

SENATE MEETING

MAY 25, 1950

3:00 P.M.

MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA SENATE DOCKET

Your Committee on Business and Rules respectfully presents the following matters for your consideration at the meeting of the Senate, May 25, 1950, Murphy Hall Auditorium, 3:00 p.m.

- I. Minutes of February 16, 1950
- II. Report of the Committee on Business and Rules
- III. Administrative Committee of the Senate for 1950-51
- IV. Senate Committees for 1950-51
- V. Special Administrative Committees for 1950-51
- VI. Staff Membership on Student Bodies for 1950-51
- VII. Report of the Administrative Committee
- VIII. Report of the Committee on Debate and Oratory
- IX. Report of the Committee on Education
- X. Report of the Committee on the Relation of the University to Other Institutions of Learning
- XI. Report of the Committee on Student Affairs
- XII. Report of the Committee on Students' Work
- XIII. Report of the Committee on Necrology

I. MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 1950 Reported for Action

II. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES Reported for Action

The following by-law is submitted:

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

There shall be a standing Committee on Institutional Research consisting of eleven members. It shall advise the Bureau of Institutional Research with respect to the studies to be undertaken by the Bureau, the studies to be given priority, and any basic questions of policy or procedure connected with the Bureau's activities.

HENRY ROTTSCHAEFER, Chairman

III. ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE FOR 1950-51

Reported for Information

The President reports the membership of the Administrative Committee of the Senate for 1950-51 as follows:

President J. L. Morrill, Professor Ike J. Armstrong (Athletics), Dean Clyde H. Bailey (Department of Agriculture), Dean Theodore C. Blegen (Graduate School), Dr. Ruth E. Boynton (Health Service), Dean Richard L. Buchta (University College), Dean William H. Crawford (Dentistry), Dean Harold S. Diehl (Medical Sciences), Provost Raymond C. Gibson (Duluth Branch), Mr. Edwin L. Haislet (Alumni Relations), Dean Richard L. Kozelka (Business Administration), Mr. Laurence R. Lunden (Comptroller), Dean T. Raymond McConnell (Science, Literature, and the Arts), Mr. Errett W. McDiarmid (Library), Vice President William T. Middlebrook (Business Administration), Dean Horace T. Morse (General College), Dean Julius M. Nolte (Extension), Mr. William L. Nunn (University Relations), Dean Wesley E. Peik (Education), Dean Maynard E. Pirsig (Law), Dean Charles H. Rogers (Pharmacy), Captain Cornelius M. Sullivan (ROTC Units), Dean Henry Schmitz (Agriculture), Dean Athelstan F. Spilhaus (Institute of Technology), Dean R. Edward Summers (Admissions and Records), Dean Thomas A. H. Teeter (Summer Session), Vice President Malcolm M. Willey (Academic Administration), Dean Edmund G. Williamson (Dean of Students).

IV. SENATE COMMITTEES FOR 1950-51 Reported for Action

The following Senate committees have been named by the President, subject to the approval of the University Senate, effective July 1, 1950:

Audio-Visual Aids: George H. McCune (chairman), H. Harvard Arnason, Venning P. Hollis, Roy C. Jones, Fred L. Kildow, William J. Micheels, Dwight E. Minnich, Julius M. Nolte, Milo J. Peterson, Edward B. Stanford, Miles A. Tinker, Tracy F. Tyler, Paul R. Wendt.

Business and Rules: Henry Rottschaefer (chairman), Ernest A. Heilman, True E. Pettengill, George J. Schroepfer, Arthur J. Schwantes.

Debate and Oratory: E. William Ziebarth (chairman), Asher N. Christensen, Mark A. Graubard, William S. Howell, Ralph G. Nichols, Lloyd M. Short; students: Delores R. Carley, Ed'51, John L. Chapman, A'53, Robert Latz, A'52, Donald H. Long, A'53, C. Robert Mathews, B'51.

Education: Horace T. Morse (chairman), Robert H. Beck, Russell M. Cooper, William H. Crawford, Ruth E. Eckert, Richard K. Gaumnitz, Dale B. Harris, Howard L. Horns, Frank H. Kaufert, John E. King (Duluth), Athelstan F. Spilhaus, George B. Vold.

Intercollegiate Athletics: Willard L. Boyd (chairman), Ike J. Armstrong, Thomas F. Barnhart, Harold S. Diehl, J. Lewis Maynard, William T. Middlebrook, Henry Rottschaefer (Conference representative), J. Warren Stehman, John H. Williams, Chester Wood (Duluth); alumni: Robert E. Shay, Donald Lampland; students: Michael Cashman, A'51, Gerald H. Friedell, L'52, James L. Marvin, UC'51 (president, All-University Congress, ex officio).

Judicial: William Anderson (chairman), William H. Alderman, Walter W. Heller, William B. Lockhart, Mervin G. Neale.

Library: Theodore C. Blegen (chairman), Gaylord W. Anderson, Russell M. Cooper, Ruth E. Eckert, Richard K. Gaumnitz, William F. Geddes, Errett W. McDiarmid, Henry N. Smith, Athelstan F. Spilhaus.

Necrology: Dora V. Smith (chairman), Edward A. Boyden, Raymond W. Brink, John O. Christianson, Ezra H. Pieper (Duluth), Hubert J. Sloan, M. Cannon Sneed.

Recreation: Gerald B. Fitzgerald (chairman), Gertrude M. Baker, B. James Borreson, G. Ray Higgins, Keith N. McFarland; students: Willie Harper, G'51, Constance Parvey, A'52, Katherine Paterson, Gr., Harold Rindal, Ed'52, Marilyn Schaefer, Ed'52, Janis Thieme, Ag'52.

Relation of the University to Other Institutions of Learning: Robert J. Keller (chairman), Ralph F. Berdie, Charles W. Boardman, Elmer W. Johnson, August C. Krey, Roger B. Page, Ella Rose, R. Edward Summers, Gerhard E. von Glahn (Duluth).

Student Affairs: Edmund G. Williamson (chairman), Loyst C. Caverley, Kenneth E. Clark, Marcia Edwards, Gerald B. Fitzgerald, Joan Clark Gendreau, Theron A. Johnson, Maynard E. Pirsig, Henry Schmitz, Edwin B. Wenzel (Duluth), C. Gilbert Wrenn; alumni: Mrs. Harold S. Eberhardt, Edwin L. Haislet; students: James Bye, B'51, Michael Cashman, Jr., A'51, Jean Fletcher, Ag'50, Walter Hoffman, IT'50, Allen Kaufmann, A'51, Kathryn LeRoy, A'52, Richard Lillehei, Md'51, Gordon Neale, IT'50, Jerome Shulkin, A'51.

Students' Work: Edmund G. Williamson (chairman), Ralph F. Berdie, John G. Darley, R. Edward Summers, chairmen of the students' work committees of the several schools and colleges.

University Functions: William L. Nunn (chairman), Ike J. Armstrong, H. Harvard Arnason, Wallace V. Blomquist, Edwin L. Haislet, Johns H. Hopkins, Jane Leichsenring, James S. Lombard, Gerald R. McKay, Paul M. Oberg, Frank M. Whiting, Edmund G. Williamson.

University Printing: Paul E. Miller (chairman), Mitchell V. Charnley, Margaret S. Harding, Errett W. McDiarmid, William T. Middlebrook, William L. Nunn, True E. Pettengill.

V. SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES FOR 1950-51 Reported for Information

The President reports special administrative committees and their membership for 1950-51 as follows:

Admissions, Board of: R. Edmund Summers (chairman), Ralph F. Berdie, Charles W. Boardman, Russell M. Cooper, Ruth E. Eckert, Henry E. Hartig, Howard L. Horns, Horace T. Morse, Henry Schmitz, Chester W. Wood.

Band Committee: Paul M. Oberg (chairman), Dean of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, Ike J. Armstrong, Edwin L. Haislet, William T. Middlebrook, William L. Nunn, Wesley E. Peik, Gerald R. Prescott (the acting bandmaster to replace Mr. Prescott during his year's leave), Clarence H. Schabacker, Malcolm M. Willey, Edmund G. Williamson.

Centennial Committee, University: Horace T. Morse (chairman),* Errett W. McDiarmid (secretary),* Raymond M. Amberg, Hedwin C. Anderson, H. Harvard Arnason, Theodore C. Blegen,* Wallace V. Blomquist, Walter J. Breckenridge, Helen G. Canoyer, John O. Christianson, Helen Clapesattle, William H. Crawford, Edward W. Davis, Katharine J. Densford, Harold S. Diehl, Theodore H. Fenske, Raymond C. Gibson, Walter H. Grierson, Alrik Gustafson, Edwin L. Haislet, Victor Johnson, Roy C. Jones, Louis F. Keller, August C. Krey,* Arthur O. Lampland, Ruth E. Lawrence, James S. Lombard, Tremaine McDowell, William T. Middlebrook,* James L. Marvin, Paul E. Miller, Charles V. Netz, Julius M. Nolte, William L. Nunn,* Paul M. Oberg, Burton Paulu, Maynard E. Pirsig, Joseph C. Poucher, Lloyd H. Reyerson, Chester Roan, Clarence H. Schabacker, Thorvald Schantz-Hansen, Henry Schmitz,* Lloyd M. Short, Fred B. Snyder, Lorenz G. Straub, Cornelius M. Sullivan, Thomas A. H. Teeter, Tracy F. Tyler, Dorolese H. Wardwell, Stanley J. Wenberg, Edgar B. Wesley, Frank M. Whiting, Malcolm M. Willey,* Edmund G. Williamson, Sheldon V. Wood. Names followed by star (*) comprise Executive Committee.

Civil Service Committee: Lloyd M. Short (chairman), Ralph L. Dowdell, Theodore H. Fenske, Clinton T. Johnson, Dale Yoder, Hedwin C. Anderson (executive secretary).

Dight Institute Advisory Committee: Theodore C. Blegen (chairman), Gaylord W. Anderson, John J. Bittner, F. Stuart Chapin, Harold S. Diehl, Royal C. Gray, Dwight E. Minnich, Donald G. Paterson, Sheldon C. Reed.

Disciplinary Committee, All-University: Edmund G. Williamson (chairman), Ruth E. Boynton, Walter W. Cook, Stanley V. Kinyon, Keith N. McFarland, Elio D. Monachesi, Dora V. Smith.

Duluth Branch Advisory Committee: Malcolm M. Willey (chairman), Dean of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, Richard L. Kozelka, William T. Middlebrook, Wesley E. Peik.

Fees, University: Henry Schmitz (chairman), Henry E. Hartig, Richard L. Kozelka, William T. Middlebrook, True E. Pettengill, Malcolm M. Willey.

Foreign Students, Committee on: Theodore C. Blegen (chairman), Francis B. Barton, Asher N. Christensen, William H. Crawford, Irvine McQuarrie, Elvin C. Stakman, R. Edward Summers, Edmund G. Williamson.

Greater University Fund, Project Advisory Committee: Theodore C. Blegen (chairman), Clyde H. Bailey, Elmer E. Engelbert, Edwin L. Haislet, William T. Middlebrook, Stanley J. Wenberg (ex officio), Malcolm M. Willey.

Group Insurance Advisory Committee, University: Richard L. Kozelka (chairman), Raymond M. Amberg, Wallace V. Blomquist, Raymond W. Brink, Austin A. Dowell, Marcia Edwards, Elmer W. Johnson, Malcolm M. Willey.

Honors, Committee on University: William Anderson (chairman), Clyde H. Bailey, Theodore C. Blegen, Frank H. MacDougall, Errett W. McDiarmid, Irvine McQuarrie, Malcolm M. Willey.

