

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 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.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

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

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

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

SENATE DOCKET

May 2, 1957

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

I. MINUTES OF MARCH 14, 1957

Reported for Action

II. STUDENT ORGANIZATION STAFF REPRESENTATIVES OR ADVISERS FOR 1956-57

Reported for Information

The President reports the following change in appointment:

Union Board of Governors, University Village, Staff Representative on: Vance Jewson to replace Willard Johnston who has been transferred to the Duluth Branch.

III. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

The Clerk of the Senate reports that Professor Francis M. Boddy and Professor Robert H. Beck have been duly elected to the Faculty Consultative Committee for a term of 3 years (1957-60) beginning July 1, 1957 and that President Morrill has requested Professor Boddy to continue as Committee Chairman for the coming year.

IV. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

1. *Legislative and Budgetary Outlook.* The President reported on work with the legislative session and discussed the necessity of canvassing the 1957-58 budgetary plans in advance of adjournment of the legislature. The deans should, he said, appraise the situation for the year ahead and suggest policy on certain matters to be dealt with in the immediate budget, especially faculty salary rates. He asked for views on such considerations as changes in salary floors for various ranks, proper competitive salaries for teaching and research assistants, and the place of across-the-board increases in the structure of any total plan of salary improvement. He cautioned the committee that funds were not yet approved, even tentatively, for any of the salary betterment proposals and that the over-all percentage increases in salary money requested were not to be interpreted as percentages that apply to individual faculty salaries.

There ensued extensive discussion in which the deans of all of the colleges were canvassed for an expression of their views. It was clear that the college situations differ somewhat, but there was apparent a general belief in the value of merit increases and recognition that whatever ultimate action could be taken, it must relate to the amounts of money available. There was mention of the use of new funds for additional staff to deal with new teaching loads.

The President stated that other meetings would be devoted to planning of this kind, with the deans and the Faculty Consultative Committee, and that meantime central offices of the University would make tentative calculations and prepare budgetary background material for criticism and discussion.

2. *Results of the California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Study.* The complete preliminary report of results of the California and Western Conference Cost and Statistical Study had been made to the participating institutions, in advance of any general release of the results. At the direction of President Morrill, the applicable sections of the portion on instruction and research were assembled in the Bureau of Institutional Research by Mr. John E. Stecklein and made available to our college deans. President Morrill called on Vice President Middlebrook to review the study, the reasons for its being undertaken, and the considerations which prevailed during its prosecution. Earlier methods had involved serious weaknesses and seemingly had emphasized institutional differences and accounting procedures rather than educational objectives and accomplishments. In this study there was clearly no attempt made to set standards for individual colleges or institutions or to secure any degree of uniformity. The results should provide useful new comparative data—possibly new tools for college administration in a difficult and changing situation.

Mr. Stecklein gave a preliminary detailed explanation of the results of the various report volumes and discussed how these results were derived from survey materials collected at the University. It was suggested that, in view of the magnitude of the report material and of its complexity, Mr. Stecklein should convene meetings of the deans concerned to study our colleges' uses of the report sections.

The President observed that the University needs to do the best planning that it can in advance of budgeting for 1957-58 and in anticipation of the long-range changes and expansions ahead. He remarked that he hoped for serious use of this material in each college. The deans were asked to evolve suitable methods for using it in their areas, since major administrative responsibility for good planning and use of funds falls on their offices.

3. *Possible Faculty Service in Classroom Teaching Beyond the Retirement Age.* The President reported that there had been discussion of the possibility of extending the service of classroom teachers beyond the 68th year compulsory age limit and that this had gone beyond mere administrative consideration—into such bodies as the Advisory Committee on Insurance and Retirement. As a prelude to desirable further consideration of this in the Administrative Committee, he read a proposal predicated on the growing need for teachers at the University and a rate of increase of undergraduate students in excess of the rate of increase of graduate degrees granted. Among the assumptions incorporated in the proposal were those of less than full-time assignments to designated individuals (not as an enhancement of the retirement program) and the understanding that any such service would be year to year on a nonregular nontenure basis with specification of service time and teaching work.

