstration; d) the physical location of the actions; e) the impact of those present upon the on-going university functions; f) the time of the demonstration; g) the extent of prior knowledge by the university; h) the volatility of the issues involved; and i) the presence of other competing persons or groups.

In most instances, each individual student will be capable of and responsible for making a decision as to what constitutes "disruptive" conduct. In some situations, the Commission foresaw that students and others might be in reasonable doubt as to whether their activities did in fact constitute a disruption. The Commission indicated that a request to leave or cease the activities involved made by an appropriate officer of the University might clarify such doubts.

The Commission felt that common sense would normally indicate those persons authorized to request demonstrators to cease engaging in disruptive activities. The teacher in the classroom would normally have authority with regard to that area. The Dean or head of a department has authority with respect to those facilities under his charge and this power can be responsibly delegated. Since the authority of the person requesting a termination or dispersal is a relevant factor in assessing the reasonableness of such a request, it would be expected that to the extent a demonstration is serious or threatening, such a judgment should be made by one correspondingly placed in the institutional decision-making hierarchy. Ultimately, the power to terminate a demonstration emanates from the Office of the President. Ultimate responsibility for such a determination also resides in that office. The President should, therefore, be requested to designate agents in an appropriate chain of command to be charged with making the initial determination of disruption wherever feasible. The question of how far up the chain of command a given decision to terminate must be made will be a function of several variables although clearly in the major confrontation, such as the unauthorized occupation of a university building, the request should issue directly from the president himself, or his designate.

The exact office charged with making the determination would be a function of several variables: a) the harmful or threatening nature of the demonstration; b) the number of persons present; c) the physical location; d) the volatility of the issues involved; e) the nature of the conduct involved; f) the extent of prior knowledge by the university; g) the announced intention or purpose of the demonstration; and h) the presence of other or competing persons or groups. Thus, where there is sufficient prior knowledge that a demonstration is planned on an issue of major importance, and which has a significant student importance, the university would be derelict in not taking appropriate precautions, including providing for the presence of an official empowered to terminate such activity. On the other hand, a truly "spontaneous" demonstration may erupt, of which the university had no prior knowledge. Procedures should be formalized by the Office of the President, such that if the demonstration appears potentially disruptive, appropriate university officials may be quickly summoned.

Only in the event that a demonstration occurs at which such persons are not in attendance, or cannot be quickly summoned, should the determination be made by the "offended" party, i.e., teacher, department

chairman, dean or administrator. And even more clearly, in the latter case, the "offended" party must have sufficient independent stature as to lend credibility to his request. Clearly the teacher in his classroom would have such authority. On the other hand, it would seem that in an administrative office, the request by a secretary, standing alone, would be insufficient to establish a violation.

The gravity of a finding of disruption accompanied by a request to the demonstrators to leave is clear. Administrative instructions to University staff should emphasize the fact that the reasonableness of the basis for the making of such a determination under the Demonstration Policy will be reviewed by those tribunals charged with considering individual or group misconduct.

University policy on demonstrations does not apply to student conduct occurring off-campus unless by reason of the nature, purpose and organization of the demonstration, and the student participation therein, it has a direct and immediate impact on the orderly administration of the University's activities and constitutes a "disruption" in the sense previously discussed, even though occurring off-campus. The burden of proving such a direct and immediate impact must be a substantial one and the standard of disruption shall be the same as applied to on-campus activities.

II. PROCEEDINGS TO ASSESS A VIOLATION OF THE STANDARD AND FIX INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP RESPONSIBILITY

It was the intent of the Commission when it adopted its report that all hearing procedures would require a decision of two issues. The first would go to a determination of whether or not a "disruptive" demonstration had occurred. The second would go to the involvement and responsibility of individual or group participants. The value of the Demonstration policy will be put in issue by a determination of the existence of disruption accompanied by a request to the parties involved to leave if that request is ignored. In such an event, the integrity of the policy requires that proceedings be initiated to determine the existence or non-existence of a disruption and the responsibility of individuals or groups who ignored the request to leave.

