

# SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1957

3:30 P. M.

## MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

Faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members may be present at Senate meetings but shall not be entitled to vote or make motions. Such faculty may, at their request and with the approval of the Senate, be given the privilege to speak on matters under consideration in which they have an interest.

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

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

### UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA SENATE DOCKET

February 7, 1957

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

#### I. MINUTES OF DECEMBER 13, 1956

Reported for Action

#### IA. SENATE COMMITTEES FOR 1956-57

Reported for Action

The President reports additional appointments as follows:

*Student Scholastic Standing:* Robert H. Nath, Richard L. Primus, students.

#### II. NON-SENATE COMMITTEES AND BOARDS FOR 1956-57

Reported for Information

The President reports the following correction:

*Civil Service Committee:* The name of Herbert Heneman, Jr. was listed in error. Instead John G. Turnbull should have been included.

#### III. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Reported for Information

The Clerk of the Senate reports that the constitutional amendments to provide representation for the Mayo Foundation which were approved at the last meeting of the Senate have since been approved by the faculty entitled to vote for Senate members and have been transmitted to the President for action by the Board of Regents.

#### IV. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

1. *Legislative Outlook for the 1957 Session.* The President reported briefly December 5, 1956, on matters related to the requests the University had filed for the 1957 legislature.

2. *Supply and Expense Budgets.* The schools and colleges have made relatively less provision for supply, expense, and equipment resources in the current budget. The President stressed the difficult position with which this confronts the deans and the administration, especially in view of the deficit condition of Regents Reserve resulting largely from an enrollment below budget estimates. The President cautioned the deans that all colleges and departments should so husband their limited funds as to ensure completion of the fiscal year, within the resources of the printed budget.

3. *Survey of Building and Land Needs of Physical Education and Athletics.* Director Ike J. Armstrong and his associates brought in an inventory of Department of Physical Education and Athletics lands and buildings and a survey indicating the long-range land and building requirements of that department. The study was prepared by an outside architectural firm at the request of the University to supplement the University's own long-range survey of land and building needs, which did not include the special needs of this unit.

4. *University Self-Survey.* The President commented on the present status of the University Self-Survey Reports.

5. *Conflict of Interests.* An instance of University staff involvement in a possible conflict between state and private interests had arisen. The President reminded the staff of a Regents' ruling governing such situations: "No member of the faculty shall accept employment which shall bring him as an expert or in any other capacity into antagonism to the interests of the State of Minnesota." (*Minutes of the Board of Regents, June 10, 1914.*)

6. *Minnesota Statehood Centennial.* Although the University does not have a special state centennial committee, staff participation in planning the program of the 1958 Centennial is already extensive. The President urged University departments to co-operate with Mr. Tom Swain, centennial director, and his associates and with the many University staff members who have assignments on various Centennial committees. Vice President Willey and Director Nunn will gladly assist in the exploration or development of any special University projects.

7. *The 10-Year Calendar.* To facilitate long-range scheduling and planning of University events, the University Schedule Committee recommended a 10-year calendar consisting of the starting and ending date of each of four quarters for the school years 1957-58 through 1966-67. This was referred back to the Schedule Committee with the request that the Committee explore possible schedule arrangements that might provide for the earlier opening of school in the fall quarter.

8. *University Work Calendar During the 1956 Christmas Holidays.* In view of the Governor's action on working hours of civil service employees on December 24 and 31, 1956, questions arose as to what the University work schedule should be on those days. Generally, the University has been guided by State policy on the closing of offices and on the granting of any special time off during the holidays. Mr. Hedwin C. Anderson presented for consideration a proposal for time keeping that he had discussed with the heads of certain University offices. It was moved, seconded, and voted to approve that policy, with the understanding that the Office of Civil Service Personnel would make the detailed announcement.

9. *Staff Participation in University Functions and Observance of Officially Approved All-University Convocation Schedule.* The President commented on violation of the Administrative Committee-Senate action dismissing classes for the Opening Convocation, the Charter Day Convocation, and the Cap and Gown Day Convocation and asked the deans to implement the official intention of class dismissal in such a manner that violations will not occur. He also solicited the co-operation of the deans in making arrangements for representation from the colleges at University functions and to this end urged the deans to review their patterns of college representation.

10. *United Hospital Fund Drive.* An extensive effort in fund raising is planned to provide for new capital outlay for hospitals in Minneapolis and Hennepin County. There is to be a 36-month program, soundly supported by civic leaders. The University had a letter asking co-operation in the solicitation of funds and in the provision for payments through payroll deductions.

