

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1962

3:30 P.M.

MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

The membership of the Senate totals 172 including 132 elected members and 40 ex officio members (32 Administrative Committee and 8 Faculty Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the membership (87) must be present. Constitution changes require advanced publication and 115 affirmative votes. By-Law changes require 87 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of members present and voting.

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.

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

NOT FOR RELEASE PRIOR TO THE SENATE MEETING

Year 1961-62

No. 9

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA THE SENATE DOCKET

May 31, 1962

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

I. MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 1962
Reported for Action

II. MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 1962
Reported for Action

III. SENATE COMMITTEES FOR 1962-63

The President's nominations for Senate committees for 1962-63 will be on a supplemental docket to be distributed at the meeting.

IV. ELECTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SENATE COMMITTEES
Reported for Action

In accordance with Article III, Section 11 of the Senate By-Laws, the Faculty Consultative Committee nominates the following candidates for the Senate Committee on Committees (candidates listed in alphabetical order). Each person has indicated willingness to serve if elected.

Paul D. Boyer	William P. Martin
Warren B. Cheston	Gordon M. Mork
Henry J. Ehlers	Horace T. Morse
Eleanor S. Fenton	Raymond B. Nixon
Richard C. Jordan	Martin Steinmann, Jr.
Robert McClure	A. K. Wickesberg

Additional nominations, certified as available, may be made by the petition of 12 Senators, provided that the petition is in the hands of the Clerk of the Senate the day before the Senate meeting.

The election will be by secret ballot with six to be elected. The 2 receiving the highest number of votes shall serve for 3 years, the next 2 for 2 years, and the following 2 for 1 year.

Election ballots will be distributed at the meeting to be placed in ballot boxes as you leave. Election results will be announced in the Official Daily Bulletin and in the Senate *Minutes*.

V. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
Reported for Information

1. *University Budget for 1962-63.* The President, on April 11, 1962, gave a very brief review of the principles underlying the budget for the year 1962-63, some of which had been discussed earlier in the Administrative Committee. Few major changes were possible from the current budget because of the dearth of new funds. The income from tuition increases would be committed to student-related functions of the University. Certain faculty salary increase money was provided by the Legislature, and the allocation of this was considered, as were the principles and procedures to apply in providing Civil Service merit increases. Special budgetary allocations made to meet the 1961-62 enrollment increases would be carried forward, and certain faculty vacancies sacrificed to provide for the instruction of unexpected numbers of students would be restored. It was proposed to withhold a small sum of money from distribution to provide for further, anticipated over-all enrollment increases; otherwise the plan was essentially that of a status quo budget. In response to questions about early action on appointments, it was mentioned that Vice President Willey was working with the deans on problems of this type.

The President expected to discuss the general principles of the budget with the Regents in their meeting of April 13, and budgetary materials were to be sent to the colleges immediately after Board action was obtained. At the April 18, 1962, meeting of the Administrative Committee, Vice President Lunden distributed copies of the proposed budget plan which the Regents had approved, and commented on the items in detail. Discussion followed. There was extensive consideration of the use of overhead income from research contracts, new funds to provide supplies and equipment for the expected additional students, the small reserve for new staff to meet enrollment increases, a pattern for the distribution of allotments to colleges for academic salary increases, and a number of other budgetary factors.

Dean Morse described the difficult fiscal situation in which the General College finds itself, despite its low cost and particularly favorable contribution to University support. The President indicated that no new position money had been obtained for 1962-63, even following strong arguments based on expected student increases, but said that further conversations on budgetary needs would be conducted with individual deans. The Dean of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts commented on the budgetary plan and endorsed use of research income in the operating budget. Provost Darland described the growth of enrollment at the Duluth Campus through the last decade, especially since 1957, and referred to the increasing staff overload problem there. Flexibility in the provision of supplemental funds would be most important to the Duluth operation, he indicated.