The failure to label a demonstration disruptive at the time of its occurrence, with the absence of a request to leave, does not preclude subsequent investigation and preferment of charges of violation of the demonstration policy. The failure to formally determine such actions as disruptive at the time of their occurrence should not be taken to condone them, and a hearing procedure, in all ways identical with those accompanying demonstrations terminated as disruptive shall be employed.

The determination that a disruption has occurred must be made by an impartial board solely on the evidence presented to it. It is suggested that the tribunal should consist of six members, three students and three faculty.¹ The tribunal should include a professor of the law school or some other person familiar with the law. Selection of the student and faculty representatives shall be made through procedures used for other Senate Committees and shall be for a period of one year. An even number of members was decided on for the panel in order to allow for a tie vote. In the event that the tribunal ends in a tie, it must be concluded that there has been a failure to establish that a disruptive demonstration has occurred. In the event that no disruption is found, it should be recognized that what at the moment seems to be a reasonable exercise of discretion may not always be vindicated in the light of hindsight. However, in the case of a gross abuse of discretion, the individual so acting should be subject to appropriate sanctions or censure.

¹ It has been suggested that existing procedures (All-University Judiciary Committee and All-University Committee on Student Behavior) should be used until such time as Vice President Cashman's Task Force on Student Affairs submits its recommendations. However, in view of the procedural inadequacy of the existing tribunals, and in light of the charge of the Demonstration Report that procedures developed must meet with generosity and not mere adequacy, the requirements of due process, these procedures are being recommended at this time.

The purpose of the inquiry initially is not the assignment of guilt on allegedly offending parties, but merely a determination that an offense has occurred. Only after a disruption has been found, will inquiry be directed toward individual or group responsibility.

The parties to these proceedings shall consist of the University, and those individuals and/or groups charged with a violation of the Demonstration Policy. A hearing may involve several students where there are elements of proof in common and such hearing would be consistent with procedural fairness, or the hearing may be conducted on an individual basis. The primary consideration is that every individual be afforded an opportunity for a fair hearing, both on the issues of disruption and of personal responsibility. If it should appear in a multi-individual hearing that the various individuals charged participated in a demonstration in widely divergent manners, and that the introduction of such evidence as to some would be prejudicial as to others, then the hearing of these cases shall be separated, either upon the motion of the parties, or by the board on its own motion.

After the determination has been made that a violation of the policy prohibiting "disruption" has occurred, individual or group responsibility must be determined. The office of the university attorney, or some other office designated by the Office of the President, shall function in the nature of a prosecuting attorney, representing the university's interests in the proceedings.

The essence of this proposal is that where substantial numbers of persons are involved that it may be desirable to hold separate inquiries into the issues of disruption and individual responsibility. Where, however, the number of parties is small, it may be appropriate to consolidate the two proceedings, subject to the limitations previously adverted to. Thus, an individual creating a disturbance in a classroom need not be afforded two separate hearings, when the issues of disruption and responsibility may be determined simultaneously.

The Commission stated its belief that the effectiveness of its policy will ultimately rest upon the procedures with which it is applied. These procedures must meet with generosity and not merely adequacy the constitutional requirements of due process. An article entitled *Reasonable Rules Reasonably Enforced—Guidelines for University Disciplinary Proceedings*, appearing in Vol. 53 *Minnesota Law Review*, 301, 325-26 (December, 1968), suggests that the following procedures must be afforded in order to meet the Commission's mandate:

1. A written statement must be provided a student or group charged with a violation at least one week in advance of any hearing and the notice must charge with some specificity the factual allegations of misconduct upon which the charge is brought, including the time, place, and manner of identification.

2. Prior to the hearing, the students or group must be afforded an opportunity to inspect any affidavits or other evidence that the institution intends to submit against it. The group must also be provided with a list of witnesses and copies of any statements or complaints they have made. In the event that substantial testimony or evidence not made available for prior discovery is intended to be introduced in such proceedings, the student or group may request a recess in which to prepare a response.

3. The hearing tribunal should be constituted as suggested above, and under no circumstances may deans or administrators presenting the institution's case, nor any other party of interest, sit on the tribunal or participate in the final deliberations.