There was some discussion of this proposal in the course of which reference was made to the related material in the Self-Survey report. The President indicated that both documents could be put before the Committee at a later date, when careful consideration of them might be called for.

4. *Results of the United Hospital Fund Drive.* The President expressed to Dean Ziebarth the appreciation of the University for the very good work done in the United Hospital Fund Drive. A report on outcomes of the campaign on the campus, giving the total amount pledged, was acknowledged by the President.

5. *Recommendations of the Honors Committee.* The Committee on University Honors recommended an honorary doctor of science degree and six Outstanding Achievement Awards (April 5, 1957), according to documentation presented. Also included in their report were proposals on the naming of a room in Fraser Hall after a retiring staff member and a building on the St. Paul Campus. After discussion, it was moved, seconded, and voted to approve the recommendations and to request their transmission to the Regents.

6. *Special Report and Recommendations of the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships.* Professor Robert J. Keller, chairman of the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships, presented a special report of his committee on the need for University-wide review of those changes in college policies and practices which have an effect on other colleges of the University or on outside educational institutions. He indicated how changes made in one college, particularly in the face of mounting enrollments, may alter the situation in other colleges, but with little consistent change in the University enrollment overall. He reviewed the constitutional assignment of the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships and discussed the action and procedures of that committee. He emphasized the desirability of early communication of college plans to his committee in order to ensure best co-ordination of the work of all campus units. The report follows.

**Special Report
of the
Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships
to the
University Administrative Committee
March 1, 1957**