It was pointed out in the meeting that fund campaigns are cleared through the Administrative Committee; that only two drives (for the Community Chest and the Red Cross) are approved and conducted through our staff; and that payroll deductions have so far been used for University purposes only, in cases where benefits to the individual employee are involved. Discussion indicated clear University support of the drive and the desirability of institutional identification with it. Reasons were given for nonparticipation by University Hospitals. Questions asked but not answered concerned the quota, if any, which might be assigned to the University and the application of this drive to staff members resident outside of Minneapolis or employed, for example, on the St. Paul Campus. On motion, duly made and seconded, it was voted to support participation in the raising of funds for the United Hospital Fund Drive.

Concerning the possibility, or even the desirability of payroll deductions for this purpose, there was much further discussion. The operational problems are virtually insoluble and procedures, if developed, would be costly to the University. It was apparent that this use of payroll deduction would establish a precedent. Clearly there was a willingness to investigate what can be done as the University looks ahead to new forms of charitable enterprise and to possible use of payroll deduction in supporting charities.

It was finally moved, seconded, and voted that while the Administrative Committee approves a campaign for the United Hospital Fund of Minneapolis and Hennepin County, it reaffirms its policy of not making payroll deductions for purposes of this kind. It was further moved, seconded, and voted that, at a convenient time, the President might appoint a subcommittee of the Administrative Committee, with suitable additions from the civil service staff, to report on the possibility and procedures for the University in the United Appeals type of campaign and payroll deduction plan.

11. *Necrology Section of the Senate Minutes.* Administrative criticism had been filed concerning the unevenness and inappropriateness of some statements prepared for the necrology section of the Senate docket. The President pointed out that these statements originate with the teaching units to which the deceased members of staff were attached and that they are merely assembled by the Clerk of the Senate. Some time ago, the Senate chose to proceed in this manner, dropping its Committee on Necrology and not returning to methods of editing or co-ordination used earlier. Experience reported from the old Committee on Necrology was that the departmental statements were used almost without change, consequently there appeared to be little need for such a committee. It was, however, considered important to include a necrology section in the minutes of the Senate. No

suitable or necessary revision of the present plan having been suggested, it was the consensus that departments should, in preparing these statements, make them appropriate, individualized, and of a dignity proper to the purpose which they serve.

12. *Use of Retired Military Personnel for Staff Positions.* Several communications have been received in the President's office suggesting employment of retiring military personnel for teaching and other University positions. Information on these can be obtained from Mr. Stanley J. Wenberg in the President's office.

R. E. SUMMERS, Secretary

## V. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

### Reported for Information

*Report of Subcommittee Appointed by the Senate Committee on Education to Discuss the Implications of Increased Enrollment for University Admission Policy*

#### 1. Appointment and Assignment of the Committee.

The membership of the subcommittee consists of Professors Theodore Hornberger, chairman (English), Roland H. Abraham (Agricultural Extension), Otto Domian (Field Studies), Stuart W. Fenton (Chemistry), Gordon Kingsley (General College), Theron O. Odlaug (Biology, Duluth), and Donald G. Paterson (Psychology). This report was written by Professor Hornberger.

The subcommittee has interpreted its assignment as being that of presenting to the Senate the main facts and issues relevant to discussion of admissions at a time when rapidly increasing enrollments are certain to make necessary many changes in the many-branched operation of the University. Some of these facts and issues have already been presented to the Senate in Dean R. E. Summers' report on December 13, 1956, and to the University community at large in Professor William Anderson's speech before the College Section of the Minnesota Education Association on October 26, 1956. Others have been dealt with in a section of the report of the University Self-Survey Committee, headed "Whom Should the University Admit?" and made available to the subcommittee through the committee chairman. Arguments developed in these documents are referred to hereinafter, and differing points of view indicated, but it is not the propose of this report to take a stand. Nor, indeed, does this report survey the entire problem of admissions. Later subcommittees have been assigned to explore the situation so far as subcollegiate work offered by the University and the pattern of advanced standing admissions are concerned.