Industrial Relations Center Faculty Committee: Richard L. Kozelka (chairman), F. Stuart Chapin, Austin A. Dowell, George Filipetti, William B. Lockhart, Donald G. Paterson, Lloyd M. Short, Lee S. Whitson, Dale Yoder.

Industrial Safety, All-University Committee on: Ray F. Archer (chairman), Richard G. Bond, Andrew Hustrulid, Philip D. Kernan, Lee S. Whitson, Joseph Woodman.

Patent Committee: William T. Middlebrook (chairman), Edward W. Davis, Harold Macy.

Public Relations Advisory Committee: To be reported later.

Radio Policy Committee: Julius M. Nolte (chairman), Ike J. Armstrong, Mitchell V. Charnley, William T. Middlebrook, Paul E. Miller, William L. Nunn, Edmund G. Williamson, Malcolm M. Willey.

Research Organization, Committee on University: Malcolm M. Willey (chairman), Clyde H. Bailey, Theodore C. Blegen, Harold S. Diehl, William T. Middlebrook, Athelstan F. Spilhaus.

Residence Status, Board of Review on: R. Edward Summers (chairman), William H. Alderman, Robert C. McClure, Andrew T. Rasmussen, George J. Schroepfer.

Schedule Committee, University: True E. Pettengill (chairman), Vernon Ausen (room scheduling supervisor), and chairmen of the schedule committees of the several schools and colleges.

Space Allocation and Use, Advisory Committee on: R. Edward Summers (chairman), A. Orville Dahl, William F. Holman, William T. Middlebrook, Horace T. Morse, Ralph G. Nichols, Stewart C. Thomson, Malcolm M. Willey.

Student Publications, Board in Control of: Ralph D. Casey, James Gray, Henry Schmitz, Edmund G. Williamson, plus seven student members.

Summer Research Appointments, Committee on: Theodore C. Blegen (chairman), Richard L. Kozelka, Dean of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, Errett W. McDiarmid, Wesley E. Peik, Athelstan F. Spilhaus, Elvin C. Stakman, Lorenz G. Straub.

Summer Session Advisory Committee: Thomas A. H. Teeter (chairman), Elmer W. Johnson, Mervin G. Neale, Lloyd H. Reyerson, Henry Schmitz, Homer J. Smith, Lawrence D. Steefel, Gilbert C. Wrenn.

Tenure Advisory Committee: Malcolm M. Willey (chairman), Jean H. Alexander, William Anderson, Paul D. Boyer, J. Lewis Maynard, James S. McCartney, Robert C. McClure, Norman W. Moen.

University Press Committee: Malcolm M. Willey (chairman), George N. Aagaard, Theodore C. Blegen, Margaret S. Harding, Harold Macy, Errett W. McDiarmid, Julius M. Nolte.

University Scholarship Committee: Morris Bye (chairman), Ralph W. Bergstrom, T. J. Berning, James K. Michie, Horace T. Morse, George B. Risty, Clifford C. Sommer, R. Edward Summers, Edmund G. Williamson.

University Art Collections, Advisory Committee on: H. Harvard Arnason (chairman), Richard M. Elliott, Ruth E. Lawrence, Dale Miller, Arthur E. Smith, Dimitri T. Tselos, Malcolm M. Willey.

VI. STAFF MEMBERSHIP ON STUDENT BODIES FOR 1950-51

Reported for Information

The President reports that the following staff members will represent the faculty during 1950-51 on boards of student organizations:

Congress, All-University: B. James Borreson, Theda Hagenah, Henry Schmitz, Edmund G. Williamson.

Social Service Council: Robert H. Beck, James I. Brown, Marcia Edwards.

SPAN Faculty-Student Coordinating Committee: Russell M. Cooper (chairman), Asher N. Christensen, Guy Desgranges, Marcia Edwards, Theron A. Johnson.

Student Publications, Board in Control of: Ralph D. Casey, James Gray, Henry Schmitz, Edmund G. Williamson.

Union Board of Governors: Sterling B. Garrison, Joan Clark Gendreau, Keith N. McFarland, Roger B. Page.

Union Board of Governors, University Village: Martin Snoke.

VII. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

1. Reported for Action

1. *Report of All-University Committee on Discipline.* Dean Williamson presented a report on policies and procedures in the All-University Committee on Discipline, as it deals with scholastic dishonesty. He pointed out that the Committee has attempted to distinguish between disciplinary matters of an all-university nature, which go to the President's committee on discipline, and various problems of concern to individual colleges only. Consultation has been had with representatives of several of the colleges. Dishonesty in examinations, especially those machine scored, was of primary concern.

It was voted that the report be approved in its entirety and that Dean Williamson be authorized to introduce it in the Senate at an early meeting. Dean Darley stated that it would be helpful if the Discipline Committee could extend its definition of policy to students in the Graduate School.

The report follows:

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY

I. Introduction

Toward the close of the spring quarter 1949, the attention of the Disciplinary Counseling Office was directed to the case of a student registered in S.L.A. who, in taking a course in the School of Business Administration, had been penalized for placing extraneous marks on his IBM type answer sheet. This penalty was a deduction of 2 points per each extra mark which registered on the scoring machine.

A check with the School of Business Administration indicated that such a policy of penalization had been adopted and that no accusation of cheating was contained in this statement of policy nor to this particular individual. We further learned that this particular case had been reviewed and the penalty reduced, satisfying the student.

This policy of assigning the penalty, a copy of which is attached, grew out of a desire to increase the efficiency of scoring by minimizing the number of stray marks on IBM machine type answer sheets.

As the IBM scoring machine works on a principle of electrical conduction, the presence of stray marks causes inaccuracies in scoring. It is standard practice to instruct the examinees to make heavy black marks and to erase mistakes carefully. To increase further the accuracy of scoring, special scoring techniques have been devised. These include scanning of the answer sheets before scoring for stray marks, incomplete erasures, and light marks. As a further check of the accuracy of scoring, certain answer sheets are hand-scored, such as every tenth or twentieth.

These stray marks may be made deliberately or through carelessness. Often students rest their pencil on the answer sheet while they ponder which response to make, or will check a question in order to return to it later in the examination. On the other hand, instances have been reported where the students have placed pencil marks over the printed dots on the answer sheet in what has been a deliberate attempt to alter the final score. There have been cases where the students have admitted doing so and rumors have been prevalent that the machine "can be beaten" in this manner.

The case was presented to the All-University Disciplinary Committee as an illustration of policy; namely, as an inter-college case it fell within the province of the committee and secondly, on the question of whether such a penalty is a form of disciplinary action.

II. Discussion

In the regulations of scholastic work, each college has established various rules and directions concerning the nature of the work, its preparation, etc., and such regulatory procedures apply to all students enrolled in the course offerings of the given college. For failure to head or observe these stipulations, penalties are often prescribed (such as for omission of name, lateness, failure to submit in authorized form, etc.). Where the penalty is imposed irrespective of intent on the student's part to improve his grade by an unauthorized and unapproved method (cheating, plagiarism), the question arises as to whether the imposition of the penalty, in a given case, is a matter of "scholastic dishonesty" so as to be the subject of review by this committee if it is an inter-college situation.

It is the sense of the All-University Disciplinary Committee that its jurisdiction extends only to those cases involving *willful, intended, and deliberate* attempts to obtain or improve a grade in an unauthorized manner, and willful, intended, and deliberate violations of the rules and regulations concerning examinations. The mere negligent, careless, and inadvertent failure to comply with the rules, even though subject to penalty, is not a case of "scholastic dishonesty."

It is not for this committee to decide whether a penalty should or should not be imposed for inadvertent rule violation or whether the penalties imposed by the college are appropriate. Our concern is with *adventent* failure to comply with the rules.

In any case of scholastic irregularity where there is evidence of adventent violation (assuming an inter-college situation), there is a problem of "scholastic dishonesty" involved, and it would be for this committee to decide the question. Such cases should be referred to the committee.

Examples: If a college charges a student with adventent violation regardless of what the student claims, it would be for the committee to decide whether it was adventent and if so, for the committee to prescribe the consequences.

If the committee found it to be inadvertent, the penalty prescribed by the college for careless or inadvertent violation, if any, would apply. Such a penalty is not a matter of review by this committee unless the committee is specifically requested to serve as an appeal board by the President. It is understood that a student may make an appeal to the President.

If the college or individual instructor establishes penalties for violations of rules or instructions relating to scholastic work which are applied to everyone irrespective of intent to cheat and generally assessed of anyone who fails to follow the rules or instructions, such penalty is not a matter of review by this committee. However, if such penalty is applied only to those cases of willful and adventent violation, it is within the province of the All-University Disciplinary Committee if it is an inter-college situation.

Also, repeated violations of rules or instructions or any other indication of willful disregard thereof should be reported. Nothing within such a penalty system precludes a report of cheating to be made for disciplinary action over and above the penalty.

III. General Principles

- a. The jurisdiction of the All-University Disciplinary Committee extends to the inter-college cases involving *willful, intended, and deliberate* violations of the rules and regulations pertaining to examinations. In any inter-college case, therefore, where there is evidence of willful cheating, such is a matter for the committee and any penalty imposed for deliberate violations falls under the committee's jurisdiction.
- b. Penalties imposed by the colleges for *inadvertent* rule violations are not a matter for the committee.
- c. In inter-college cases where a question arises as to whether the violation was advertent or inadvertent, the committee is charged with deciding the issue and if found to be advertent, to decide the consequences.

IV. Recommendations for Procedures to the Colleges

- a. Each college using the machine scored type of answer sheets should announce to the students that answer sheets are checked for inaccuracies in marking and that extraneous marks, however made, will come to the attention of the college.
- b. It is further recommended that where a penalty system is in effect, the students should be fully informed. It also should be made clear to the students that the use of a penalty system for the purposes of efficient test administration does not eliminate the possibility that consideration might be given to the intent underlying the behavior in question.

Adopted by the All-University Committee on Discipline on February 1, 1950
E. G. WILLIAMSON, Chairman

2. *Report of Special Committee on Enrollment in Reserve Officer Training.* There was a report from the Special Committee on Enrollment in ROTC units. Comment indicated the importance of issues involved and of the defense training mission of land-grant colleges. The educational integrity of the programs was apparent from the report. It was said that scheduling difficulties and lack of curricular flexibility are major deterrents to enrollment.

It was voted that the Administrative Committee recommend to the Senate that it consider establishing a standing committee on reserve officer training. It was further moved, seconded, and carried that the Administrative Committee recommend that college ROTC committees be established, particularly in colleges which admit freshmen. Those would maintain liaison between the college and the Armed Forces Departments, study schedule and curricular conflicts, keep advisers informed of the ROTC programs, and afford opportunity for the members of staff of the Armed Forces Departments to present details of their programs to the faculty.

The report follows:

REPORT OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER FEASIBLE TECHNIQUES TO IMPROVE THE ENROLLMENT SITUATION IN THE RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

At the November 9th meeting of the Administrative Committee of the Senate, Vice President Willey reported on the enrollment situation in the Reserve Officers Training Programs at the University of Minnesota. After some discussion of the subject, the Administrative Committee authorized the President to appoint a committee "to consider feasible techniques of placing this problem before the University and of promoting action toward the improvement of the ROTC units here." On November 28, President Morrill appointed the following committee: Dean Henry Schmitz (chairman), Professor Thomas F. Barnhart, Dean T. C. Blegen, Professor Francis M. Boddy, Mr. B. James Borreson, Professor L. F. Keller, Dean John E. King, Mr. William L. Nunn, Dean Maynard E. Pirsig, Dean A. F. Spilhaus, Mr. Robert P. Provost (President, All-University Congress), Mr. E. C. Grayson (President, Interfraternity Council), Mr. Howard L. Carlson (College of Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics, and Veterinary Medicine representative on All-University Congress).