- I. Need exists for University-wide review of changes in college policies and practices in terms of their effect on other colleges of the University or outside educational institutions.
 1. The discussion of admission policies at the last meeting of the Senate emphasized the interrelationships among colleges—how changes independently made in one college affect enrollments in other colleges, but with little or no reduction in overall student load.
 2. Mounting University enrollments lead to review of policies of admission, transfer and graduation requirements as one method of managing the teaching load.
 - a. Such review has already started as judged by proposals made or under consideration in Agriculture, I.T., Law, Medicine, Pharmacy, S.L.A. and probably other colleges.
 - b. Changes in policy resulting from such review have implications for other colleges and secondary schools within the state, including other colleges of the University.
- II. The Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships has responsibility for dealing with this kind of problem as specified by *Senate By-Laws*, Article III, Section 6. "There shall be a standing Committee on Institutional Relationships, to consist of at least seven members, whose chief concern shall be the relation of the University to other institutions of learning. This committee shall review all matters which affect these relations of the University. It shall also serve as an advisory intra-university relations committee on admission requirements, graduation requirements, credit allowances, and other matters which affect relations among the several colleges or departments of the University. It shall determine and report to any college proposing changes in these areas, the probable effect of the change on other colleges or departments of the University, other Minnesota colleges, or Minnesota secondary schools. The committee shall also promote articulation between the University and other educational institutions of the state and develop plans for making the University more helpful to them. It shall represent the University in determining the accreditation accorded Minnesota schools and colleges. It may also represent the University in conferences with educational associations and agencies."
 1. This Senate Committee is assigned advisory responsibilities for matters of concern to other colleges within the University as well as those which affect other institutions of learning.
 - a. The internal affairs of a single institute, college, or school of collegiate rank are excepted and assigned to each faculty under the University Senate Constitution (Article III, Section 2 and Article VI, Section 2). These internal affairs are specified to include "... entrance requirements, curricula, instruction, examinations, grading, degrees, and disciplinary matters . . ."
 - b. *Senate By-Laws*, Article III, Section 6 (above) also specifies advisory responsibility of the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships for some of the same areas when they have implications or possible effect on other colleges or secondary schools.
 2. Early review by this Senate Committee is expected by the provision that the probable effect on other colleges or schools be ascertained for the college proposing changes, not after changes have been made.
 3. The functions assigned to the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships become increasingly important with rapid changes in enrollment. This will be particularly true in the years ahead when all collegiate institutions are strained with the pressure of providing higher education for larger numbers of young people. The pressure upon the University will be extremely great.
- III. Management of these functions has been spotty, both on the part of the Senate Committee and the several colleges.
 1. Some constructive actions have been taken.
 - a. Accreditation of private secondary schools, public and private junior colleges, and other colleges of the state.
 - b. Establishment of the Committee on Relationships with Prospective College Students and a revised policy on relationships with such students. *Minutes*, 1952-53, No. 1, pp. 33-35.
 - c. Numerous policy decisions on entrance requirements including general requirements, admission by examination, admission without regard to pattern of credits for high ranking high school graduates, adult special students, and non-high school graduates.
 - d. Transfer of credits to the University, limitations, conditions, correspondence study, military service, evaluation of credits earned in military service, credits from professional schools and colleges.
 - e. Sponsorship of High School-University Transition Conferences, one or more each year since 1949-50.
 - f. Improved relationships with Minnesota colleges through cooperation with the Association of Minnesota Colleges, the Minnesota Association of Junior Colleges, the Council of Minnesota Colleges, the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, the Minnesota Association of School Administrators and various other professional groups.
 2. Current matters under consideration.
 - a. Foreign language requirement for S.L.A.
 - b. Proposal for handling transfer of D-quality grades in S.L.A.
 - c. Transfer of terminal course credits from junior colleges.
 - d. Policy on the offering of sub-collegiate courses (Joint subcommittee with Senate Committee on Education sponsorship.)
 3. Many matters in this area are not reviewed.
 - a. Foreign language requirement was referred to Senate Committee after protests arrived following public announcement in newspapers.
 - b. No referral on changes in transfer and length of program in Pharmacy.
 - c. Changes in admission requirements in Law were referred after adoption by the faculty.
 - d. Casual discussion of possible changes in admission in I.T.
- IV. Alternative ways for managing these functions include the following:
 1. Continue with no more co-ordination or communication than that which now exists, a spotty, haphazard, voluntary form of communication.
 2. Develop improved procedures and machinery for review of proposed changes in policy or practice within the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships. This alternative involves a strengthening of current practice and necessitates
 - a. Early review of proposals
 - b. Development of procedures for getting reactions of the separate colleges both within and outside the University.
 - c. Establishment of needed channels of communication.
 3. Develop and establish machinery for review and coordination outside the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships, possibly through
 - a. A separate standing committee on the University Senate
 - b. An *ad hoc* committee of the President
 - c. Assignment of such function to another Senate Committee, such as the Committee on Education or the University Administration Committee.
 - d. A position established within the Office of the President.
- V. The Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships recommends the second alternative. While virtues may be found in the other alternatives, or some not yet conceived, this committee feels that we need to come to grips with this problem now, and that the second alternative represents the best way of handling this matter at the present time. This Senate Committee seeks
 1. Endorsement by the University Administrative Committee to this interpretation and approach to the management of functions assigned to the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships.
 2. Assistance of the University Administrative Committee in requesting deans and other administrative heads
 - a. To send minutes of their separate faculties to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships
 - b. To keep the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships informed of proposals for such changes in policy as defined earlier (*Senate By-Laws*, Article III, Section 6), which have implications for other schools and colleges both within and outside the University.
 - c. To become particularly concerned about institutional relationships and to keep open and used those channels of communication between colleges which promote understanding and good will.

ROBERT J. KELLER, Chairman

President Morrill commented that problems of the kind that are reported to the Committee on Institutional Relationships will inevitably increase as enrollments increase. He said that the University has obligations of leadership and educational statesmanship, on campus and in its dealings with other schools. While indeed the principle of collegiate autonomy is cherished at the University, and is well understood on campus, the sum of what all of our colleges do is interpreted off campus as reflecting University policy, not necessarily as isolated college action. In the area of admission of students and perhaps more acutely in respect to curricular requirements, what the colleges do individually has serious implications for the whole University.