The President commented on the enrollment projection and on the extent to which that figure, scaled down, had been used in arriving at the student forecast and estimate of tuition income used in the plan. Behind the budget plan, he said, is the prospect of even greater student loads and work demands than those provided for in this budget. Dean Lockhart noted a departure from the practice of earlier years which permitted application of marginal savings on staff appointments to the underwriting of salary increases going beyond those financed with newly allocated funds. He expressed hope for return to the former practice when stabilization in budgeting permits.

2. *Time of the June Commencement, 1962.* The Senate Committee on University Functions had recommended that the hour of the opening of the June 1962 Commencement be changed from 8 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. This would provide the extra time needed for a special presentation and for the awarding of honorary degrees without extending the Commencement beyond its usual closing time. Approval was given by a motion duly made, seconded, and voted.

3. *Classroom Scheduling for Effective Use of Facilities.* The members of the committee had reported to the University Schedule Committee an endorsed subcommittee report recommending means for achieving fuller utilization of instructional facilities through better scheduling of classes. Assistant Dean Roger B. Page, chairman of the subcommittee, commented that the proposal essentially called for a reaffirmation of the principles contained in the University Schedule Committee recommendation that was adopted by the Administrative Committee on April 4, 1956, and for approval of some added provisions needed to implement those principles. Mr. Vernon L. Ausen, room scheduling supervisor, pointed out that effective action

on better scheduling at the source of schedules in the college offices would keep decisions on these academic matters with the instructional units rather than allowing the availability of facilities to determine choices among course offerings and the hours for courses.

The discussion at first seemed to question whether the University would be well advised to proceed with the recommendations as speedily as possible or should act with some further reserve. That the hoped-for improvement had not been made seemed clear, as did the need for positive action. It was acknowledged that the plan may have arbitrary features and that it will pose problems for the scheduling of graduate courses where graduate students serve as teaching assistants. To be effective, University-wide compliance must be obtained, it was indicated.

It was moved, seconded, and voted to accept the report and recommendations as expressing the sense of the committee. The President then asked Mr. Ausen, working with the Schedule Committee or its several members, to contact the appropriate personnel in each college unit so as to implement the recommendations as policy established by the Administrative Committee.

The following recommendations were contained in the report:

(The first 4 regulations shall apply to courses of 150 enrollment and above *separately* from their application to classes below that enrollment. For example, a department could not satisfy regulation 2 by scheduling only small courses in the afternoon, including among its morning courses all of its large courses; it must schedule one-third of its large courses outside the morning. The word "course" is used to mean any class meetings which include the same students. Thus a class scheduled I MWF with 2 laboratory sections, I-II TTh and VII-VIII TTh [students choose 1], counts as 3 courses.)

1. Multi-sectioned courses in each department shall be scheduled so that no more than one-half the sections will meet in the mornings (I through IV MWF and MTWThF).

Exceptions to this for a given department may be made only if scheduling by the department's college is co-ordinated to accomplish the same effect on a college-wide basis. Even these exceptions are permissible only when Lower Division students are not thereby prevented from scheduling an acceptable total program outside the morning hours (as here defined).

2. Single section courses in each department shall be scheduled so that no more than two-thirds of them meet in the mornings (I through IV hour, MWF and MTWThF) by (1) offering some of them at other times regularly, (2) alternating morning and other scheduling in succeeding quarters for repeated courses, and (3) alternating morning and other scheduling in alternate years for 3-quarter sequences. Same exceptions possible as under 1 above.

3. Courses which meet in a general purpose classroom twice a week must be scheduled on TTh unless the University Room Scheduling Office can certify that there is an adequate use for the room on the day remaining in a MWF schedule.

4. During the mornings (I through IV hour) courses may not be scheduled in a manner which leaves a classroom unusable on other days of the usual sequence at the same hour (for example, courses may not be scheduled I MTW, or II MWF and IV F, or II M), unless, again, the University Room Scheduling Office is satisfied that the room can be used to reasonable capacity for the remaining days of the sequence (MWF) at that hour.

5. At the present time, these regulations need not apply to courses both scheduled in seminar rooms and intended primarily for graduate students (those numbered 200 and above and those numbered 100-199 if the predominant registration is graduate), but they should be applied upon certification by the University Room Scheduling Office that such application is necessary to utilize space efficiently.