The Current Enrollment Situation in ROTC Programs Is Critical—The current enrollment in all basic ROTC programs—Army, Navy and Air Corps—is unsatisfactory, if not critical. In September, 1949, a total of 84 students were registered in the 1st year basic course (Army and Air), 101 students in the 2nd year basic Army program, and 68 students in the second year basic Air program.

When the present freshman and sophomore classes in the Army ROTC program reach the junior and senior years, it is estimated that the advanced course enrollment will not exceed 130—220 fewer than the Army authorized quota for the University of Minnesota.

Because of its Holloway plan, the Navy ROTC program at the University of Minnesota is yearly assured of its quota of the 2,000 students selected on a national competitive basis for assignment to the 52 Naval ROTC Universities. However, in addition to the annual quota of about 38 or 39 Holloway Plan students, the Navy has a yearly quota of 60 contract (volunteer) students for the University of Minnesota. In the current academic year, the Navy has enrolled but 17 contract students, approximately about one third of the number enrolled in September 1948.

Until the academic year 1949-50 the Air Force ROTC was operated jointly with the Army. In September 1949, 84 students were registered in the first year basic Air program and 68 in second year program.

The number of juniors and seniors enrolling in the Army ROTC program for the academic year 1949-50 is satisfactory. It exceeds the Army quota to the University of Minnesota by 59. Of 409 juniors and seniors enrolled in the program, 348 are veterans. Inasmuch as the number of veterans attending the University of Minnesota will drop considerably in 1950 and sharply in 1951, veterans who enter the advanced course without the basic course can no longer be counted on to maintain enrollment in the advanced program. The satisfactory registration in the advanced programs at the present time in no way masks the seriousness of the present situation which will require effective action by the University to correct.

Certain Army and Air ROTC Units at the University May Be Withdrawn—The National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, provides that no Army ROTC unit shall be established or maintained unless there is an enrollment of at least one hundred physically fit male students except in the case of units other than infantry, cavalry or artillery, in which the number shall be 50.

Many Army and Air ROTC units at the University of Minnesota are below the minimum number. The Coast Artillery unit in the fall quarter, 1949-50, for example, had an enrollment of 20 students in the second year advanced course.

Because of the fact that the enrollment in some Army ROTC units is below the legal minimum in a number of colleges and universities, including the University of Minnesota, the Chief of the Army Field Forces in December 1949 raised the question of the possibility of withdrawing certain unproductive units at various institutions, including the University of Minnesota.

In his memorandum, the Chief of the Army Field Forces listed the factors which seem to work against satisfactory enrollments. These are as follows:

- a. Failure to provide adequate physical facilities in comparison with other departments.
- b. Scheduling in such a manner as to make it inconvenient and awkward for students to pursue ROTC courses.
- c. Placing ROTC and physical education on the same level.
- d. Failure to make bona fide effort to obtain suitable academic credit toward graduation for ROTC courses.
- e. Lack of cooperation by faculty, particularly those members advising students regarding enrollment.

Opinions may differ concerning the applicability of these general criticisms to the University of Minnesota. There can be no difference of opinion, however, regarding the fact that ROTC enrollments at the University of Minnesota are unsatisfactory and below the legal requirements for the maintenance of many of the programs.

It does not appear likely that the University of Minnesota will permit the complete withdrawal of ROTC programs from the University. If and when the time arrives when that decision must be made, an alternative method for increasing registration in the ROTC programs will undoubtedly be suggested. It is not unlikely that such an alternative method will be less favored by members of the staff than the present voluntary system.

The ROTC Programs Are on the Collegiate Level—The present Army and Air ROTC program, which went into effect with the beginning of the academic year 1949-50, differs considerably from previous ROTC programs and is completely unlike ROTC programs of ten, twenty, or thirty years ago. Branch science instruction now starts at the beginning of the second year basic course (sophomore). Previously, this instruction was confined to the advanced course (last two years of the four-year course). Foot drill, as such, has been reduced to an average of 8 hours each quarter. Under this new program there is only one year (first year basic) in which subjects common to all branches of the Army and Air Force are taught at the University of Minnesota.

The first year basic course comprises instruction in general military subjects applicable to all branches of the Army and Air Force. It includes Military Law, Hygiene and First Aid, Leadership, Drill and Exercise of Command, Maps and Aerial Photographs, Evolution of Warfare, Military Organization, Geographical Foundations of National Power, Military problems of the United States, Military Psychology and Personnel Management, and Military Mobilization and Demobilization.

The second year basic and the advanced course cover three years of the program. These consist of specialized study in any one of the Army branches taught at the University of Minnesota, i.e., Coast Artillery Corps, Corps of Engineers, Ordnance, Quartermasters Corps, Signal Corps, Transportation Corps, and the Air branches, Supply and Communications. The instructional staff in these special fields consists of competent specialists in the respective areas. All members of staff of all the Armed Forces Departments must be approved by the University administration, which has exercised scrupulous care to insure the maintenance of a high level of academic and military competence and training. In addition to instruction in the specialized subjects, the students also receive advanced instruction in general courses, such as Leadership, Drill and Exercise of Command, Command and Staff Duties, Military Teaching Methods, and Combat Intelligence.

The committee heard detailed descriptions of the Army, Navy and Air programs presented by officers charged with responsibility for these programs. It has examined the text material used in the various courses, subject plans, course syllabi, lesson plans, and training aids. The committee also studied the organization and construction of all the ROTC courses tied in and articulated with other subjects included in various curricula. This is

especially true of such Army branches as Anti-aircraft Artillery, Corps of Engineers, Ordnance and Signal Corps, in which enrollment is generally limited to students enrolled in engineering, technical, or scientific courses. The committee believes that instruction in the ROTC programs is clearly on the collegiate level in all respects, and that this fact should be accepted by members of the academic staff.

Credit Allowance in ROTC Courses—The amount of credit given for the first year basic and second year basic courses is not completely satisfactory to the Army and Air Force ROTC staff nor to many students who enroll in the program.

An analysis of the number of credits allowed for ROTC courses by various land-grant colleges and universities indicates that, although practices vary widely, the University of Minnesota, by granting 24 quarter credits for the Army and Air Force four-year program, follows fairly widely accepted practice. This comparison, however, has little significance inasmuch as the programs at Minnesota are on a voluntary basis and on a compulsory basis at practically all other institutions. A considerable number of land-grant colleges, however, grant from 30 to 36 quarter credit hours for the Army and Air Force programs.

The fact that the Navy ROTC program carries 36 quarter credit hours while the Army and Air Force programs carry 24 quarter credit hours places the Army and Air Force programs at a great disadvantage. Furthermore, there seems to be no sound educational or other reason for this discrimination against the Army and Air Force programs.

The committee, after attempting to assess all the factors in the situation, recommends that no change be made at the present time in the amount of credit granted for the Army and Air Force ROTC programs. At some future time, however, perhaps soon, the committee believes the University of Minnesota must consider placing the Army and Air Force programs on a parity with the Navy program insofar as credit is concerned. This question should be given immediate attention by the proposed Senate ROTC committee.

At the University of Minnesota, grades earned in ROTC courses are used in computing the student's scholastic standing, or honor point ratio. This practice, with minor exceptions, is generally followed by all institutions offering work in ROTC programs.

Use of ROTC Credits Toward Degree Requirements—The *Bulletin of General Information* of the University of Minnesota states explicitly that the one credit per quarter earned in the basic Army and Air ROTC may be counted toward any degree offered by the University. A similar statement is made with respect to 3 credits per quarter earned in the Army and Air advanced course.

The bulletins of many colleges of the University (Science, Literature, and the Arts; Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics, and Veterinary Medicine; Institute of Technology; and Pharmacy) reaffirm the validity of Army and Air ROTC credits in meeting credit requirements for degrees granted by these colleges.

The committee found, however, that despite these statements some colleges, e.g., the Institute of Technology and the College of Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics, and Veterinary Medicine, had established specific course credit requirements which precluded the possibility of the student using credits in Army and Air ROTC, or any other credits for that matter, in meeting the requirements for a degree. For example, one curriculum in the College of Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics, and Veterinary Medicine specifies 202 credits out of a total requirement of 204.

The situation was further complicated by the fact that apparently little or no consideration was given by members of staff constructing these curricula to the possibility of conflict between the scheduling of required courses and ROTC courses. This problem, which clearly has developed over a number of years, cannot be corrected quickly or easily. The committee is, however, happy to report the most constructive assistance from the chairmen of curriculum subcommittees and the college faculties concerned. Most of the curricula in the Institute of Technology and in the College of Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics, and Veterinary Medicine have been opened up at least to the extent of providing an opportunity for the student to use not less than 24 elective credits, and in the remaining curricula in these colleges the faculty is definitely committed to the policy of providing such an opportunity.

In the Law School and in the School of Veterinary Medicine the use of ROTC credits has not yet been fully clarified, but substantial progress is being made. The Law School has, however, recognized ROTC credits as satisfying part of the pre-law credit requirement.

Student Attitude Favorable to a Voluntary ROTC Program—There are many indications that there is no organized opposition among Minnesota students to the Reserve Officers Training Program. Rather, the attitude of leading student groups such as the All-University Congress, the Senior Cabinet, the Inter-Fraternity Council, and others, is extremely favorable. Polls made by the *University Daily* further reflect the favorable attitude of the student body.

One question included in the last *Daily* poll (fall quarter, 1949-50) asked the question: "If you were enrolling next year as a freshman, would you consider registering for the four year ROTC program?" Forty-one per cent of the students polled answered "Yes" to the question; 11 per cent were undecided; and 48 per cent answered "No." Interestingly enough, 32 per cent of those who answered this question in the affirmative preferred the Army, 35 per cent the Navy, and 28 per cent the Air Force. Five per cent had no special preference. The major reason given by those who answered "No" to the above question was that they did not have enough time. One reason, perhaps, for these students not having enough time is the high percentage of specified course requirements in many curricula.

Another question in the poll was: "Were you ever discouraged from enrolling in the ROTC program here?" Five per cent of the students answered "Yes"; 95 per cent answered "No." Students who were discouraged from enrolling in the ROTC program were so discouraged by ex-service men and by fellow students. There was no evidence that students were discouraged from enrolling in programs by members of staff or by student advisers.

The greatest support for the ROTC program came from those who are or who had been in the program. Ninety per cent of the students polled who had been or were members of the ROTC indicated the belief that the program is worth while. Five per cent did not believe so, and 5 per cent were undecided.

Even though the validity of the poll method of attempting to fathom student attitudes toward ROTC programs may be somewhat discounted, a reasonable conclusion would seem to be that in every freshman class there is an adequate number of young men with no inherent opposition toward the ROTC programs and who may be regarded as potential enrollees in the program. The problem is to reach them.

Lines of Communication Between the Departments of Military Science and Tactics, Naval Science, and Air Science and Tactics and the Student, the Members of Staff, the Several Colleges, and the General University Must Be Improved—The Departments of Military Science and Tactics, Naval Science, and Air Science and Tactics are in an unfavorable position with respect to communicating with prospective students. Between these departments and the prospective student lies the college of the student's choice. Lines of communication between these departments through the college to the prospective student, must be established.