The University Self-Survey Report gave serious attention to this matter, even exploring the possibility of some all-University curricular co-ordination and control on a new nonauthoritarian basis. Foresight in effecting good relationships among our colleges and with sister institutions is desirable, the President said.

There was discussion of the specific recommendations (section V in the report) which would foster improved procedures for the review of proposed changes in policy or practice well in advance of change. This review could be carried out in the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships, according to its present by-law, but with greater assistance from the deans and the various faculties. Better implementation of the prescribed work of the relationships committee was called for and it was said that communication both to and from the committee could be improved. Questions were asked concerning operational details and with regard to the time schedules which could and should be maintained.

It was moved, seconded, and voted to adopt the recommendation of the report. This carried endorsement by the Administrative Committee of the assignment given to the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships by the Senate Constitution. It provided the assurance of assistance to that committee by the deans and different faculties through effective communication and concern for good institutional relationships.

R. E. SUMMERS, Secretary

**V. REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Reported for Information**

The Committee on Education has analyzed carefully the report of its subcommittee on Course Additions, Deletions and Modifications. This subcommittee, appointed several years ago and chaired by Prof. Ruth Eckert, surveyed the University curriculum changes from 1946 to 1951 as reported by department chairmen, and made a validating check on later changes in S.L.A. A summary of the facts as to curriculum change and curricular practices throughout the University were reported to the Senate in the spring of 1956. Since then the Committee on Education has studied its subcommittee's recommendations for sound practice in curriculum development and from these have selected and developed the recommendations made in I below. These are presented as recommendations for improved practice addressed to individual faculty members, to the faculty of a department, and to the faculties of a college. It is believed that observance of these principles and practices by any faculty would strengthen the quality of curriculum change in the University. Many of the practices suggested are, of course, already operating procedures for the different faculties.

The Committee on Education also has studied the recommendations of the Self-Survey Committee with regard to curriculum development. With many of these we are in complete agreement. Others are believed to be useful hypotheses regarding which further evidence should be collected. They are inserted at appropriate places in the Senate Committee's list of recommendations but presented as the recommendations of the Self-Survey Committee. We do not individually approve or disapprove any one of them. Consideration was given to a complete amalgamation of these with the Senate Committee's recommendations, for there is general agreement, but differences of language and paragraph construction made this integration difficult. Beyond this, violence might be done to the specific intent of the Self-Survey Committee's statement if this procedure were to be followed. They are therefore inserted in the Senate Committee's lists as largely harmonious with it but as separate statements of the Self-Survey Committee.

Before presenting the recommended practices, which do not of course bind any college or department to their observance, it is essential that a further proposal of the Committee on Education be made. This committee is convinced that the curriculum development of the total University structure is so complicated as to demand further study and some guidance. No one in the University, no committee, and no University office, has at present a comprehensive and specific knowledge of the curriculums of the various colleges and departments, of the manner in which these interrelate, or of the trends which may be present. Until some comprehensive picture of the total curriculum is developed an individual college or department has difficulty in seeing how its projected changes are related to other units or how

THREE—6737—SENATE DOCKET—JL

they relate to general trends. Each department and college has autonomy in curriculum development and this is as it should be—up to a point. With rapid growth ahead it is desirable that each part of the University should see its specific relation to the whole if the most economical use is to be made of faculty time and talent. This will require careful study by a responsible agency of the Senate.

I. To this end your Committee on Education proposes that the Senate approve its appointment of a subcommittee on the University Curriculum. In the normal course of events no approval of subcommittee appointments is needed but the task of this subcommittee lies so close to the heart of the University as an educational institution that we seek your approval. This subcommittee would consider its first mission to be the accomplishment of the following tasks:

1. To study existing reports and recommendations regarding curriculum change.
2. To develop a system for recording and classifying the present curriculum structure of the various colleges and a method for supplying curriculum information to any college requesting it.
3. To recognize problems of policy which might emerge from accumulating curriculum modifications, additions, or deletions, and which should be brought to the attention of the Senate Committee on Education for possible Senate action.