6. These regulations are to apply to all departments, schools, and colleges which use general purpose classrooms scheduled by the University Room Scheduling Office, except for their scheduling of classes after the 8th hour and during the Summer Session.

7. Conflicts within a college for class space may be resolved by whatever review the college may prescribe. Conflicts between colleges are normally resolved by direct negotiation. The supervisor of room scheduling shall arbitrate differences not so resolved. On questions which involve broad policy, if arbitration has not been successful, appeal to higher administrative levels is possible.

8. These regulations, once endorsed by the proper authority, are to be considered mandatory, and exceptions are permissible only upon the approval of the supervisor of room scheduling.

One basic problem remains even if the above scheduling regulations are fully implemented, namely, which students are to take classes at those hours often considered by students to be undesirable. At the present time, the priority is on the basis of who registers first, and order of registration is either on a first come, first served basis, or on a randomly assigned basis, or, in one college, on a class basis. It is recommended that each college review its registration procedures to develop policies governing which students should register some or all of their work outside the I through IV MWF, M-F schedule. Very likely a first come, first served system is not the best. In order to provide for any desirable University-wide co-ordination of such procedures, colleges should report their plans to the University Schedule Committee (or a designated official or subgroup of it) by the middle of spring quarter.

4. *The 1962 Consolidated Fund Drive.* Mr. Sterling B. Garrison appeared before the committee on behalf of the planned 1962 Consolidated Fund Drive on the Minneapolis Campus, of which he is director, and introduced Dr. N L Gault, the associate director. Mr. Garrison spoke of the opportunities afforded by the drive for participation in a vital and active community enterprise and of the desirability that the University provide leadership through its support. He referred to the aid, especially of research, which accrues to the work of the University from the fund. He asked for evident interest on behalf of administrative officers and bespoke their co-operation in the appointment of captains and solicitors. The drive is to open the week of October 1, 1962.

5. *Recommendations on University Honors.* On April 11, and again on April 18, 1962, the Committee on University Honors, acting through its chairman, Dean Morse, moved the endorsement of candidates for the Outstanding Achievement Award. Approval was voted, subject to action of the Regents. The Honors Committee further recommended the award of an honorary degree and this, too, was seconded and voted, subject to Regents' action. Since there was some question about the designation of the particular degree, it was voted to recommend that this be the doctor of science degree.

6. *Administrative Committee Representation and Participation in the Senate.* Although the discussion of the participation of the Administrative Committee in the work of the Senate was to receive subsequent detailed attention, interim considerations were given in the meeting of April 11, 1962. There were brief reports relating to this matter, and information was made available on the way in which the Administrative Committee vote had gone on certain actions taken by the Senate. When this issue came before the committee on April 18, 1962, there were two suggestions of the manner and proportion in which members of the Administrative Committee might participate in the work of the Senate or the vote of that body. One of these proposals was that the full membership of the Administrative Committee should continue in *ex officio* but nonvoting membership in the Senate. The other indicated two patterns of representation for purposes of voting. Discussion dealt primarily with such matters as the desirable proportionate representation, the retention of rights which accrue to members of the Administrative Committee because of professorial rank, the service of the members of the Administrative Committee in the Senate, and the extent to which certain administrative officers ought to retain regular Senate membership. It was finally voted, with two dissenting votes recorded, as the judgment of the Administrative Committee that the members of this committee should serve as *ex officio* nonvoting members of the Senate and that their otherwise regular participation in the Senate should continue with the Senate's full knowledge that members of the Administrative Committee may not vote.

7. *Report of the Junior College Task Force.* In the meeting of April 11, 1962, Dean Morse gave a preliminary report from the Junior College Task Force. He reviewed the purpose of the study, prepared for Administrative Committee consideration, and the background of the problem investigated. In the continuation of the report at the May 9, 1962, meeting, Dean Morse discussed the growing need for additional college facilities in the seven-county area which contains the Twin Cities and described several different possibilities for development considered by his study group.

Attention was turned to many of the details of the report and to the background data. Discussion followed on both the subject matter and the uses of the report. It was moved, seconded, and voted to request consideration of the report by such other University committees as the Senate Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships.