4. The student or group is entitled to retain and have present at the hearing, counsel and may seek his advice at any time during the conduct of the proceedings.

5. The student or group representatives must be afforded the opportunity to be present to confront the accusers and all other witnesses presenting evidence. Strict adherence to the formal rules of evidence is not required.

6. The student shall be permitted to hear *all* of the evidence presented against him and should be permitted either personally or by counsel, to question any witnesses testifying.

7. The student or group shall be afforded an opportunity to present their own case, including their version of the facts, and any affidavits, exhibits, or witnesses in support thereof.

8. The hearing panel shall make its determination and disposition of the case solely on the basis of the facts presented to it in these proceedings and shall provide a written findings including the facts found in support of its determination.

9. Appellate procedures must be provided and a record of the events of the hearing must be preserved for review. Such review would be concerned with the adequacy of the proof and the equity of the disposition. Appeal from the tribunal should be to the President, and ultimately to the Board of Regents. The President may appoint a committee to review the record and advise him.

The hearing procedures, to the extent not inconsistent with the maintenance of campus order, should be open, except when specially requested closed by the parties or when conduct by observers is such as to be disruptive of fair, orderly and impartial proceedings. This determination shall be made by the tribunal.

The Commission predicated group, as opposed to individual, responsibility on two grounds of liability, where there has been: (a) deliberate preparation and conduct of a demonstration by the officers and members responsible, acting in their capacity as officers or members of the group, in such a manner as to violate the University policy, or deliberately conducting a demonstration under these same circumstances; or (b) culpable failure on the part of the officers or members of the group, or acting as officers or members, to take steps reasonably available to them in the circumstances which would have avoided or substantially mitigated the violation of the University Demonstration Policy.

The function of the hearing tribunal, acting consonantly with the procedures elaborated above, is to determine, for groups, whether either of these two situations prevail. In the event that the tribunal finds that group violations have occurred, then appropriate sanctions may be imposed upon the group. This does not preclude adjudication of individual responsibility as well. Individual responsibility would follow from preparation for, participation in, or assistance of a disruptive demonstration. It could also result from a failure to comply with a reasonably presented request to leave a demonstration which has been declared disruptive.

III. SANCTIONS

Group

In the event that a group has been found, through deliberate preparation and conduct of a demonstration by the officers and members responsible, acting in their capacity of officers or members of the group in such a manner as to violate the policy, or by deliberately conducting a demonstration under the same circumstances, or by culpable failure on the officers or members of the group, acting as officers or members, to take steps reasonably available to them in the circumstances which would have avoided or substantially mitigated the violation of the policy, to have engaged in activities violative of the policy, sanctions may then be levied against the group.

Such sanctions are necessarily confined, as to groups, to the withdrawal of university recognition of such groups with the concomitant loss of a privilege flowing from university recognition. This would include the loss of rights to use university facilities or to engage in organized group activities on campus. In cases of violation, however, this maximum penalty need not be exacted and lesser sanctions, such as a probationary status may be imposed in lieu thereof. Effective by the adoption of the Commission on Demonstration's Report by the Faculty Senate is the repeal of the Policy on the Responsibility of Student Organizations for the Conduct of Members (Conduct Control Policy) to the extent that its provisions are inconsistent with the assignment of group responsibility as described above.

Individual

In the event that an individual has been found, through deliberate preparation for, participation in, or assistance of a demonstration characterized as disruptive, sanctions may then be levied against such person.

Such sanctions shall include the entire scope of remedies available to the University in dealing with cases of individual misconduct. These might entail a warning, probation, suspension, or in the most severe cases, expulsion. The imposition of such sanctions must conform with the gravity of the offense. They should also be employed to further an educational function, if possible, rather than a purely punitive or retributive function. In the final analysis, greater deterrence is achieved by certainty of punishment than by severity.