It is not the intent that this subcommittee shall at present have other than informative and consultative functions until the total picture of the University curriculum emerges more clearly and there is a basis for recommendations regarding more specific review functions. Any such recommended change would be presented to the Senate after study by the Committee on Education.

The proposed subcommittee would find it impossible to accomplish any portion of its tasks without professional staff assistance. It is proposed, therefore, that this subcommittee have appointed as its executive officer a qualified professional man on at least a half-time basis for the first year of operation. It would further need some research and administrative assistance. A report to the Senate of the work of this subcommittee and its staff would be made periodically.

II. Recommendations for Curriculum Practice

1. Individual faculty members should be helped to contribute to curriculum-building through
 - a. Allocating time, in reckoning their work loads, to periodic revision of their current offerings, to systematic study of the total departmental and college program to which their own courses contribute, and to the development of needed new courses.
 - b. Financing occasional visits to other institutions or to professional meetings where new curriculum practices are being studied.
 - c. Providing time and funds to enable qualified faculty members to study the professions for which their own departments may be training students.
 - d. Affording consultative help to faculty members in constructing or revising their courses or in developing tests and other instruments to access students' learning.
 - e. Encouraging widespread discussion and experimentation, aimed at relating each instructor's teaching to other school and college experiences of the students concerned.
2. Departmental staffs should be encouraged to assume leadership in curriculum development through
 - a. Giving sufficient time, in departmental staff meetings, to discussions of course offerings, perhaps periodically re-examining the reasons for offering each course to see if these are still valid—or if other valid reasons exist.

Self-Survey Committee statements:

Each department responsible for the teaching of a subject should be free to rearrange its own courses and their contents according to its best judgment, after careful consideration and consultation with other departments affected, provided:

(1) It does not increase the number of its offerings (as measured by credit hours), or take other action that might call for an unauthorized increase in its budget, and

(2) It does not injuriously affect other departments whose students need and take its offerings, or throw additional burdens from its own students upon such other departments. In all cases the other departments that are affected should be consulted in advance, and they should have the right to appeal to higher authorities, at the college level first, and later even at the University level.

(The Committee on Education believes that the word "appeal" may at this point be interpreted as "consult" and at the University level this would be with the proposed subcommittee on the University Curriculum.)

- b. Maintaining up-to-date files of the courses taught in the department (such records to include information regarding their aims, subject content, readings, and sample examinations).
- c. Making inventories of student reactions to current departmental offerings, and occasionally also probing the opinions of alumni and other qualified off-campus groups.
- d. Consulting with individual faculty members or staffs in related areas, to work out better means of correlating course offerings.

Self-Survey Committee statements:

Before starting any new course, every department should examine the offerings in other departments and colleges to see whether the new course might not duplicate in whole or in part any course or courses in the University.

Minor overlappings and partial duplications are not to be condemned entirely. They have some positive values, in fact, insofar as they show the interconnections and relations between various fields of study. But substantial duplications, as evidenced by course outlines and by readings and other work assigned, should be taken more seriously. If the departments concerned in such a case cannot reach a satisfactory agreement, the college or colleges in which the separate courses are to be given should take the matter under advisement, jointly if necessary.