8. *Services of the American Association on Emeriti.* The Academic Vice President circulates to colleges and departments, from time to time, lists of potential faculty members provided by the American Association of Emeriti, and Mr. Willey asked how useful these have been. The association is now establishing a membership plan in which the University had been asked to participate in the interest of continuing to receive the personnel lists. After discussion, it was decided that it may be desirable for the University to become a member of the Association for a year, while assessing the values that accrue from membership as against obtaining the lists on a subscription basis.

9. *Recommendations of University Scheduling Committee on Class Hour Schedule.* The all-University Schedule Committee had given special attention to the hourly class schedule which will be the most useful as west river area buildings come into operation. A subcommittee of that committee had made a study of the factors affecting students and faculty in scheduling classes on the west bank, beginning in the fall quarter of 1962. Through use of the computer facility in the School of Business, they had made an extensive investigation of the probable best scheduling of courses in the west bank area as against scheduling of them on the older, eastern area of the campus. Out of this study had come a report and a recommendation that, for the transitional 1962-63 academic year, west bank classes meet according to the present St. Paul Campus schedule (hour I at 8 a.m., hour II at 9 a.m., etc., with a 10-minute interval between classes). There were other recommendations in the report, among which were some relating to minimization of schedule conflicts and student travel time, the provision for faculty transportation across the river, and procedures for resolution of conflicts between day school and Extension Division evening schedules. The Schedule Committee had, after careful consideration of the issues, voted unanimously to endorse the recommendations and had transmitted them to the Administrative Committee for approval and implementation.

Speaking for the subcommittee of the Schedule Committee, Professor Keith Heller provided background information on the student scheduling and traffic situation expected next fall and described useful by-product results of the computer study; for example, about 700 students may take all their work west of the river. He called attention to the scope and underlying assumptions of the investigation, noted that the time schedule recommended appeared to be the best of several, and emphasized the need for yearly restudy of the situation as the west river area work increases. He recognized need for assistance to the faculty on matters of transportation and parking, especially in the immediate future.

Dean Grambsch reported discussions which had been conducted among faculty members of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts and asked for flexibility in scheduling for 1962-63, particularly under the new rules designed to promote effective use of facilities. A faculty work-lounge should be provided. He referred to traffic, transportation, and parking problems and to the difficulties that St. Paul Campus students may sometimes face in attending classes in the new area of the Minneapolis campus.

In discussion, it was emphasized that there will be many unavoidable interferences with regular instruction as the west river buildings are completed and brought into service and that every effort needs to be made to facilitate the necessary changes. During the time when the construction is largely incomplete, and until the ultimate bridge is built, efforts must be made to have the new facility well used, yet at the same time possibilities for modifications and some flexibility of scheduling should be provided for.

The President emphasized the value of maximum convenience to the faculty and gave assurance of administrative understanding and support to alleviate transitional difficulties.

It was voted to endorse the report and plan as the basis for general procedure and as setting the pattern for scheduling to become operative in the fall quarter 1962.

R. E. SUMMERS, Secretary

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

Proposed Changes in Constitution

The Senate on January 18, 1962 suggested that consideration be given to revising the *Constitution* to reduce administrative representation, allow nonmembers to speak and introduce motions but not vote, improve the method of selection of members, and lengthen their term of membership.

The following changes in the *Constitution* are recommended to accomplish these suggestions and to provide a procedure for initiating a referendum or plenary session. In the revision, the status of the President as a full voting member has also been clarified. The proposal as it affects the Administrative Committee has been endorsed by that group.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN CONSTITUTION

(Additions underlined. Deletions lined out.)

Article III. University Senate

1. Composition

The University Senate shall be composed of (a) elected representatives of the various institutes, colleges, schools of collegiate rank, and the Mayo Foundation, (b) the President of the University, and ~~(b) (c) the members of the University Administrative Committee and the Faculty Consultative Committee~~ who shall serve ~~ex officio as regular~~ as ex officio nonvoting members of the Senate. Each member of the Senate shall represent the faculty and the University as a whole.