The Departments of Military Science and Tactics, Naval Science, and Air Science and Tactics are also in another unfavorable position with respect to their relationship to the total educational program of the University. In a sense, these departments are in but not a part of the University. They are not a part of any college. They have no direct voice in formulation of educational policies or programs of the several colleges which directly affect registration in the ROTC programs. Members of staff serve on no college committees. Were ROTC training at the University of Minnesota compulsory, this situation would be relatively unimportant. Inasmuch as ROTC training at the University of Minnesota is voluntary, the present administrative position of these departments is incongruous.

The committee recommends that the full professors of Military Science and Tactics, Naval Science, and Air Science and Tactics be invited by the colleges which admit freshman students, to participate in matters related to curricula and registration that have a bearing on registration in ROTC programs.

Wider use of members of staff of the various military departments on Senate and all-University committees also would appear desirable. The needs of these departments should also be given greater consideration in the assignment of certain university facilities, such as the athletic field, the Field House, etc. The University should overlook no opportunities to incorporate the Armed Forces Departments into the University in fact as well as in theory.

Improvement in the lines of communication between these departments and the two-day orientation program sponsored by the University also is imperative. The committee has already taken steps, with the full cooperation of the Student Activities Bureau, to insure contact between students and the military departments at the critical moment when the student is making his first contact with the University.

Better communication between the Armed Forces Departments and many other areas of university activity also is necessary. For example, if the Alumni Association contemplates continuing to use students for the discussion of the Orientation Program before alumni groups throughout the state, the program could be modified to the extent that it include mention of the ROTC programs at the University and the opportunities they offer the student. Student groups used in Alumni Association sponsored discussions might well include a student enrolled in an advanced ROTC program.

Because the Student Counseling Bureau handles a large number of pre-college counseling cases, the Student Counseling Bureau should be fully aware, if it is not already so, of the opportunities of ROTC programs for those students who decide to go to college.

These proposals deal with only a few segments of the total problem. Inasmuch as student and faculty attitudes are the result of many factors, the University should avail itself of every opportunity to improve and strengthen the relationships and the lines of communication between the Armed Forces Departments and the individual student, the members of staff, the several colleges, and the general University. This is one of the major problems that lies ahead and which the proposed Senate and college ROTC committees must effectively solve.

Faculty Support, Interest, and Cooperation the Key to the Problem—Perhaps the most significant question in the *Daily* poll with respect to the work of this committee was that asking, "Were you ever personally contacted or encouraged to enroll in the ROTC program?" Only 13 per cent of the students replied "Yes" to this question; 87 per cent answered "No." The poll further shows that when the student was contacted or encouraged to enroll in the ROTC program, that contact and encouragement was mainly given by a member of the ROTC staff. Only one student replied that he was encouraged by a member of the academic staff—his instructor in freshman orientation.

This evidence confirms a deep-seated conviction reached by the members of the committee that in the ordinary registration procedure of entering students, advisers simply do not call the advisee's attention to the opportunities and advantages provided by enrolling in the ROTC program. Unless those responsible for advising students at the time they first register in the University of Minnesota are willing to cooperate at this juncture, the committee believes that there is little possibility of a successful ROTC program on the volunteer basis.

It would be unrealistic to expect an adviser to "sell" an educational program concerning which he knows little or nothing. The committee is of the opinion that effective and continuing University and college level programs designed to alert advisers concerning the educational, financial, and personal developmental opportunities in the ROTC programs must be developed. Among these the committee recommends:

a. A standing committee of the Senate should be established, the function of which would be to maintain liaison between the Departments of Military Science and Tactics, Naval Science, and Air Science and Tactics and the University Senate, and to give continuing consideration to the problems confronting those departments. This committee, like the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, the Senate Committee of Student Affairs, and other Senate committees, should have student representation as well as representation from the Armed Forces Departments.

b. College ROTC committees should be established. The purpose of these committees would be to maintain liaison between the college and the Armed Forces Departments, to study possible conflicts between curricular requirements and ROTC courses, to develop programs to keep advisers informed of developments in the ROTC programs and the advantages that may accrue to students who enroll in them.

c. The development of a college meeting or seminar once each spring quarter for advisers and members of staff of the Armed Forces Departments. Such an annual meeting would not only provide an opportunity for the members of staff of the Armed Forces Departments to present the details of the educational program those departments provide but would also afford an excellent and sorely needed opportunity for members of staff of the Armed Forces Departments to become better acquainted with other members of the academic staff.

The above proposals suggest steps to keep advisers informed about ROTC programs. They will be effective only insofar as they develop in the mind of the individual adviser a sympathetic, cooperative, constructive attitude toward the value of the ROTC program to the individual student.

Active whole-hearted support of the program by the staff will make it possible to maintain a deeply cherished tradition at the University of Minnesota as well as make a significant contribution to the total educational experience of many students by pointing the way for them to meet their responsibilities to themselves, the State, and the Nation.

Whether military training at the University of Minnesota remains on a voluntary basis lies largely with the individual members of the staff.

Registration in the ROTC programs at the close of the registration period of the fall quarter 1950 will indicate if the University of Minnesota can continue the ROTC programs on a voluntary basis.

HENRY SCHMITZ, Chairman

2. Reported for Information

1. *Bulletin for ROTC Programs.* Approval was voted for a bulletin to present all of the Reserve Officers Training programs of the University.

2. *Central Clearance of Information on Scholarships and Fellowships.* At its meeting October 5, 1949, the Administrative Committee discussed the desirability of complete central information on all recipients of scholarships, tuition exemptions, and the like. Vice President Willey was authorized to explore the possibilities of more immediate and complete reporting. Need for this is precipitated by requests for scholarship information by the Western Athletic Conference. Additionally, the University frequently receives questionnaires, as from the United States Office of Education, which require knowledge of our aids to students.

It was agreed among Vice President Willey and his advisers that filing of such information in a central office is virtually impossible, on a current basis. He said that the University should probably have the results available on some annual basis, not to satisfy any individual request, but to serve all uses. Findings could be incorporated in a report at the end of each fiscal year.

Mr. McCormick stated that the Western Conference requires reports every spring quarter, and that a summary as of the close of our fiscal year would not suffice. He will confer with Mr. Willey on requirements placed on the Athletic Department. Mr. Willey will proceed in this as appears to be desirable.

3. *Cap and Gown Day Convocation Program.* The University Committee on Honors and Awards recommended a change in the name of certain listings in the convocation program of Cap and Gown Day from "Honors and Prizes" to "Prizes and Awards." It also recommended that there be included only those societies which require a "B" average in the specified fields of study of interest to the particular society. This definition of the scholarship emphasis of organizations would not exclude any appreciable number of societies. It would, however, establish certain academic standards for inclusion of new groups in the program. It was moved, seconded, and voted that the recommendations be accepted, subject to minor clarification of phrasing of the grade threshold by the Committee on Functions.

4. *Budgets for 1950-51.* President Morrill discussed monetary allocations of the second year of the current biennium. He anticipated that prospective resources are down, largely because of lower student-veteran attendance. This indicates some necessary retrenchment and possible re-allocation of funds among our colleges.

After presenting detailed figures for decline in prospective resources and proposals for offsets against some of those declines, the President called for advice. Suggestions from members indicated that the President's office should prepare a distribution of resources with budgetary proposals to the colleges for 1950-51. The President pointed out that the deans will face the real difficulty of making necessary internal salary adjustments. He indicated his desire to take into account, in some measure, both shifting enrollments and changing teaching loads.

5. *Report for Efficiency-in-Government Commission.* There was a special meeting of the Administrative Committee to plan the report requested by the Efficiency-in-Government Commission of the State of Minnesota. The chairman reviewed the origin of the commission, its work to date, and progress by the University in developing materials for the study.

The University will report, primarily, its: (a) organization and structure, (b) functions and major activities by departments shown on the organization charts, (c) publications and public service, by illustration, and, (d) research. The special problem of reporting for a complex educational institution was evident. This may require attention in hearings conducted by the commission.

The deans were asked to submit a brief statement of the purposes and functions of each of their departments. If a major function or unit came into being after 1939, the beginning date should be specified. Reporting should include activities supported by non-university funds. For other-than-teaching departments, some measures or units of work should preferably be indicated for the five years beginning with 1944-45 and ending June 30, 1949.

6. *Accommodations at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City.* It was brought to the committee, for information, that the Biltmore Hotel in New York City offers special room rates for college people. Members of the staff going to New York on University business might be interested in availing themselves of the privileges.

7. *Textbook Approvals.* Approval was given for text materials as follows:

The Prairie, by James Fenimore Cooper, published by Rinehart and Company. Price 75 cents.

Kinematics and Mechanism Problems, by Millard H. LaJoy and Otis M. Larsen, published by the International Textbook Company. Price \$2.25.

The Philosophy of Logical Atomism, 1,000 copies, a mimeographed reprint from the lectures of Bertrand Russell. To be sold by the Nicholson Hall Bookstore. Price \$1.25.

Por Centro y Sud America, by R. L. Grismer, published by Macmillan. Price \$1.80.

R. E. SUMMERS, Secretary

VIII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DEBATE AND ORATORY

Reported for Information

During the forensic season just concluded, 25 members of the Varsity Debate and Discussion Squad and 28 members of the Freshman Debate Squad have had approximately three hundred intercollegiate speaking experiences.

Propositions debated:

Resolved: That the United States should nationalize its basic nonagricultural industries.

Resolved: That the Brannan Plan should be adopted.

Resolved: That the President of the United States should be elected by a direct vote of the people.

Among the discussion topics of major importance were: "What should be our policy in the Far East?" and "Should the United States adopt a system of compulsory health insurance?"

The University of Minnesota was again host to a major forensic event, sponsored and administered by the Freshman Squad. This consisted of three concurrent debating tournaments, one for freshman debaters, one for junior college teams, and a third division for Minnesota colleges. Twenty-eight colleges and universities from six states were represented.

University students took part in debate, discussion, oratory, extemporaneous speaking and radio newscasting activities in tournaments at the Universities of Iowa, Wisconsin and Indiana, and at Eau Claire, River Falls, St. Thomas, Augsburg, Concordia (Moorhead) and Macalester colleges.

Varsity teams participated in additional audience debates at Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, and in a convocation debate at St. Cloud State Teachers College.

Three audience debates were held on the University of Minnesota Minneapolis Campus with teams representing the U. S. Military Academy, the University of Missouri, and Washington State College.

All members of Freshman and Varsity Squads took part in major intercollegiate competition. The Varsity group was relatively young and inexperienced, but there was substantial and steady improvement throughout the season. At the Delta Sigma Rho spring tournament at the University of Wisconsin, Minnesota teams won seven of eight debates.

Among the honors accorded our speakers were these: top, undefeated teams "A" Division, Eau Claire Sixth Annual Speech Meet (30 colleges and universities); teams in semi-finals, Northwest Debate Tournament, Men's Division (72 teams, approximately 50 colleges and universities); team in

semi-finals, Northwest Debate Tournament, Women's Division (34 colleges and universities); undefeated team, Delta Sigma Rho Tournament (26 colleges and universities), and best over-all school record of any university in the annual Western Conference Debate Tournament. In the last mentioned event, the climax of our forensic season, our men's and women's teams won eleven of sixteen debates, Iowa was second with ten wins, and Northwestern third with nine. In the Western Conference Tournament the Minnesota team of Ronald Mankoff, SLA 2, and Dwight Lindholm, SLA 3, was undefeated, the only team in the tournament to achieve this distinction.

The startling improvement in the record over the season is significant only because it indicates the increasing proficiency of our student speakers. More significant is the fact that all members of the Freshman and Varsity groups were engaged in an educational activity of first rank importance in a democratic society.