- e. Determining which courses are central to the department's purpose in order to help advisers and students select the proper ones.
- f. Comparing different curriculum approaches to find out how these influence the extent and quality of students' learning. One approach which merits consideration would shift greater responsibility to students themselves, reducing deliberately the number of hours given to formal class meetings in favor of independent study and investigation.
- g. Being given greater understanding of departmental budget making problems and thereby coming to appreciate more fully the financial implications of various "curriculum choices."
3. College faculties should be encouraged to study and appraise the total program sponsored by their division through
 - a. Setting aside some faculty sessions for discussion of basic educational questions, with a view to helping the staff clarify its goals, and means used to attain them.
 - b. Keeping all departments periodically informed regarding changes effected in the college's instructional program and on projected lines of development.
 - c. Rigorously screening all proposals for new courses, so that the total college program is not expanded beyond the University's ability to support it defensibly. Unless new sources of support are in prospect, such proposals should be accompanied by suggestions as to how the addition is to be handled with available funds.
 - d. Investigating the uses made of present courses and the learning outcomes achieved through them. Follow-up studies of drop-outs and graduates, conducted periodically and designed to relate accomplishments to the particular college's objectives and resources, should be useful in charting future lines of advance.
4. A series of recommendations made by the Self-Survey Committee refer to the University as a whole. These are recommendations of the Self-Survey Committee with an occasional comment from the Committee on Education.

Self-Survey Committee statements:

In general, for any one clearly defined subject, the University should have 1 and only 1 department of instruction. The exceptions to this general rule for separate campuses and other situations are provided for in other parts of this report. Some undesirable duplications and unnecessary multiplications of courses might be avoided by adherence to this principle.

A certain amount of duplication between general undergraduate courses designed primarily for general liberal education, and advanced professional courses in the same subject in the several professional schools, is a recognized partial exception to the "one department principle."

(The Committee on Education believes that the two recommendations just cited should be carefully examined by the proposed Subcommittee on the University Curriculum and possibly used as tentative guide lines in their examination of reports made to them regarding curriculum changes.)

Self-Survey Committee statement:

Each department should recognize its University-wide obligation to serve the needs of any and all qualified University students who wish to include its offerings in any reasonable program of studies. Students should be permitted to register for courses wherever given in the University provided they have the necessary prerequisites. Efforts should be made to enable students to cut across college lines in order to make their own distinctive combinations of courses to fit them for significant and so-called useful new occupations and professions.

C. GILBERT WRENN

Chairman

VI. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Reported for Information

1. *Conference Action and Legislation, 1956-57, Concerning Financial Aid to Athletes.* As you have been informed from time to time through oral reports from our Conference Representative, Professor Rottschaefer, the Big Ten Conference Representatives have inaugurated and spent a great deal of time this year on a new program of financial assistance for athletes in the Big Ten institutions. The program has been highly controversial and was finally adopted by a 6-4 vote in February, to become effective as to all student athletes who matriculate after the coming June 1, 1957.

The program is already under way, and much time has been spent both here and at the Conference headquarters and other institutions implementing it. There is, therefore, not much likelihood that it will be postponed, although that is still a possibility. However, there is much dissatisfaction with

FOUR—6737—SENATE DOCKET—JL

a number of the present provisions and it is likely that some of these will be changed or modified at the Conference meetings in May or at special meeting this summer.

Thus, although Minnesota will probably have to live with the new plan in substantially its present form for at least 1 year, it still seems to the Committee that it would be premature to attempt to present to you even a brief explanation of it at this time. After the May meeting and when the plan is actually implemented, your Committee will submit a brief report on its general features, objectives, and operation.

2. *Activities of the Committee.* During the current academic year your Committee has been occupied with its routine activities of determining game schedules and eligibility of players, granting "M" awards and special awards, determining ticket prices and student seating at football games, and dealing with ticket violations and other matters.

In addition, 3 lengthy meetings out of the 9 so far held since last September have been devoted mainly or entirely to extended discussion and consideration of the new Conference Legislation reported above. Further, the implementation of that legislation at this University has consumed much additional time on the part of the Conference Representative and individual Committee members and also on the part of the President, the Vice-President, Business Administrator and his staff, the Director of Athletics and his staff, the Dean of Students and his staff (particularly the Director of Loans and Scholarships), the Director of the Greater University Fund, the Recorder, the Director of the University bookstores, and numerous administrative officers in the Institutes, Colleges, and Schools. The committee wishes to express its appreciation for this assistance and co-operation from these many people.