GEORGE SHAPIRO
Chairman

X. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS Reported for Action

1. *Transfer Recognition for Lea College, Albert Lea, Minnesota.*

Lea College is a private liberal arts college. Its purpose is to provide educational opportunity to many young people who may find educational opportunity denied them elsewhere, or who may not have been successful in earlier academic performances. The institution began operation with a freshman class in September, 1966. At the request of the college, and following completion of an institutional self-study, Lea College was visited by a committee chaired by Keith McFarland, Director of Resident Instruction and Assistant Dean, College of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics on March 14 and 15, 1968. The committee recommended that Lea College be granted Transfer Recognition for lower division offerings with the provision that a revisit be held during the 1968-69 academic year.

On March 18 and 19, 1969, the college was revisited by the following committee:

- Hyman Berman, Associate Professor and Chairman, Social Science Program, University of Minnesota (Chairman)
- Leo Abbott, Assistant Director of Admissions, University of Minnesota
- Thomas W. Chamberlin, Academic Dean, University of Minnesota, Duluth
- Patricia Goralski, Director of Teacher Personnel, State Department of Education
- Lloyd Hollingsworth, Professor and Chairman, Department of Health and Physical Education, Gustavus Adolphus College
- Herbert Johnson, Assistant Professor and Librarian, Hamline University
- Norman Kerr, Associate Professor and Assistant Dean, University of Minnesota
- G. Gordon Kingsley, Professor and Head, Student Personnel Services, University of Minnesota
- Gordon Mork, Professor of Teacher Education and Higher Education, University of Minnesota
- James Nichols, Chairman, Department of English, Winona State College
- Lynn Steen, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, St. Olaf College
- Gerhard Weiss, Professor and Associate Dean, Humanities and Fine Arts, University of Minnesota
- C. Lloyd Bjornlie, Executive Secretary, Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships, University of Minnesota (ex officio)

The initial visiting committee had expressed particular concern over the relative incompleteness of curricular and related planning for the upper division programs, especially the teacher education program. The committee expressed the opinion that the composition of the student body and the limitation in physical facilities, instructional resources, and staffing might not support immediate entry into upper division instruction.

The 1969 revisiting committee expressed similar concerns over the upper division program and the members agreed that, in general, the upper division offerings were not yet comparable to upper division offerings of the University of Minnesota.

The visiting committee was of the opinion that the lower division work should continue to be granted transfer recognition. The visiting committee offered the following recommendation to the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships which approved it and submits it to the Senate:

That coursework offered in transfer, be granted continued recognition at the lower division level only, with the provision for a revisit in the year 1969-70 for Lea College of Albert Lea, Minnesota.

2. *Renewal of Accredited Status for Private Minnesota High Schools.*

In accordance with the procedures and standards for renewing accredited status outlined in the Criteria for the Accreditation of Private Secondary Schools (Senate Minutes, November 20, 1952, pp. 24-33), the following schools are recommended for continued accreditation by the University of Minnesota subject to the submission of annual reports which satisfy the above Criteria:

Academy of the Holy Angels	Minneapolis
Archbishop Murray Memorial High School	St. Paul
Loyola High School	Mankato
Regina High School	Minneapolis
Sacred Heart High School	Waseca
St. Mary High School	Sleepy Eye
St. Mary's Hall	Faribault
The Summit School	St. Paul

These schools have been recommended for renewal of accredited status after review of reports of visiting committees, annual reports, and other supplementary information submitted by each school. In each case, the recommendation favoring continued accreditation has the concurrence of visiting committees composed of eight to 19 representatives drawn from the University, state colleges and junior colleges, public and private high schools, and the State Department of Education. Committee chairmen or co-chairmen were:

Gary Alkire	Regina High School
C. Lloyd Bjornlie	St. Mary's Hall
Donald E. Davis	The Summit School
Eugene Gennaro	Loyola High School
Richard Kimpston	Archbishop Murray Memorial High School
Manley Olson	Academy of the Holy Angels & St. Mary H.S.
Robert Randleman	Sacred Heart High School

A total of 97 different persons participated in the visitation program for renewal of accreditation during the 1968-69 school year. The committees spent an evening and the full day following in reviewing each of the high schools listed except the Academy of the Holy Angels which was reviewed concurrently with the North Central Association and where an evening and two days were spent in visiting the school. Under this program schools are visited on a seven-year cycle.