E. W. ZIEBARTH, Chairman

IX. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION Reported for Information

PROGRESS REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

1. *Committee on Terminal Occupational Curricula of Less than Four Years in Length.* The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education, dealing with terminal occupational curricula of less than four years in length, has been gathering information on the existence of such curricula elsewhere. They are also inquiring into the plans of the State Department of Education, concerning vocational training throughout the state. The committee recognizes the fact that the needs of many of our students could be met more realistically through terminal curricula, including occupational training. The committee has agreed that terminal occupational curricula should make use of abilities of students other than those necessary for academic work. The increasing number of such curricula at the University of Minnesota appears to indicate that such programs would be well attended.

The committee plans to study the outlet for the students trained in terminal occupational curricula both here and elsewhere before presenting a recommendation to the Senate Committee on Education.

A. L. VAUGHAN, Chairman

2. *Committee on Student Participation in University Policy Making.* The first subject taken up by the committee was that of defining the project. It was decided that the problem is one of participation in policy making activities rather than one of representation on committees which are devoted to interpretation of present policies. The committee agreed that emphasis should be put upon present channels of communication between students, faculty, and administration. The over-all goal of the committee was stated as that of aid in the formulation of all-university policy reflecting the sentiments of students, faculty, and administration, with a final report to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Education.

The committee has discussed the possible advantages of student participation. These include the facts that the presence of students on policy committees can furnish insight into present and future reactions of students to these policies, in addition to supplying constructive suggestions. Another advantage is that of giving students a greater sense of belonging to the University, as well as a better understanding of the problems and procedures involved in policy making.

The major part of the committee's work has been that concerned with discovering present means of communication on questions of policy. At the university level, under the official policies set up by the All-University Congress and the University Senate, are student membership on Senate and all-university special committees, individual student contacts with university administrative officers, the All-University Congress, communication with the Office of the Dean of Students, and the *Minnesota Daily*.

It has been pointed out that there are certain factors which influence the need for and use of the agencies and methods named above. First, there is the necessity for a belief on the part of faculty, students, and administrators in the need for student participation. Second, students must be willing to work toward making real contributions in policy making, and faculty members and administrative officers must be willing to put their beliefs in student participation into practice. A third factor is that of size and homogeneity of the college population, a factor which must be considered in determining the need for utility of any organized system of student participation in a particular college.

E. G. WILLIAMSON, Chairman

3. *Committee on Relations of Research to Instructional and Other Staff Responsibilities.* At three different meetings which we have held, I have found it difficult to state to the satisfaction of the committee a purpose or charge for our activities. We have discussed a variety of things which could be done and we have discussed previous committee and subcommittee activities seeming to bear on our commission. I refer to the work years ago by a committee under Professor Chapin, the later work of a committee under Professor Visscher and quite recently Professor William Anderson's subcommittee.

If I am to interpret the sentiment of our subcommittee, I would make the following points:

- a. There is considerable feeling that a questionnaire study of faculty activities would not give valid results concerning the faculty's load and its distribution of effort.
- b. There has been some resistance offered to a suggestion that we do a study on sampling basis. There is the feeling that the university administration would graciously accept such a report but the report would probably have no more impact than many other reports on faculty load, promotion policies, etc.
- c. There has been considerable feeling to the effect that it is simply not possible to make valid comparisons among various departments or even within any department of the University on such matters. In fact, one member of our committee has become enthusiastic over doing such a study simply to demonstrate the impossibility of such comparisons!

I think we are also ready to recommend that colleges generally undertake continuing faculty load studies as is now true in the Arts College.

There is some feeling that Dr. Ruth Eckert's "Survey of Faculty Load" during President Coffey's administration should be followed up to see what use deans and the university administration have made of the information in equalizing loads, giving recognition to university professors for faculty service, etc.

DALE B. HARRIS, Chairman

4. *Committee on Evaluation of Outcomes of Instruction.* Purpose of the committee: To serve as a clearing house for information about policies and practices having to do with the evaluation of outcomes of instruction in the various units of the University.

The committee met for a luncheon meeting in the Campus Club on December 8, 1949. The following staff members reported on policies and practices in the various units of the University: Prof. Arthur M. Borak, Business Administration; Prof. W. M. Sandstrom, Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics, and Veterinary Medicine; Prof. Magnus Olson, Science, Literature, and the Arts; Prof. C. Irene Hayner, Library School; Dr. Thomas D. Speidel, Dentistry; Dr. Richard Varco, Medical School; Prof. T. A. Soine, Pharmacy.

The committee recommended a series of in-service training sessions (or seminars) for interested staff members. These meetings to deal with the construction and use of achievement tests and furnish help on common problems which arise with respect to the use of achievement examinations.

A committee was appointed to work out the details of the in-service training program. This committee, under the chairmanship of Robert Sutton, is preparing a letter and short questionnaire to be sent to all staff members of the University to determine the extent of interest in achievement testing seminars, the topics which should be dealt with, and the general nature that such seminars should assume.

If there is sufficient interest, it is hoped that seminars can be organized to begin not later than the fall quarter (1950-51).

Several units of the University have committees or informal groups at work now on the improvement of examination practices.

WALTER W. COOK, Chairman

5. *Committee on Faculty Welfare.* The subcommittee has considered a number of matters including the following: Faculty housing, policy on outside work, retirement, travel to professional meetings, medical services, office facilities, a handbook for faculty members, the establishment of a credit union and optional salary savings plan.

The subcommittee's inquiries on many of these matters resulted in a decision not to pursue them either because there appeared to be no real prospect of solution or because the matter was not of general importance. On certain of the problems it was discovered that other faculty committees or faculty groups were already active. In two instances, recommendations were made to the Senate Committee on Education. The first was a recommendation that a faculty handbook be prepared and as a result of the Senate Committee action, such a handbook is now in preparation. A recommendation was made also concerning travel to professional meetings, but thus far no final action has been taken. The subcommittee, at present, is working on two or three of the items listed above, but the outcome of consideration of these matters cannot be forecast.

R. K. GAUMNITZ, Chairman

6. *Committee on Courses Enrolling Both Graduate and Undergraduate Students.* The Subcommittee on Courses Enrolling Both Graduate and Undergraduate Students subordinated its activities to the Subcommittee on General Grading Practices who have embarked on a rather voluminous survey of grading practices by colleges. The preliminary data provided and developed by the Recorder's Office indicated the separation of courses by graduates from undergraduates in each course in the University in specified quarters. A preliminary examination of these grades indicated no substantial evidence for the complaint of students that graduate students were unduly favored in the distribution of grades.

Since the general problem of grade distribution by courses and colleges has now been made a subject of intensive study by the separate colleges, it seems wise to defer further study by this subcommittee until the results of the general study have been digested and acted upon by the separate colleges.

RICHARD L. KOZELKA, Chairman

7. *Committee on Admission Standards and Practices.* The subcommittee, which incidentally is very large, has held a number of meetings. At these meetings topics assigned to our group, particularly the differences in admission standards and practices of the various colleges, were discussed, sometimes with considerable intensity. It appeared early that, at present, uniform standards would not be acceptable to the various faculties and at the last meeting of the committee we were quite uncertain as to the direction our future deliberations should take. Possibly some suggestions or recommendations will come out of later deliberations.

J. W. BUCHTA, Chairman

8. *Committee on Course Additions, Modifications, and Deletions.* A survey of the University's program of studies in 1941-42 served to highlight many problems relating to curriculum development, policies, and procedures in various colleges and divisions of the University. In general, the study showed that the university curriculum has been growing principally by a process of accretion. During the preceding twenty years, for example, the number of courses offered had more than doubled, the usual practice being to establish a new course when expansions in subject matter or social or professional requirements suggested treatment of other topics, rather than to reorganize existing courses to meet this need. This multiplication of offerings was especially characteristic of certain departments and colleges, raising questions as to the policies which individual units employ in appraising proposals for new courses or in modifying their current offerings. The survey also suggested considerable duplication of effort and inarticulation of offerings, certain courses overlapping seriously with others offered in the same college or in some other unit of the University. Other problems related to the validity of many prerequisite requirements, the relevance of the objectives set for certain types of courses, and the bases for widely different practices with respect to "contingent credit," the frequency with which particular courses are offered, the typical number of credits assigned offerings, and a host of other divergent practices. Perhaps the most fundamental question posed was why some courses and curricula have remained relatively static whereas others have shown a high sensitivity to changing educational and social developments.

Among questions which the subcommittee on curriculum problems hopes to investigate next year are the following, the first four relating to departmental and college practices and the remaining ones to the feasibility of establishing a greater measure of university leadership and control over curriculum developments.

- a. What changes have occurred in departmental and college programs since 1941-42 (the time of the earlier survey)? Were the results of that study helpful in identifying courses that might be dropped or consolidated?
- b. How are proposals for new courses initiated in the various departments and colleges? What evidences concerning the scope and character of the proposed course are required? What efforts are made to explore relationships between the proposed course and current offerings in the same or related fields?
- c. What groups are expected to survey and approve these proposals? What, specifically, are the functions of the college curriculum committee in this matter? What policies guide its action on the institution of new curricula? The addition of courses? The dropping of courses?
- d. Does the curriculum committee or some other college agency give continuing study to the program, trying to chart the directions in which it should be developed and to evaluate present offerings in the light of these goals? What means have been devised to detect excessive fragmentation and dilution of content? How successful have these efforts been?
- e. What might be done on an all-university basis to help faculty members in individual colleges secure the data required to make intelligent appraisals of their own programs and to become acquainted with promising practices in other divisions and colleges?
- f. Should an all-university committee or council be established to give special leadership in the development of the educational program? What might its functions be? Should such a committee formulate general policies to guide individual college committees in their actions? Should it advise with college committees on major developments in their own units? Should it give final approval to changes recommended by individual colleges?

R. E. ECKERT, Chairman

9. *Committee on Educational Implications of Centralized Services.* During the past year this committee has circulated the deans and heads of departments requesting opinions regarding the effect of parking regulations on curtailment of research and teaching activities. The response of the faculty has been good, and the committee wishes to express appreciation for the interest shown.

W. H. CRAWFORD, Chairman

10. *Committee on Faculty Promotion Policies.* In 1945 the Senate Committee on Education appointed a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Professor William Anderson to inquire into the standards currently used in promoting faculty members at the University of Minnesota and to propose whatever new policies or practices seemed desirable. Following extended study and discussion of the problems involved, the subcommittee compiled a lengthy report which was submitted to the Senate Committee on Education in 1949. Revisions suggested by members of the latter committee were undertaken by a special subcommittee consisting of Professors Russell M. Cooper, Ruth E. Eckert, and Horace T. Morse. Portions of this revised document were considered to be of sufficiently wide interest to justify circulation to members of the Senate as a preliminary report of the Senate Committee on Education on this problem. A final report will be submitted after evidence has been secured from the general study of university promotional standards outlined in this preliminary document.

Practices in Other Institutions: The original subcommittee received assistance from the University Bureau on Institutional Research in investigating and summarizing pertinent data relating to two particular aspects of the problem. One of these, a "study of practices in colleges elsewhere with respect to the evaluation of teaching ability" resulted in a mimeographed "preliminary report" on the *Evaluation of College Teaching* (16 pages) by Ruth E. Eckert and Robert Sorenson. This report is on file and may be examined in the Bureau of Institutional Research in Burton Hall.

One of the major findings from this survey of literature was that teaching ability is highly regarded but difficult to appraise when promoting staff members. Other abilities or qualities are therefore often weighted more heavily than teaching ability as a promotion factor. Research output, for example, because it is more easily evaluated, has often become the major factor considered by administrators in deciding whether or not to recommend an individual staff member for promotion.