4. Election of Senate Members

(a) The elected ~~members of~~ representatives of the faculties to the Senate shall be chosen by secret ballot by the faculties of the several institutes, colleges or schools of collegiate rank as follows: The regular members of each faculty who are professors ~~or~~ associate professors, or assistant professors (including research associates) shall jointly elect from their rank (professors ~~and~~ associate professors, and assistant professors) one Senate member for each 10 of their regular members or fraction of that number holding such rank. ~~The regular members of each faculty who are assistant professors (including research associates) or instructors (including research fellows) shall jointly elect from their ranks one Senate member for each 40 of their regular members or fraction of that number holding such rank.~~ The provisions hereof shall not apply to the election of the representatives of the Mayo Foundation.

(b) For the purpose of electing representatives to the Senate, the members of each faculty holding the rank of ~~instructor (including research fellow)~~ assistant professor (including research associate) and above shall be eligible to vote, providing that they hold regular appointment as defined in the *Regulations Concerning Academic Tenure* ~~(as revised and re-adopted by the Regents July 11, 1959)~~. The provisions hereof shall not apply to the election of the representatives of the Mayo Foundation.

(c) The Mayo Foundation shall be entitled to four elected representatives to be elected jointly by faculty members who are professors, associate professors, assistant professors (including research associates). The election shall be by secret ballot. ~~Three of them shall be elected by faculty members who are professors or associate professors, and one by faculty members who are assistant professors (including research associates) and instructors (including research fellows).~~ Each group shall elect as its representative persons belonging to it. ~~All representatives shall be elected by secret ballot.~~

(d) Members of the University Administrative Committee shall not be eligible for election to the Senate as a member of the faculties under (a) hereof.

~~(d)~~ (e) The Committee on Business and Rules shall determine the status and faculty membership of any academic staff member not regularly attached to an existing faculty for purposes of voting for members of and serving as a representative in the Senate.

~~(e)~~ (f) Annual elections to the Senate shall be held no later than the 20th day of October. Faculty members elected to the Senate shall serve for one year and/or until their successors shall be elected and qualified. They shall be eligible for re-election. Elections to the Senate shall be held every three years, no later than the 20th day of May. All members elected to the Senate shall serve for three years and until their successors shall be elected and qualified. Subject to the rules of individual institutes, colleges, or schools, Senate members shall be eligible for re-election.

7. Senate Meetings-Call-Quorum

The Senate shall hold regular meetings, at least twice in each quarter of the academic year, at a time and place determined by the President. Special meetings of the Senate may be held upon the call of the President or upon the written request of ten members of the Senate or of twenty voting members of the faculties. At any regular or special meeting of the Senate, a majority of the membership of the Senate shall constitute a quorum. ~~Faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members~~ All members of the faculty who hold regular appointment as defined in the *Regulations Concerning Academic Tenure* 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, and shall be entitled to speak on agenda matters and to offer motions for Senate action on agenda matters. Non-Senate members shall not be entitled to vote.~~

8. Referendum

Within three weeks of final action on any matter by the Senate, the matter may be referred to the faculties for vote approving or disapproving the Senate action. Such referendum shall take place (a) if so directed by the Senate at the time of acting upon the matter, or (b) if requested by a petition signed by one hundred faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members, and delivered to the President within one week of the Senate meeting at which the action took place. In such referendum, all faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members shall have one vote. The Clerk of the Senate shall mail ballots to the faculties within three weeks of the Senate action. Ballots shall be returned not later than one week thereafter. Ballots shall contain a short and concise statement of the issue to be voted upon, a statement of the Senate action on the matter, and a place for a vote approving or disapproving the Senate action. The Senate action shall be considered approved unless fifty per cent of the members eligible to vote return ballots and the vote received results in a majority disapproval. In lieu of the foregoing procedure, the President, within three days of the Senate action or within three days of receipt of a referendum petition, may set a meeting for all faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members to attend, discuss the matter, and vote on approving or disapproving the Senate action. The Senate action will be considered approved unless the attendance at such meeting is fifty per cent of the faculty members eligible to vote and the vote at the meeting results in a majority disapproval. This section, pertaining to referendum, shall not apply to amendments to the University Senate Constitution.