3. *Accreditation of Private Minnesota High Schools.*

During 1968-69, the application of one private high school, Archbishop William O'Brady High School, West St. Paul, was reviewed for possible accreditation by the University of Minnesota. This school had completed an institutional self-study utilizing the *Evaluative Criteria of the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation*.

The school was visited on April 28, 29 and 30, 1969, by a 24-member visiting committee composed of representatives from public and private high schools and the University of Minnesota and chaired by Charles Bruning, Director of Clinical Experiences, College of Education, University of Minnesota. Procedures followed were those outlined in the Criteria for Accreditation of Private Secondary Schools (Senate Minutes, November 20, 1952, pp. 24-33) on the basis of the self-study and the visitation report, this Senate Committee recommends:

That Archbishop William O'Brady High School, West St. Paul, Minnesota, be added to the list of private secondary schools accredited by the University of Minnesota. Accreditation is granted subject to the subject to the submission of annual reports which satisfy the above Criteria.

4. Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conferences.

On November 4, 1965, the University Senate approved the following recommendation by the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships regarding the establishment of a conference which would involve faculty members from all Minnesota institutions of higher education.

It is recommended that the Senate formally indicate its sponsorship of such a conference and invite the Association of Minnesota Colleges and the State Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) to join as co-sponsors.

The AAUP accepted the invitation and joined the Senate in sponsoring three Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conferences. The Association of Minnesota Colleges (AMC) while not becoming a formal sponsor, provided support and encouragement to the venture. Each of the three organizations named three members to a Steering Committee which has directed the three conferences held. Financial support has been provided by a generous grant from the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation.

This grant expired with the 1969 conference but it is the opinion of those who have attended past conferences that the series should be continued. Therefore, the Steering Committee is developing plans for future conferences, funded in part by the institutions of higher education in Minnesota. The Steering Committee also decided to broaden the sponsorship of the conferences. The AMC has been asked to become a formal sponsor and the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission, the Interfaculty Organization of Minnesota State Colleges, and the Minnesota Junior College Faculty Association have also been invited to join in sponsoring future conferences. If the invitations are accepted, these four organizations, will join with the Minnesota Conference of the AAUP and the Senate in sponsoring future conferences and in naming representatives to the reconstituted Steering Committee. The current Steering Committee is coordinating the establishment of the new committee and will continue to function until the new Steering Committee is established.

The Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships supports the continuance of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conferences and recommends that:

The Senate continue its support of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conferences and join with other organizations in the sponsorship of future conferences.

Reported for Information

This being the last meeting of the year, the following items which describe areas of committee discussion or activities this year are reported for information (items which have been reported for action this year are not included):

1. An Advisory Committee to review the *Criteria for the Accreditation of Private Secondary Schools* was appointed. The committee suggested several modifications in the accrediting process including revision of the *Criteria*. A revised version of the *Criteria* was drafted by a subcommittee and this draft is now being considered by the Advisory Committee. The *Criteria* will then be submitted to the private schools and to the University for approval and are expected to become operative with the 1970-71 school year.
2. On November 6, 1968, the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships sponsored a conference on "Special Opportunities at the University of Minnesota" for counselors and students from all high schools in the seven-county metropolitan area. Fifty-nine counselors and 49 students from 63 public and private high schools and 48 University staff and students attended. The purpose of the conference was to acquaint counselors and students with programmatic, academic and curricular special opportunities at the University of Minnesota.
3. The Committee discussed the problems and effects of the proposed merger of the Committee with the Senate Committees on Scholastic Standing and Admissions Policy.
4. The Committee heard brief reports about a number of completed conferences: The Third Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conference at Sugar Hills; a conference for junior college English teachers at University of Minnesota, Duluth, and a Forestry Conference held in St. Paul. The Committee also discussed possible sponsorship of future conferences of various types.
5. Informational reports were presented and discussion held on:
 - a. Planned changes in IT admissions requirements and housing of IT students;
 - b. CLA Planned Growth developments;
 - c. Employment of informational representatives;
 - d. A CLA Honors Division Pilot Program with ten high schools to identify high achievers in specific areas but whose overall record would not identify them as "honors students."