Emphasizing the importance of establishing adequate criteria of good teaching, the report summarized results from a number of studies made of this problem. In general, they revealed substantial agreement as to what the qualities of good teaching are. The report also illustrated some of the methods that are being used currently to judge teaching effectiveness. While tests, rating scales and other devices have not yet been perfected to the point that they provide administrators with highly definitive evidences on these points they constitute valuable sources of information. Use of a number of such evidences would broaden considerably the base used in judging an individual's competence, making it possible to give appropriate weight to teaching effectiveness in selecting and promoting faculty members.

The Situation at Minnesota: Following this survey of pertinent literature, the Subcommittee on Faculty Promotional Standards decided to inquire into local standards and practices of faculty promotion. As a means of eliciting the desired information, Dr. William Anderson, chairman of the committee, sent a letter, early in the fall quarter, 1947, to department and college heads requesting each to summarize his methods of determining eligibility for promotion. Specifically, each department or college head was requested to ". . . put down on paper an account of your own methods, practices, and experiences in attempting to make the discriminating judgments that are needed for testing teaching, research, and other abilities in members of the faculty." The following three questions were listed to guide the form of responses:

- a. By what method do you judge the teaching ability and success of the members of your staff? Do you elicit the opinions of students, colleagues, and outsiders in making your judgment? If so, how; and how do you weight and evaluate the results?
- b. By what methods do you appraise the research ability and product of your staff members?
- c. What criteria, other than teaching and research ability, do you endeavor to appraise, and by what methods?

To this letter of inquiry thirty-five deans and heads or chairmen of departments and divisions wrote replies. The replies were turned over to the University Bureau of Institutional Research for analysis. On April 28, 1948, a report was submitted by Robert J. Keller and John E. Dobbin of the Bureau staff. This was a manuscript of 33 pages entitled *Faculty Promotional Policies and Practices at the University of Minnesota Based on Letters of Administrative Officers*. The responses came, in various numbers, from the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, the Medical School, the Institute of Technology, and the Department of Agriculture. Single replies were received from the School of Business Administration, the Institute of Child Welfare, the College of Education, the General College, and the University Library.

Problems in Interpreting Responses: Two major difficulties confronted the persons attempting to draw meaningful generalizations from the data. The first was the small number of responses, representing only a third of all the administrative officers whose cooperation had been sought. The second was the unstructured nature of the responses made by these officials. In the report prepared by Mr. Keller and Mr. Dobbin, a number of tables were presented which indicated the frequency with which various factors were mentioned by these thirty-five administrative officers. As might be anticipated, a large number of different factors received mention, some respondents mentioning only a few general criteria whereas others provided a much more specific and detailed listing of factors which influenced their decision, while variations in the expression of certain criteria further complicated the analysis since there was danger of misinterpreting or giving a somewhat different shade of meaning in the effort to combine points into more inclusive categories. Other factors mentioned less frequently were scholastic ability and academic achievement, offers from other institutions, administrative ability, general reputation, attitude toward the University and department, intelligence, experience, work, and travel, and effect on departmental balance.

The Senate Committee on Education hence felt that it was not justifiable to present tables of frequency or other statistical summarizations of these data. It may be interesting, though, to know that among the most frequently mentioned factors were teaching ability, research ability, extent and quality of publications, faculty relationships, student relationships, professional activity and affiliations, public relations, personality, and participation in departmental and university affairs.

One of the natural difficulties, in judging teaching ability, which headed the present list, lies in discovering specific evidences of teaching effectiveness. Among the teaching qualities sought were such things as effective presentation and revision of subject-matter content, emphasis upon basic principles, skill in handling classes, use of a variety of instructional aids, linking material to the common experiences of the students, preparing examinations which cover a broad range of objectives of the course, presenting assignments in a stimulating and challenging manner, and maintaining defensible standards of achievement for students. An examination of this list

suggests the difficulties in objectifying such criteria for the purpose of determining present promotional policies. The committee felt, however, that with a more structured questionnaire to administrative officials and a broader sample of replies, valuable evidence might be gained concerning practices followed in the various colleges, divisions and departments of the University.

The inter-relationships of all the factors considered in recommending promotions and conditions which surround a given position complicate any attempt to judge the relative importance of these criteria, particularly in an exploratory study of the sort undertaken. Each case became an individual matter in which certain factors gain or lose significance in terms of the total situation.

Comments and Proposals of the Committee: A study of these documents helped greatly to clear the ground for the subcommittee. It was informed concerning the standards that a considerable group of deans and department heads at Minnesota keep in mind when considering promotions on their staffs, and the practices that they follow. It knew also that while other institutions have been experimenting in various ways to test the effectiveness of their teaching staffs, no college or university has found a thoroughly satisfactory means of doing this. Objective measures are particularly difficult to establish.

On the other hand, a more persistent and systematic use of inter-subjective methods of evaluation would seem to offer considerable promise of worthwhile results. By an inter-subjective method is meant here simply a method by which various persons, with a fairly wide range of viewpoints and experience, systematically rate the same person with respect to his achievement in any field. For example, if a teacher's students, fellow teachers, and other observers evaluate his success as a teacher from time to time on carefully devised forms, something will be known that is far more valuable than the snap judgment of one or two. Productive scholarship is another criterion that can be tested inter-subjectively. Deans, department heads, other colleagues, and outside scholars in the same field might be asked to appraise a man's work, both published and unpublished. An all-round judgment of a man might thus be prepared based on a variety of criteria and data. This is already being done to some extent both here and elsewhere.

In arriving at the following suggestions with respect to the broad University policy of promotions, the subcommittee assumed that judgments would have to be based on complex and highly subjective factors. The following discussion is submitted as a report of progress, not as a set of proposals for adoption at this time. In an area such as this there are no solutions that would apply to all cases, though carefully devised adjustments for making improvements are entirely feasible.

a. *Promotions only one factor in personnel policy.* The question of appropriate standards and procedures for deciding on promotions in the academic staff is not peculiar to Minnesota or to our times. Every college and every university that aims to achieve distinction faces the same persistent question. Furthermore, the issues involved in promotional policy cannot be separated from questions concerning standards and procedures for the original selection of staff, the acquisition of indefinite tenure, the establishment and revision of pay-scales and individual salaries, and a variety of other matters that enter into a University's faculty personnel policy. In the background remain such factors as limited university revenues and budgets, nature of retirement plans, and the competition from other institutions and industries for men. There are also questions concerning the relative role of deans, department heads, and faculty committees in the recruitment and retention of faculty personnel. Many points made in the following paragraphs are about as applicable to original appointments and salary increases as to promotional questions. Indeed, the University's entire faculty personnel policy should be governed by consistently high standards and principles.

b. *Importance of faculty personnel policy.* Since the faculty performs most of the prime functions for which a college or university exists—the functions of teaching, counseling, research, productive scholarship, university and community service—the standards that are observed in the employment, promotion, and retention of faculty members largely determine an institution's status, quality, and capacity for achievement. A few examples will suffice. Some institutions put almost their entire emphasis on teaching and work with students, to the discouragement of research and productive scholarship. Others emphasize research and productive scholarship almost exclusively. Still others seem to seek men of a certain polish, or of particular economic, moral or religious learnings. Any one of these policies consistently pursued will in time produce an institution of fairly distinctive characteristics.

Appointments and promotions should be made, therefore, with the clear purpose of promoting the functions, fostering the ideals, and achieving those services to the public and those evidences of distinction at which the institution aims.

c. *Ideals and objectives of the University of Minnesota.* What are the ideals for which the University stands today, and what are the specific goals or objectives toward which it is working? The latter have never been brought together in a single comprehensive statement. The relative emphasis to be placed upon teaching, research, and public service, and the degree of concern for the physical, mental, and moral well-being of its students, are examples of questions that concern the University's general objectives and program. It would be as unfortunate to fix these goals or objectives for all time, as it would be futile to try to enforce such a predetermined program. Freedom to grow and change is essential to a vigorous and effective university life.

This by no means implies a policy of drift. Even in large institutions every change is the result in part of decisions made by one or more persons in positions of influence. A university needs a policy and a consciously adopted program so that all decisions can be made in harmony with them. Its various members need to be reminded frequently of the policy and the changes that are made therein from time to time. Only in this way can the several faculties and administrators be aided in holding their own appointment and promotion policies in line with the University's objectives. Following the formulation of policies by appropriate faculty-administrative groups, the president and other high ranking university officials should therefore restate rather frequently the ideals and policies of the institution, showing their relation to appointments and promotions. A frequent reassessment of the University's faculty personnel situation for the information of faculty and administration would also be salutary.

d. *Effects of university size.* The University of Minnesota is a large institution, situated on several campuses, and composed of many colleges, schools, departments, divisions, and special branches. These are administratively and financially integrated into one University, but they have different specific objectives, serve different clienteles, are in various stages of development from the new and experimental to the mature, and almost of necessity follow somewhat divergent policies and procedures in attempting to achieve their objectives. Furthermore, they utilize academic personnel of diverse subject-matter interests and various degrees of educational preparation. A statement that would be true of the Law School faculty, for example, might not be true of the Department of Romance Languages, the Department of Bacteriology, or the Department of Physical Education for Men.

The importance to be attached to these various types of achievement should properly vary with the nature of the position, the rank to which the individual would be promoted, departmental balance, and other relevant factors. Hence no formula can be established on a university-wide, or even a college-wide basis, for attaching importance to the various forms of faculty service. Persons directly responsible for the effective operation of each unit or program should have the deciding voice in this matter.

The situation calls for a great deal of decentralization in faculty personnel administration and that in general is what the University seems to have developed. With the multiplicity of his other duties so occupying his time and thoughts, the President can give but little attention to particular appointments other than the most important ones. Indeed several of the colleges are now so large and diversified that the dean has a similar difficulty.

The danger as it seems under present conditions is that each department, division and college will be so preoccupied with its own personnel needs that it will not give enough consideration to the standards and ideals of the University as a whole. Unless there is a university policy as to the qualities and the degrees of excellence to be sought, the pressure of personnel shortages and offers from rival institutions may result in unwise departmental decisions concerning the retention and promotion of staff members. The various units will need to weigh the relevance of all-university policy for their particular needs, and the broad policy can serve as an excellent guide and measure.

e. *Making the policies effective.* The criteria employed in a particular college or department should be given suitable publicity and should be discussed with the staff periodically, so that each faculty member understands clearly both the criteria and the procedures by which his performance is being judged.

Records of persons who have held a given rank should be reviewed periodically by the department chairman and the dean to ensure that each person receives fair consideration. Decisions reached in such a review should be made a matter of record so that these appraisals will be available to persons subsequently responsible for acting on a given case.

Candidates who do not qualify for promotion after a reasonable length of time should, on their request, be informed as to factors that may temporarily or permanently hinder promotion. Recommendations for promotions should be supported with a brief summary of the evidences on which the proposal is based.

Systematic procedures should be established for consultation with persons who would be affected by a particular promotion. Normally this would involve discussion with representatives within the college or department of equal or higher rank than that for which the candidate is being considered and with such persons outside the college as will be affected in some way by the promotion (i.e., Graduate School dean, deans of colleges involved in joint programs, President's Office representative, etc.)