Varsity "M" awards for the current academic year have been voted in the following sports:

- 12 in Basketball
- 6 in Cross Country
- 32 in Football
- 5 in Gymnastics
- 18 in Hockey
- 11 in Swimming
- 11 in Wrestling

Letters in the remaining sports, baseball, golf, tennis, and track, will be awarded upon completion of their schedules. New letter winners will be inducted into the "M" Club at the annual banquet, which is scheduled for June 5, 1957.

Special awards of "M" rings were voted to the members and coaches of the 1956 Conference and N.C.A.A. championship baseball team, and to the members and coach of this year's championship wrestling team.

Under the auspices of the subcommittee on tickets, spot checks were made during the football season for violations of the privileges under the student ticket card. From 3 to 5 per cent of the 13,210 student tickets sold were checked at each football game. Apparent violations were found in 4 per cent of the tickets checked, and in roughly one-half of these cases (60) violations were confirmed and the tickets were confiscated.

Increases in the admission prices in several sports were voted, partly to meet mounting costs of operation and maintenance and partly to conform our prices to those prevailing at other Big Ten schools. The principal increases were as follows:

- Football:*
 Single game, from \$3.60 to \$4.00
 Public season ticket (5 games), from \$18.00 to \$20.00
 Student-Faculty-Employee (season—all sports) from \$10.00 to \$11.00
 Spouse of Student-Faculty-Employee (season—all sports) from \$13.00 to \$14.50
 Children under 16 (bleacher when available) from \$1.00 to \$1.25
- Basketball:*
 Public reserved seat, all games, from \$1.75 to \$2.00
 Children under 16, general admission, from \$.75 to \$1.00
 (All other basketball prices: Public Season, Staff-Student reserved, etc., remain unchanged)
- Hockey:*
 Rinkside reserved, from \$1.50 to \$1.75
 (All other hockey prices unchanged)
- Baseball:*
 Public general admission, from \$.75 to \$1.00

The following schedules for this year, and for 1957-58 in so far as completed, have been approved:

		<i>Baseball—1957</i>
Mar.	25-26	Texas at Austin
	27-28	Rice Institute at Houston
	29-30	University of Houston at Houston
Apr.	1-2	Oklahoma at Norman
	12-13	Iowa State College (3 games)
	19-20	Iowa State Teachers College (3)
	26	Northwestern at Evanston
	27	Wisconsin at Madison (2)
	30	University of North Dakota
May	3	Purdue
	4	Illinois (2)
	14	St. Thomas
	17	Michigan at Ann Arbor
	18	Michigan State at East Lansing (2)
May	21	St. John's at St. Cloud
	24	Indiana
	25	Ohio State (2)
June	1	Alumni game
		<i>Golf—1957</i>
Apr.	29	Wisconsin and Iowa at Madison
May	3	Macalester and St. Thomas at Keller, St. Paul
	4	Augsburg, Gustavus Adolphus and Mankato T. Col.
	7	Carleton, St. Olaf, Augsburg
	10	Macalester, St. Thomas
	14	Carleton, St. Olaf at Northfield
	18	Iowa at Iowa City
		Northwestern at Iowa City
		Wisconsin at Iowa City
	24-25	Conference at Iowa City
June	23-29	NCAA at Broadmoor Country Club, Colorado Springs
		<i>Tennis—1957</i>
Mar.	26	Georgia Tech at Atlanta, Ga.
	27	U. of Georgia at Athens
	28	Emory University at Atlanta
Apr.	26	Macalester
May	1	Carleton
	2	St. Thomas
	6	Iowa
	10	Marquette at Milwaukee
	11	Illinois at Madison, Wis.
	13	Iowa State
	17	Wisconsin at Madison
	18	Northwestern at Evanston
	23-24-25	Conference at Evanston
		<i>Football—1957</i>
		(Games at home)
Sept.	28	Washington (Editors, Legislators—H.S. Bands Day)
Oct.	5	Purdue (Alumni Band and H.S. Squads Day)
Oct.	26	Michigan
Nov.	2	Indiana (Homecoming—H.S. Squads)
Nov.	23	Wisconsin (Dad's Day)
		(Games Away)
Oct.	12	Northwestern at Evanston
Oct.	19	Illinois at Urbana
Nov.	9	Iowa at Iowa City
Nov.	16	Michigan State at East Lansing
		<i>Hockey—1957-58</i>
Nov.	30	Alumni game
Dec.	6-7	Michigan Tech
	21	U. S. Nationals
	27-28	Harvard
	30	Colorado College at Colorado Springs
Jan.	1-3	Denver at Denver
	4	Colorado College at Colorado Springs
	10-11	Michigan State
	17-18	North Dakota
	24-25	Michigan Tech at Houghton
	31-Feb 1	Denver
Feb.	7-8	Michigan
	14-15	North Dakota at Grand Forks
	21-22	Michigan at Ann Arbor
	28-Mar 1	Michigan State at East Lansing
Mar.	7-8	Colorado College