T. E. KELLOGG
Chairman

XI. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SENATE COMMITTEES

1. Reported for Information

The Committee on Senate Committees has been engaged in the following activities during the academic 1968-69:

1. Worked with the Senate Committee on Business and Rules to present a revised University Senate Constitution (adopted April 10, 1969) and a new Constitution for the Twin Cities Assembly (Constitution adopted May 23, 1968; Bylaws adopted December 5, 1968; revised and presented for action at the Senate meeting of May 22, 1969);
2. Assisted the Senate Committee on Business and Rules and the Task Force on Student Representation in implementing the final report of the Task Force;
3. Conducted (March, 1969) the biennial faculty survey for interest in serving on committees of the University Senate; concurrently, surveyed all faculty of the Twin Cities Campus for interest in serving on committees of the Twin Cities Assembly; (Summary of Faculty Interest Survey attached below);
4. Presented exactly double slates of nominees to the University President for appointment of committees of the University Senate and Twin Cities Assembly for the 1969-72 terms. In accordance with the revised and new Constitutions and Bylaws, appointments are to be so adjusted that approximately one third of the terms expire each year. Slates included no nominations for continuance of committee members whose years of service exceed six consecutive years. Faculty members will be appointed to no more than two major standing committees of the University Senate so that a broader base of faculty service may be realized.

2. Reported for Action

1. The Committee on Senate Committees presents for Senate approval a handbook summarizing the rules of the University Senate and Twin Cities Assembly. The handbook (distributed separately) was developed in accordance with the principles presented by the Committee on Senate Committees and approved by the Senate on March 7, 1968 (Agenda Item VIII). The handbook is directed to centralizing the rules which, among other things, create University and Campus Committees, define membership duties and responsibilities of committees of the Senate and Twin Cities Assembly, and assist in the operational affairs of the University Senate.

MAYNARD C. REYNOLDS, Chairman
DAVID COOPERMAN
ELEANOR S. FENTON
HERBERT W. JOHNSON
ARNOLD LAZAROW
D. BURNHAM TERRELL

RESULTS OF FACULTY INTEREST SURVEY FOR SERVICE ON COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY, 1969

Number of surveys sent:	All members of the faculty eligible to vote for members of the University Senate	
Number surveys returned:	423	
Volunteers for Committees:	624	
Recommendations by others:	282	
Terminations requested:	9	
Volunteers with no Committee Preference:	22	
Recommendations with no Committee Preference:	7	

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Senate Committees University Committees Committees	Volunteers	Recommendations	Terminations
Academic Standing and Relations (Administrative Committee)	35	20	1
All University Honors	4	4	
Printing and Publications	11	4	
University Schedule	14	6	
(Consultative Committee)			
Business and Rules	3	4	1
Educational Policy	71	43	
Computing Facilities	17	16	
Extension Committee	30	11	3
Instructional Materials	30	20	
Summer Sessions	12	5	1

9—SENATE DOCKET—22508

Faculty Affairs	49	18	
Tenure	7	5	
Judicial	4	4	
Library	39	15	1
Research	42	22	
Use of Human Subjects in Investigation	16	6	
Resources and Planning	70	21	

COMMITTEES OF THE TWIN CITIES ASSEMBLY

Assembly Committee	14	8	
Campus Committees			
Educational Policy			
Convocations and the Arts	12	8	
Educational Services	19	9	
Honors Program	9	1	
R.O.T.C.	10	2	1
Intercollegiate Athletics	25	6	
Student Affairs	38	21	1
Foreign Students	32	7	
Intramural and Extramural Activities	10	4	
Judiciary Council	1	0	

XII. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Reported for Information