The University as a whole, through its Board of Regents, University Senate, and President's Office, should give leadership and support in the development of sound promotional practices. While the policies would not be administered centrally the above agencies could give invaluable aid to individual colleges and divisions by performing the following functions:

- (1) Public announcements of general policies governing promotions.
- (2) Stimulation and support of university-wide studies of the distribution of ranks, rates of promotion, quality of personnel promoted, etc., in the different units.
- (3) Continuous study and refinement of methods of appraising certain characteristics (notably teaching ability and quality of research endeavors).

f. *Need for further study.* It is evident from the above analysis that a great deal of thought and care has already entered into faculty personnel activities but that still further study and development are necessary if the quality of faculty is to be kept continually at its best.

It is proposed, therefore, that the Senate Committee on Education should encourage the individual colleges to study their own promotional problems and it should launch a more comprehensive study on a university-wide basis.

- (1) Recommendation for College Surveys of Personnel Policies and Practices: Among the matters that might be dealt with in such a self-survey by each college are the following:

First, an analysis of the duties and responsibilities attached to each academic position on the college staff. This "job analysis" should be stated in clear, succinct English. In situations where a number of staff members teach separate sections of the same course, the analysis would have the special advantage of providing a reasonably definite standard by which to test the relative performance of various staff members doing similar work.

It is undoubtedly true that positions of higher rank, where the teaching and other services are more individualized, are not so easy to analyze. Even in these cases, however, it should be possible to state the minimum or normal requirements of the position.

For any position the following questions among others should be asked: Does the position require the incumbent to do independent research? To direct the research of others? To direct graduate studies? To lecture to large classes? To conduct discussion groups or sections? To supervise laboratory work? To keep abreast of research in a given field? To counsel students on programs of study? To have knowledge of foreign languages, statistical methods, and other "too subjects" in addition to the subject being taught? To administer any special activity? To serve on committees? To administer the department? To appear on behalf of the University before off-campus groups?

Other questions of some importance could easily be added to this list. In each case, of course, the particular subjects to be taught or studied should be stated in the job analysis, together with the level at which the work is to be done, from freshman to graduate school.

One point must be emphasized. In a sense every outstanding faculty member makes his own position. Even as an instructor or assistant professor he may become known as an outstanding leader in research. When he is promoted to an associate or full professorship his work does not actually change, although his rank and salary are higher. This situation has been put forward as an argument against the attempt to analyze positions. In a sense it is only an example of the faculty man who performs work beyond the requirements of his salary. The essential requirements of the position, the amount and type of work expected of the incumbent, remain very much the same.

Second, to match the requirements of the position there should be an adequate body of data concerning the person whose appointment or promotion is being considered. The University's present "Request for Information" blank for new appointments covers a number of important factual matters. There is no comparable form for promotions. To record qualitative information, a check list of individual qualities, achievements and productions would be very helpful.

While it is important to avoid unnecessary increase in paper work, a folder or file of information on an individual is of great value when the time comes for decision on a promotion, pay increase, or other change in status. Given proper instructions and authority the secretary of a dean or department chairman can do much to build up and maintain such files about every staff member in the college. Reprints of articles, newspaper notices, reviews of a man's books, and other data can go into such files. A plan for the regular accumulation of such data might be part of every college's personnel program.

Third, a college's self-survey might include some statement of the qualitative criteria to be applied normally to individuals to be appointed or promoted to various positions and ranks. What training and degrees will they be expected to have? What evidences of research completed and of other scholarly work will be expected of them? What deficiencies in any respect will be considered as decisively disqualifying?

Fourth, the college survey should set down the organization and procedures by which decisions are made in the college as to appointments, salary increases, promotions, demotions, and separations from faculty service. Who makes the decisions? What persons or classes of persons are regularly consulted? Are there regular committees for this purpose and how do they operate? What methods are followed for determining whether the person concerned is a good teacher, a productive scholar, and so on?

As already suggested, a frank self-survey of this general nature could prove to be of great benefit not only to the President but most of all to the deans and faculties of the colleges themselves. It would emphasize and clarify questions of personnel policy. The hours of hard work would be repaid by this clarification of issues and the improvement of personnel practices.

- (2) Proposed Further Study by the Senate Committee: To carry out its part of the general investigation, the Senate Committee on Education would presumably need staff assistance, either through the Bureau on Institutional Research or otherwise. The Senate Committee should supply general leadership and direction to the entire study described below and give advice and assistance where needed. It should review and approve the original outline and the schedule of questions and provide consultative assistance on other problems involved.

First. The Senate Committee should launch a carefully designed study to find out what policies and procedures are being used in the various colleges and departments of the University in promoting faculty members. The exploratory study referred to in the earlier section of this report will be useful in formulating questionnaires or interview forms adapted to this purpose. Among questions that this study would attempt to answer are the following:

- (a) What factors are actually considered in judging an individual's readiness for promotion? What weighting is given these different factors? Does the latter vary according to the academic rank involved in the promotion?
- (b) What means are used to collect evidences on the factors deemed important? How are these data summarized, recorded and used?
- (c) What procedures are followed in initiating recommendations for promotions? To what extent do members of the department participate in these processes?
- (d) What do deans and department heads consider to be the greatest obstacles at present in developing and applying sound promotional policies? What might be done on an all-university basis to clarify the standards used and to assist individual departments and colleges in their efforts to build distinguished faculties?

Second. It should direct the collation and comparison of the several college surveys of personnel policies and practices, and should assist in drawing therefrom such general conclusions and recommendations as might be helpful in improving the University's policies and practices respecting faculty personnel. Some colleges may be following policies that might be very useful in others but are unknown to them. The President and other top academic officers need the synoptic overview of faculty personnel policies that only a summary of college policies and practices can give.

Third. The Senate Committee might undertake a general statistical study of faculty personnel over a period of years in order to discover significant trends. The study should bring existing data up to date by analyzing faculty *appointments, promotions, and separations* for recent years and for selected earlier years, by *rank and college*. A sampling method might be required, but a more trustworthy picture might be obtained if all cases could be covered. Some of the points of interest would be: (1) number of years of graduate study at time of appointment, promotion, etc.; (2) degrees held; (3) age; (4) beginning salary; (5) marital relationship; (6) higher institutions attended and degrees received; (7) years elapsed between Ph.D. and assistant professorship; between assistant and associate, and associate and full professorship; (8) salary increase with promotion, and new amount; (9) reasons given in cases of separation (resignation, etc.) from service; (10) evidences that outside offer prompted promotion; *and so on*. Salary levels and increases, by ranks and colleges through the years, should also be covered to some extent. No doubt there already exist a number of statistical compilations that would render unnecessary a new study on some of the points here suggested.

Fourth. In addition to the studies described above, the Senate Committee should investigate a number of special questions of importance in faculty personnel policy. The following sample questions may suggest others:

- (a) Does the acquisition of indefinite tenure by assistant professors reduce in any way their desire for promotion to higher ranks and thus reduce also their motivation to better service and achievement? What other effects, if any, has acquisition of indefinite tenure at this rank had?
- (b) How does the probationary period operate for acquisition of indefinite tenure by assistant professors? What percentage of assistant professors fail to acquire indefinite tenure? For what reasons?
- (c) How does the present health test work out for those who are acquiring indefinite tenure by either promotion or new appointment? How can the administration of the test be improved, if at all?
- (d) Is it possible to detect potential personality weaknesses which might interfere with a staff member's effectiveness?
- (e) How is the rule against instructors acquiring indefinite tenure working out? Are there attempts to evade the seven-year rule? Are promotions being given that would not otherwise have been given, or are non-regular positions becoming more common?
- (f) How in practice do deans and department heads find the best recruits for their staffs?

(g) Do part-time personnel create any special problems of promotion or tenure?

(h) What is the value of various listings in *Who's Who, American Men of Science*, etc., when it comes to determining the general excellence of the faculty? Are these listings of any value in promotions, and how often are they available for that purpose?

(i) In various departments of our university where faculty committees have a veto on major appointments, what is the opinion of informed people (deans, professors, etc.) as to the results in practice?

(j) How meet the problem of the "top heavy" department and achieve a "normal distribution" among the various ranks?

Fifth. Interim Faculty Personnel Policy. While the college and Senate Education Committee surveys of faculty personnel policies are going on, and indeed until the University formulates a more definite and systematic policy concerning faculty personnel the subcommittee recommends in general a continuance of present policies and lines of responsibility. The fact that the University has been able to achieve its level of excellence and recognition in the face of certain handicaps is evidence that its personnel policies are reasonably sound.

For the time being, it is essential that all responsible officials be continually aware of the critical importance of faculty personnel policy. The most crucial actions undoubtedly are the original appointments, the action conferring indefinite tenure, and promotion to higher rank. At these points the danger signals should be always flashing. With steady growth in the number and reliability of evidences underlying the decisions at these points, faculty standards at the University of Minnesota should remain high.

H. T. MORSE, Chairman

X. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RELATION OF THE UNIVERSITY TO OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING

1. Reported for Action

1. *Secondary Schools.* The following schools have been inspected this year and are recommended for continued approval on the published list for a three-year period subject to the submission of satisfactory annual reports.

Bethany Lutheran College High School, Mankato, Minnesota

Good Counsel Academy, Mankato, Minnesota

Shattuck School, Faribault, Minnesota

St. Margaret's Academy, Minneapolis, Minnesota

St. Thomas Military Academy, St. Paul, Minnesota

De LaSalle High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota

St. Paul Academy, St. Paul, Minnesota

2. *Junior Colleges.* Bethany Lutheran Junior College has been inspected this year and is recommended for continued approval on the published list of accredited junior colleges. (This action extends the time previously granted to this institution for the experimental development of a four-year junior college, grades 11 to 14.)

Duluth Junior College, which is being closed this year, is recommended for removal from the published list of accredited junior colleges at the close of the 1949-50 academic year. Transfer credit for students seeking advanced standing in the University for work done through 1949-50 at Duluth Junior College will be handled in the usual manner of granting credit for courses taken in accredited junior colleges.

2. Reported for Information

1. *The Conference on Problems of High School-University Transition.* As its chief new project of the year, the Committee on Relations to Other Institutions of Learning has sponsored a pilot conference on problems of high school-university transition. This conference, held Saturday, May 20, 1950 was attended by representatives from selected public high schools outside the Twin Cities and Duluth, university students who graduated from these high schools, and members of the several departments and colleges of the University which are particularly concerned with problems of high school-college articulation. Plans for the conference were made by representatives from the University with the cooperation of the Association of Secondary School Principals, the Minnesota Council of School Executives, and the State Department of Education.

The primary purpose of this conference was to identify student problems of high school-university transition and to develop procedures for assisting in their solution. Evaluation of this meeting has consequently been an integral part of the conference plan as one of the techniques by which the Committee on Relations seeks to promote better relationships between the University and other institutions of learning. Suggestions and criticism by members of the Senate with respect to other problems and devices for developing such relationships are most welcome to this committee. A report of this conference is being prepared for distribution to participating schools and university staff members. An abridged report will also be prepared for information of the Senate.

2. *Other Committee Activities.* During the past year the committee has been active in the inspection and recommendation for accreditation of twenty-three private secondary schools, the preparation of the detailed reports and recommendations which have sent to these schools, the receipt and examination of annual reports submitted by all secondary private schools accredited to the University, meetings with various educational institutions and associations, and review of such other matters as were brought to the attention of the committee. During the past year the latter have included problems of recruitment and public relations, the accreditation of certain colleges and junior colleges, the responsibilities of the committee for reporting action of the separate colleges which are of interest to other divisions of the University, and the revision of policies and standards governing the accrediting of high schools by the University.