#### 2. University Admission Policy at Present.

a. Distinction between Freshman and Advanced Standing Admissions. The first important fact to be remembered in the discussion of admissions was stated at the last Senate meeting by Dean Summers: "Almost one-half of the new students who enter here, even in the fall quarter when the new crop comes from the high schools, are advanced standing matriculants or special students, many of whom cluster around or enter the gates of the Graduate School." An admission policy, therefore, has two prongs: what to do with beginning freshman, and what to do with applicants with previous college training.

b. Five major units of the University principally share the task of dealing with entering freshmen. Their present admissions policies appear to be as follows: (1) The General College admits any applicant who is a graduate of a Minnesota high school, although it can exercise the power to reject in certain cases and in practice places some reliance on tests and recommendations. (2) The Duluth Branch, which has no General College, classifies about 35 per cent of its entering freshmen as admissible to the Associate in Arts program, which corresponds roughly to that of the General College. Most of these students are in the lower 40 per cent of their local high school classes, as determined by grades, tests, and the composite HSR (High School Rank). For the Bachelor of Arts program the Duluth Branch admits applicants whose HSR is above the 40th percentile. (3) The College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics accepts only those students whose HSR is in the upper 75 per cent of their class and meet certain other unit requirements. (4) The College of Science, Literature, and the Arts admits applicants whose HSR is above the 40th percentile. (5) The Institute of Technology admits applicants whose HSR is above the 50th percentile, provided that they offer among their entrance credits solid geometry and higher algebra. A University Committee on Admissions looks periodically at these widely variant policies, and presumably will consider them in relation to the expected bulge in enrollments.

c. Advanced standing admission policies vary from college to college and even from department to department. In general, however, admission is based upon the previous collegiate record of the applicant. In some of the professional schools, space limitations impose quotas; in others, a high degree of selectivity is favored on principle.

#### 3. The Main Issues.

In the area of admissions, this subcommittee finds three main issues, as follows:

a. Should there be greater selectivity in admissions than there is at present?

b. Should the University make a greater effort than it now does to identify and assist the superior student?

c. Should admissions be limited to student bodies for whom competent teaching personnel can be obtained?

On each of these issues opinion is divided within a subcommittee of seven members. It seems probable that faculty opinion likewise is divided as to the course of wisdom.

#### 4. The Argument Against Greater Selectivity and Limitation.

Dean Summers, Professor Anderson, and the Self-Survey Committee all seem to be in substantial agreement that there should not be greater selectivity or limitation of admissions. Professor Anderson and the Self-Survey Committee, moreover, appear to be skeptical, our tools of predicting college success being what they are, of identifying superior students and providing accelerated programs for them. They point out, in support of their position, the fallibility of such measuring and testing devices as HSR, the ACE tests, etc., and they make much of both the peculiar distribution of the population of Minnesota and the democratic tradition that every individual should have his chance. The Self-Survey Committee recommends, it is true, that a study be undertaken of the ways and means of predicting success in college, but the tone of the recommendation is restrained. Of the third main issue isolated by the present subcommittee, little has been said.

#### 5. The Argument for Greater Selectivity and Limitation.

Other minds have come to quite different conclusions. California, for example, has recently drawn up a master plan for higher education in which extremely high selectivity for its "eminent university," which shares with Harvard the distinction of six Nobel Prize winners on its faculties, is a conspicuous feature. It has, to be sure, an elaborate system of community, junior, and state colleges such as seems very unlikely to develop in Minnesota, but its evident concern lest research and the training of experts be overshadowed by education for community service and responsible citizenship, worthy as these goals are, is probably shared by large segments of our own faculties. California and New York, moreover, would seem to be thinking in terms of the affirmative side of the second and third issues stated above. The California report contemplates requesting the state legislature to provide scholarships for as many as 3,200 students each year, 40 per cent of them to go to those preparing to teach. The Regents of the State of New York, as reported in the *New York Times* for December 28, 1956, have recommended an elaborate scholarship program, including 250 annual grants of up to \$2,500, awarded on need and merit, to persons wishing to train for college teaching. New York is also said to be exploring ways and means of assisting private institutions of higher education to expand, in order that they may help meet the anticipated needs.

Proponents of greater selectivity and limitation, while admitting the inadequacies of tools for prediction, think that they may be refined and improved, or that a general entrance examination, perhaps designed to discover the adequacy of preparation for the specialty the applicant hopes to take up, might be desirable.

Finally, much of the discussion of increased enrollments appears to assume that when the students arrive there will be competent teachers to instruct them. In many units of the University, this assumption appears to be growing more untenable day by day. There are simply not enough trained people to go around. Nor will money alone be enough to maintain the quality which attracts to a university the type of teachers everyone wants. An overburdened staff, skeptical or cynical about the integrity of its teaching, is not unimaginable, and ought probably to be a specter in the dreams of all who look at the estimates of enrollment in 1970.

C. GILBERT WRENN, Chairman

## VI. NEW BUSINESS