		VARSIITY HOCKEY SCHEDULE 1969-70
Nov.	14-15	U of M Duluth — At Duluth
	28-29	Colorado College — At Colorado Springs
Dec.	5-6	U of North Dakota
	21-23	Big Ten Tournament — At Ann Arbor
Jan.	2-3	Colorado College
	9-10	U of M Duluth
	16-17	Michigan State U — At East Lansing
	23-24	U of Michigan
	30-31	Michigan Tech — At Houghton
Feb.	6-7	U of Wisconsin — At Madison
	13-14	Michigan State U
	20-21	U of North Dakota — At Grand Forks
	27-28	U of Wisconsin
Mar.	6-7	U of Michigan — At Ann Arbor
	12-14	WCHA Playoffs — AT Duluth and Denver
	19-21	NCAA — At Lake Placid, New York

BASKETBALL 1969-70

Dec.	1	Notre Dame
	4	University of North Dakota — At Grand Forks
	6	UCLA
	9	Iowa State University — At Ames
	20	Drake University
	22	Marquette University — At Milwaukee
	23	San Diego State
	26-27	Motor City Tourney — At Detroit
Jan.	3	Ohio State University — At Columbus
	10	University of Indiana
	13	University of Wisconsin — At Madison
	17	Michigan State University
	24	Ohio State University
	26	Loyola University of Chicago
	31	Michigan State University — At East Lansing
Feb.	3	University of Iowa — At Iowa City
	7	University of Illinois
	14	Northwestern University
	21	University of Michigan — At Ann Arbor
	24	Purdue University
	28	University of Illinois — At Champaign
Mar.	3	University of Michigan
	7	Purdue University — At Lafayette

XIII. OLD BUSINESS

XIV. NEW BUSINESS

XV. NECROLOGY

JAMES RUDD CURTIN

1922-1969

James R. Curtin, Professor and Assistant Chairman of the Department of Elementary Education, suffered a coronary attack and died suddenly at his home early in the morning of January 13, 1969, at the age of 46. His death brought a great sense of loss to his colleagues both in Minnesota and throughout the country.

Born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, James Curtin earned his Bachelor's degree from the Milwaukee State Teachers College and began his career in elementary education as a teacher at Lake Geneva, Wisconsin. He received his Master's degree and then the Ph.D. degree from the State University of Iowa. During the years of his advanced studies, he was a teacher at the University of Iowa Elementary School and later an elementary school principal, first in Coralville, Iowa, and then in Monmouth, Oregon. After receiving his doctorate, he spent his first year as a professor at the Oregon College of Education in Monmouth.

In 1955, Dr. Curtin joined the faculty of the College of Education at the University of Minnesota; in 1956, he was appointed Director of the University Elementary School; and in 1963, he became the Chairman of the Department of Elementary Education. When he lost his vision in 1966, he assumed the assistant chairmanship of the same department. Despite his loss of sight, he continued to teach at his usual high level, to serve as an untiring and perceptive adviser for many graduate students in elementary education and educational administration, and to provide remarkable faculty leadership.

Professor Curtin was the author of many articles and monographs and a textbook on elementary school supervision which has affected significantly the supervisory practices of school principals. At the time of his death, he had another major book in preparation. During his all too brief career, he spoke at many state, regional and national meetings, continually championing the improvement of elementary education. His dedication to this goal of improving instruction was both strong and constant, and his positive influence on elementary school teachers and principals may well be the most significant of his several outstanding achievements.

He was one of the early organizers of the Association for the Evaluation of Elementary Schools, a group which he served as President. As President and Past-President also of the Minnesota Elementary Principals Association, he was a continuing consultant to its Executive Board. At its 1968 Winter Institute, this Association recognized his exceptional contributions with a formal tribute and the award of a life membership. To principals throughout Minnesota, he was "Dr. Jim," their mentor and friend.

To have an entire class rise and applaud at the final session was no uncommon experience for Jim Curtin, although he always was surprised anew when it happened. Several times, the members of his classes have sent statements to the College of Education to express their individual and collective appreciation for the inspiration of his teaching, his human qualities, and his courage. Jim could spur his students on to make contributions beyond those they had ever believed to be possible, and he never lost his sense of proportion through all the years when his health problems must have been a heavy burden. He was no pessimist expecting the worst — he just seemed able to cope with whatever physical difficulties occurred as come they did. His adjustment to his blindness simply became another means of teaching through example.