ROBERT J. KELLER, Chairman

XI. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS

Reported for Information

The Senate Committee on Student Affairs respectfully submits the following report for the academic year 1949-50 for the information of the Senate:

The Senate Committee on Student Affairs held 19 meetings during the academic year 1949-50. Three of these were joint meetings with the President of the University and the All-University Congress. Among the matters given consideration by the committee were the recognition of new student organizations, the reactivation of formerly recognized student organizations, petitions of inactivity for student organizations, constitutional changes of student organizations and general problems relating to the welfare of organized student life.

The following actions were taken by the Committee:

1. Forty-six new student organizations were recognized, 24 constitutional changes were approved, 5 groups were declared inactive upon their own petition.

2. Among the reports reviewed, discussed and approved by the committee were a summary report on the financial standing of student organizations, progress in the elimination of discriminatory membership restrictions in the constitutions of student organizations, proposed changes in the orientation program, a program evaluation of charitable fundraising, the violation of social regulations among medical fraternities, and the development of improved advisory services for student organizations during the coming academic year.

3. The committee authorized 5 special subcommittees to study specific problems among organized student groups. Among the problems studied by these subcommittees were: The provision of a health and safety survey service for recognized student organizations operating residences or commissaries; the revision of hours regulations for women's residences; the relationship of SPAN as a student organization to the University; the relationships between policies adopted by the committee and organized student life at the Duluth Branch; and the desirability of consultation between student organizations, their alumni associations and the University on the construction of new student organization residences.

E. G. WILLIAMSON, Chairman

XII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENTS' WORK

1. Reported for Information

The Senate Committee on Students' Work has considered the following topics during the past year:

a. The problems surrounding the readmission of students who have been dropped from a college within the University. Since at the time of this discussion, it was evident that there were many different policies and procedures employed, the committee voted to establish a subcommittee to re-study this problem of the intercollegiate relationships pertaining to cases of students dropped for poor scholarship.

b. Use being made of the grade of "I," incomplete, was discussed and the committee voted to make no changes in the regulations, but to urge that all colleges give attention to informing the faculty of the intended use of this grade.

c. The topic of how courses that are repeated shall be handled on students' records and the computation of such things as honor point ratio and credit for graduation was discussed. A subcommittee was appointed to draft a statement of the principles involved and to consult with the chairman of each college student work committee.

d. There was a discussion of the procedures to be followed and the interpretation to be made of the Senate regulation regarding students who cancel from class or who cease attending.

The problems of concern and the recommended interpretations are presented herewith for consideration and discussion with the recommendation that action could be taken at the fall meeting of the Senate.

2. Reported for Discussion

Grade to be assigned to students who stop attending class without officially cancelling their class registration.

The present Senate regulation provides:

"That a student may cancel without grade through the end of the sixth calendar week of classes, and that thereafter the cancellation be with 'no grade' if he is passing and with 'failure' if he is failing. For the Summer Session the deadline shall be the end of the third calendar week of classes." Senate Minutes, 2-18-48, p. 40.

This rule is being currently interpreted by some instructors as applying only to students who have officially cancelled their course registration, and by other instructors as applying to all students who discontinue attendance irrespective of official cancellation.

Your committee considers it important that there be a uniform interpretation and understanding of this rule, and recommends that the rule be interpreted as applying only to students who have officially cancelled their course registrations.

The committee further recommends that a symbol be established to be used by the instructor to indicate that the student left class without officially cancelling.

In the opinion of the committee, cancellation, which is a change of registration, should involve the same general procedures which are followed in registration. To permit a student to withdraw from a course without consultation and completing the normal registration process tends to make meaningless the care and consideration which go into approval of the original registration. There is need for a notation on a student's grade slip which would call to the attention of the proper college officials the fact that a student has not appeared for a class for which he registered or has disappeared from class apparently without following the required procedure of consultation. Since investigation of such cases in the past has revealed that often the cancellation was properly effected but the information did not reach the instructor on time, this notation should not in itself involve any penalty. The notation would be rather a signal of possible irregularity which should be investigated in accordance with the policy and procedures of the individual college. When some error or misunderstanding is discovered, the proper final grade can be recorded.

To accomplish these purposes, the following procedure is recommended to supplement the present Senate regulation on cancellation: The notation Y shall be reported by an instructor if a student officially registered in his course does not appear or disappears before the end of the sixth calendar week of classes without officially cancelling or disappears after the sixth week without officially cancelling and is not failing.

The grade Z (cancel with failure) shall be reported if a student disappears after the sixth week and is failing.

This proposal is presented for discussion at this time, and it is recommended that it be considered for action at the fall, 1950 meeting of the Senate.

E. G. WILLIAMSON, Chairman

XIII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NECROLOGY

EDWARD G. CHEYNEY

(1878-1950)

Professor Emeritus Edward G. Cheyney, who retired in 1947 after 42 years service to forestry and forestry education in the University of Minnesota School of Forestry, died on January 21, 1950.

He was born in Washington, D. C., November 24, 1878, and was educated in the public schools of that city. He matriculated at Cornell University in 1897 and received the A.B. degree in 1900. Following a year at the Yale School of Forestry and several years as a student assistant with the United States Bureau of Forestry, now the U. S. Forest Service, he came to the University of Minnesota in 1905 as an assistant in forestry. In 1907 he became assistant professor and in 1911 professor and chief of the University Division of Forestry. In 1925 he retired as division chief to concentrate on teaching, writing, and research. Since retirement from the University of Minnesota in June, 1947 he and Mrs. Cheyney had been living at Apalachicola, Florida.

He was an esteemed teacher, friend, and counselor of the more than one thousand forestry graduates who studied under him and learned to appreciate his ready wit, understanding, and sound advice. His classes always will be remembered because of the free discussion he stimulated and his interest in the development of independent thought and the ability to write and speak on the part of students.

He was the author of many articles and bulletins on forestry subjects. For many years he was editor of *The North Woods*, one of the first forestry magazines. His professional writings included the following books: *American Silvics and Silviculture*, *This Is Our Land*, *The Farm Woodlot* and *What Tree Is That?* In addition to his professional writing he was author of the *Scott Burton* series of books for boys.

From 1911 to 1923 Professor Cheyney served on the Minnesota Forestry Board and was an adviser to the State Forest Service on various forestry questions and special projects during most of his 42 years of service to Minnesota forestry. He was elected a fellow in the Society of American Foresters in 1943—the highest honor that can be accorded a forester in the United States. He was a life member of the Twin Cities Lumbermen's Club.

WILBUR HARKNESS CHERRY

1887-1950

Wilbur Harkness Cherry, Professor of Law, passed away suddenly on February 21, 1950. He was the son of Dr. and Mrs. William Cherry of Toledo, Ohio, and was born November 23, 1887. After attending a preparatory school in Ontario, Canada, he entered McGill University from which he received the degree of bachelor of arts in 1907. He then entered the Law School of Columbia University and was graduated with the degree of bachelor of laws in 1910. He was a member of the Student Editorial Board of the Columbia Law Review and secretary of the board in his senior year.

He began the practice of law in New York City, but in 1912 he came to Minneapolis where he continued in practice until 1925. In the later years he was a partner in the firm of Carleton, Cherry and Carroll. He won recognition for high probity, sound judgment and special skill in trial work.

His connection with the University of Minnesota began in 1914 when he was appointed an instructor in the Extension Division. He was promoted to professor of law in 1917 on a part-time basis, but in 1925 he retired from active practice and thereafter gave all his time to his work in the University.

His experience in practice especially qualified him for work in adjective law, and for thirty-three years he taught the courses in practice and evidence and presided over the trial of cases in the Practice Court. As a teacher in these fields he had few, if any, equals and no superiors. His mind was brilliant, logical and quick, qualities which made him master in the use of the case method of law teaching. His conduct of the Practice Court, one of the most difficult problems in law schools, was outstanding. He was admired and beloved by his students who now constitute a large part of the Bar of Minnesota.

When difficult problems arose, his counsel and judgment were sought and were always available. He served on many committees and was chairman of the Judicial Committee on Tenure at the time of his death. He was one of the founders of the Hennepin County Bar Association and took an active part in the activities of the State and American Bar Associations. He was secretary to the Governor's Crime Commission in 1926 and 1927. In 1935, he was appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States to its Advisory Committee on Rules of Procedure in the Federal Courts and continued as an active member to the time of his death. In 1939, he was selected by the American Law Institute as an adviser on the Code of Evidence, and continued to serve until the code was completed in 1942. He was president of the Association of American Law Schools in 1939.

He lived simply and contributed generously to social objects. Annually for many years he made gifts of substantial sums to scholarships in the University, always anonymously, and his contributions to other community purposes were equally generous. By his death the University has lost a great teacher, the State a great citizen, and our university community a great friend.

FREDERIC BENJAMIN GARVER

(1884-1950)

Frederic Benjamin Garver, Professor of Economics, died suddenly at his home on February 22, 1950. He was born in Fairfield, Nebraska, on November 2, 1884. He received the B.A. degree from the University of Nebraska in 1909, the Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1917, and was awarded an LL.D. by the University of Nebraska in 1939. His teaching career started as instructor at the University of Chicago in 1912. He was assistant professor of economics at Stanford University from 1914-19. He came to the University of Minnesota in September, 1919, as associate professor of economics, at the time that the School of Business Administration was first organized. In 1921 he was promoted to professor of economics and he remained as the senior member of the staff in economic theory from that time until his death. For many years during the development of the School of Business Administration, he served as chairman of its curriculum committee.

Mr. Garver was essentially a humble man who insisted, often against the urging of his colleagues, that his own opinions were too imperfect and inexact to be presented in formal published form. As a result, his list of writings is not long. It includes a widely adopted basic text in *Principles of Economics* (with A. H. Hansen) first published in 1927 with a third edition in 1947; *The Subvention in State Finances of Pennsylvania*, 1919; *Location of Manufactures in the United States* (with F. M. Boddy), 1933.

His immediate colleagues unanimously adopted the following resolution: "We, the faculty of the Department of Economics and the School of Business Administration, express to the family of our colleague, Professor F. B. Garver, our sincere sympathy; further, we take this means of recording in the permanent minutes of this faculty our high regard and deep respect for Professor Garver's major contribution to the development of training and graduate study in economics at the University of Minnesota and for his conscientious and critical scholarship. His sympathy and consideration for students and his determined search for truth and understanding will always be an inspiration to all of us who had the privilege of working with him."

JAMES KERR ANDERSON

(1891-1950)

Dr. James K. Anderson, clinical associate professor of surgery, died on March 28, 1950, of coronary thrombosis. He was born of Pennsylvania forebears at East Liverpool, Ohio, on July 11, 1891. After receiving the liberal arts degree from Washington and Jefferson College in 1913, he attended Johns Hopkins Medical School, receiving the M.D. degree in 1917. For the remainder of that year, he interned at the Minneapolis General Hospital, then entered the Army as a First Lieutenant in the Medical Corps of World War I, serving until 1920. Between the years 1924 and 1929 he was successively superintendent of the sanatorium at Deerwood and the Sunnyrest Sanatorium at Crookston, Minnesota. From that period on he was associated with Dr. Walter A. Fansler in private practice in Minneapolis. In 1934 he became an instructor in surgery at the University, and in 1938 was joint author (with Dr. H. O. McPheeters) of a book entitled *The Injection Treatment of Varicose Veins and Hemorrhoids*. His special field was the diseases of the anus and rectum. He was a member of the American Proctologic Society, a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, president of Hennepin County Medical Society (1945-46) and past national president of his medical fraternity, Phi Beta Pi. To his colleagues he was known as a man of good will and integrity, one who did not hesitate to take a strong stand when the occasion demanded it.

GEORGE P. CONGER, Chairman
T. E. PETTENGILL, Clerk of the Senate