STANLEY V. KINYON, Chairman

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. NECROLOGY
Thomas Hawley Canfield
 1901-1957

Thomas Hawley Canfield, associate professor of poultry husbandry, passed away suddenly on Sunday, March 10, 1957, while attending church services. The news of his death saddened the hearts of his many friends among the students, staff, and faculty of the University, especially on the St. Paul Campus.

Professor Canfield was born on August 31, 1901, at Lake Park, Minnesota. In 1924 he received his B.S. degree from the University of Minnesota and became an assistant in the Poultry Department in 1928. From 1929 to 1936 he was employed in commercial hatchery and flock management work but returned to the University again as an instructor and to pursue graduate study. In 1938 he was granted the M.S. degree. He became assistant professor in 1944 and associate professor in 1945. During part of 1953 he served as acting head of the Poultry Department, and for the fall semester of 1955 he was a visiting professor at Pennsylvania State University.

His professional interest centered largely in teaching and working with undergraduate students. Professor Canfield's genial personality, his own enthusiasm for his work, and his ability to present subject matter in an interesting manner stimulated in his students a desire to learn and engendered a feeling of confidence that led so many of them to frequently seek his counsel. In recognition of his outstanding ability as a teacher, he received several citations. In 1952 he was 1 of 3 awarded the All-University Faculty Recognition for teaching. The Poultry Science Association honored him in 1955

FIVE—6737—SENATE DOCKET—JL

with its Teaching Prize, and last year the Minnesota Agricultural Education Club named him the recipient of its outstanding teacher award. In 1949 and again in 1956 he served as chairman of the teaching section at the annual meeting of the Poultry Science Association. He was an associate editor of *Poultry Science* during 1950-53.

In addition to his regular classroom activities, Professor Canfield served as adviser to undergraduate students majoring in poultry husbandry and as coach for the poultry judging teams, which won many honors in intercollegiate contests over the past 20 years. He also was responsible for the development of the Poultry Science Club and served as its faculty adviser since its inception in 1948. His research was concerned principally with problems in goose production and included studies on breeding, hatching, nutrition, and management. He worked closely with the goose producers in the state and was instrumental in organizing the Mid-West Goose Growers Association, which he served as secretary-treasurer. At the time of his death, he was also secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota Poultry Industry Council. For many years he played an active role in judging poultry shows and served as superintendent of the poultry section at the Minnesota State Fair.

Tom, as he was affectionately and respectfully known to students and associates alike, had a keen interest in all types of athletics and won his varsity "M" as third baseman on the Minnesota baseball team. His interest in sports continued through the years, and he was looked upon as one of the campus "authorities" on Minnesota athletics.

The University and the poultry industry have lost a valued friend in the passing of Professor Canfield. In the years ahead the memory of his devotion to teaching and serving his fellow men will long be an inspiration to those who were fortunate enough to be associated with him.

Surviving are his wife, Margaret, his daughter, Patricia, his father and mother, 1 brother, and 3 sisters.