Since James Curtin came to Minnesota under the late Dean Walter W. Cook, it is appropriate to quote the words Dean Cook once used in describing him: "Dr. Curtin has a personality that makes him desirable to subordinates, peers, colleagues, and the various strata in the community. He is pleasant, unassuming, dynamic, understanding and 'lost' to the cause and importance of education as are few others I have known."

In one of his earliest elementary classrooms, he wanted to teach folk songs to the children. He bought a guitar, sought out songs in their original folk forms, learned them himself, and eventually delighted many people with his singing. He became somewhat of an authority on folk music, and he had been urged to supplement his two records with notes on sources, history, and variations of the songs. His Irish humor was cherished by his friends, and its unbarbed flash would break a deadlock in many a professional discussion.

Jim Curtin had a love of people, children, life in general — and everyone responded to his rare and sensitive spirit. Truly he was universally loved and admired, and his friends and colleagues everywhere will not cease to miss him. Consolation must come from knowing that the effects of his excellent work will continue and that his warmth and blitheness will be long remembered.

Professor Curtin is survived by his wife Mary Anne and by four daughters: Julia, Ellen, Jane and Anne. In his surviving family there is the same strength and valiance which characterized Jim himself throughout his life.

OTTO W. SWENSON
1895-1969

Otto W. Swenson, former agronomist at the North Central Station, Grand Rapids, and later assistant professor in Agronomy and St. Paul farm and grounds superintendent, passed away January 29, 1969. Funeral services were held February 1, 1969 at the St. Anthony Park Lutheran Church with interment in Sunset Memorial Park.

Otto, as he was known to his many friends and associates, was born April 6, 1895 in Chicago, Illinois and attended grade school there. A short while later he moved to Minnesota and was graduated from the West Central School of Agriculture at Morris in 1916. He was employed part time at the West Central Station. Otto's longest period of employment with the University was at the North Central School and Station at Grand Rapids for the period 1926-March 31, 1942. He was named instructor in 1937. Otto was an excellent teacher and well liked by students, staff, and residents of the Grand Rapids area. He merited the respect of agronomists at the central station who enjoyed working with him on crops research. He also at times served as preceptor, superintendent of buildings, and athletic coach. His crops judging teams consistently placed first at the Red River Valley Winter Shows. At the World's Grain Exhibition and Conferences at Regina, Saskatchewan his crops team placed first in competition with teams from other states and Canadian provinces.

Otto's duties at St. Paul began April 1, 1942 when he was named farm superintendent and assistant professor of agronomy. During this time he was named honorary premier seed grower by the Minnesota Crop Improvement Association and the Northwest Crop Improvement Association.

A crippling illness forced Otto to take his first leave of absence in 1955 and to retire officially June 30, 1960. In spite of many years of suffering he maintained his cheerful friendly personality to the end.

His immediate survivors are his wife Clara, his daughter Jean (Mrs. Paul T. Grimes), and his son Glenn.

May 22, 1969

SCSA Motion (presented by Prof Shapiro, but defeated by passing Cooperator
Substitute motion supporting the decision of Pres Moos

With the full understanding

1. that President Moos has made noble efforts to protect the rights of all students and student groups of the University campuses, and ^{to refuse permission to hold SDS Convention here.}
2. that the proposed SDS convention creates the potential of a threat of disruption by a variety of individuals and groups from divergent political persuasions, and
3. that the proposed SDS convention creates the potential of publicity reflecting adversely on the University of Minnesota

the Senate Committee on Student Affairs nevertheless believes that

1. to insure full freedom of speech ^{and assembly} for the entire University constituency, and
2. to permit equal opportunity of expression to all authorized student groups,

SDS should be permitted to hold its convention on the University of Minnesota campus with the understanding that SDS is committed to the same responsibilities for payment of costs and protection of property to which all other student organizations are held.

Secret to this page 01/1/69