ELIO D. MONACHESI, Chairman

(There will be a pause in the proceedings to permit the seating of the nonfaculty members of committees for the discussion of their reports.)

VII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
Reported for Information

Trimester and Related Proposals for the Reorganization
of the Academic Calendar

For purposes of discussion, the trimester plan is understood to mean a series of three terms of approximately equal length, running from September through December, January through April, and May through August, with a vacation period of roughly 2 weeks at the end of each term.

The committee has examined the merits of this system over a 2-year period, in which materials have been assembled, circulated, and discussed. The Bureau of Institutional Research assisted in this work by preparing a summary of available materials in the spring of 1961, as reported to the Senate at the meeting of June 1, 1961. (See page 110, *Minutes*, Year 1960-61, No. 7.) Additional materials have been incorporated into this survey and a revised review of trimester programs as prepared by the Bureau of Institutional Research is appended to and made a part of this report.

After considering the merits and demerits of a trimester program and of similar programs now operating at other institutions, it is the committee's opinion that the trimester form of calendar does not offer net advantages that outweigh its disadvantages at Minnesota.

This conclusion rests in good part on the fact that the University of Minnesota is now on a quarter system. If the University was presently on a semester system, the trimester plan of alternate operation would be worth serious consideration. Having made the transition to a quarter system, and with some progress being made in accommodating the dislocations and time wastages involved in registrations, examination periods, quarter breaks, and the like, there does not seem to be any compelling advantage that would result from a shift to a trimester basis of operation.

There are in addition several specific points that would argue against the trimester system:

Item 1: The present Summer Session program at the University of Minnesota is growing and deserving of further support. The current two 5-week sessions were tailored in part to meet the needs of primary and secondary school teachers who form about one-third of the summer student population. Primary and secondary school teachers seeking summer school instruction might be unwilling to devote the entire summer to it, as would be the case under a trimester system of operation. A separate program of instruction would probably be required for them. As undergraduate student enrollment increases, we may experience a decline in the proportion of primary and secondary school teachers in the summer school. With this in mind the committee feels that serious consideration should be given to the development of a full fourth quarter, building upon the base of the existing summer school. It would seem that in this direction the University would find its greatest opportunity for improved instruction and fuller utilization of the physical plant.

Item 2: While the flow of students through the physical plant might be increased by a trimester plan of operation it is not clear that this would result in a reduction in per-student-hour instruction costs. A nearly complete complement of faculty and staff would be needed for the summer period, May through August, if any improved utilization of buildings is to be achieved. Unless summer term enrollments were at levels comparable to the fall and winter terms, this could result in a relatively higher cost per-student-hour of instruction in the summer term. A reduction in enrollment or in class size typically does not permit a proportionate reduction in instructional costs.

Item 3: Approximately two-thirds of the students presently enrolled at the University of Minnesota work for a part of the cost of their support while going to college. While the timing of access to available job markets might be improved by a trimester system of operation, the student seeking full-time summer work would be out of school from early May through August. This could result in a lengthening of the time required to obtain a degree, for those students who must work.

Item 4: Student representatives who have been consulted in the course of the committee's deliberations have pointed to the fact that a valuable aspect of undergraduate college experience lies in the opportunity to meet people, attend concerts, participate in extracurricular campus activities, and the like. Reducing the elapsed time the student is in college and scheduling more of it in the summer months cuts short the opportunities to attend symphony concerts, sporting events, and to sit in on extracurricular lectures, convocations, and all of the similar nonclassroom aspects of a college education. To some students this foreshortening of an opportunity to participate in the extracurricular life of the campus would be a distinct loss. This seems likely to be the case with the better students and with those students more alert to a wide range of cultural, scientific, and intellectual pursuits. It is possible to devote too much attention to the speed with which the student is forced through the undergraduate curriculum, although the "student in a hurry" might find it to his advantage. This could be true with preprofessional training programs, with older students, or with those whose professional objectives are sharply defined when they enter the University. A significant part of the undergraduate student body apparently would not find the speeded-up aspect of the trimester system to their liking.

In view of prospective increases in enrollment, the committee feels that the experiences of other schools with the trimester calendar should be kept under review. The summary that follows includes a list of references that are currently available for faculty consultation in the Bureau of Institutional Research.

A Review of Materials Related to a Possible Calendar Revision at the University of Minnesota

(Prepared by Robert L. Lathrop, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota)

The following memorandum presents, in outline form, a summary of the discussions at several institutions and collegiate organizations which have considered the merits and demerits of a variety of calendar revisions. A list of the references to these discussions is attached.

I. Reasons Given for Interest in Calendar Change:

- A. Acceleration of students through degree programs
- B. Curricular enrichment
- C. Accommodation of increasing enrollment with existing or moderately expanded physical plants
- D. Increased economy through more extensive use of facilities
- E. Opportunity for re-evaluation of existing programs and course offerings

Comment: Although all of these reasons have been suggested as motives for initiating a calendar change, the opportunity afforded for program re-evaluation seems the most immediate effect. The impact of calendar changes on the other four reasons is still too recent to be evaluated. One motivation not mentioned in this list, but alluded to by the University of Pittsburgh, was the national attention gained by a bold calendar change.

II. Calendar Arrangements Proposed by Various Institutions:

- A. Two semesters plus 1 or 2 summer sessions
- B. Three quarters plus 1 or 2 summer sessions
- C. Three terms with no summer program
- D. Three trimester terms, with or without concurrent summer program
- E. Four quarter terms, with or without concurrent summer program
- F. Six 8-week terms
- G. Four 9-week terms
- H. Miscellaneous arrangements

Comment: With very little searching it was possible to identify almost a dozen distinct proposals for calendar revision. It seems reasonable to presume that a more extended search would uncover several more. As some of the more thoughtful authors suggest, the particular division of the calendar is less important than the educational thinking which precedes and follows it, and many of the desired outcomes are possible under a variety of calendar arrangements. The unique advantages of one calendar division over another are often either untested or only submitted to subjective evaluation. Much of what is referred to as increased student interest or improved student performance may fade away as the novelty of a new calendar passes. It is also very difficult to know the degree to which such reports tap a representative cross-section of student and faculty opinion.

III. Possible Questions or Problems Resulting from Calendar Changes:

- A. Drop in faculty or student morale
- B. Difficult curriculum revisions
- C. Difficulty in redefining credit unit
 1. Problems with transfer students
 2. Establishment of degree requirements
- D. Scheduling problems
 1. Classes
 2. Examinations
 3. Pre-registration
- E. Articulation problems
 1. With other university calendars
 2. With secondary school calendars
 3. With graduate and professional school calendars
- F. Vacation and special holiday scheduling
- G. Problems with commencements and special events
- H. Tuition and fee changes
- I. Accreditation by professional and licensing agencies
- J. Implications for extracurricular activities
- K. Selection of calendar dates
- L. Revision of University publications and forms
- M. Student and faculty fatigue with year-round calendar
- N. Lowering of student quality (through uncommon enrollment periods)
- O. Problems of physical plant maintenance
- P. Problems of residence scheduling
- Q. Problems of student employment and student finances
- R. Infringement of faculty study and research
- S. Problems of salary adjustment
- T. Immediate need of increased faculty and accompanying facilities
- U. Problems of library utilization
- V. Problems of intercollegiate athletic eligibility

Comment: Obviously the concerns listed here constitute only a partial listing of possible problems which could arise from a calendar change, for virtually all phases of University operations would, in some way, be affected. Although certain problems have presented greater difficulties than others in institutions where calendar changes have been made, most have been worked out very smoothly where they have been anticipated and where change has been preceded by careful planning. The areas which may warrant particular attention by this Committee in their early deliberations are: (B) curriculum revision, (E) articulation problems, (I) accreditation problems, (Q) problems of student employment and finance, (S) problems of salary adjustment, and (T) immediate increase in need for faculty and facilities.

IV. Present State of Calendar in Other Institutions:

- A. Big Ten
 1. Illinois Semester (and quarter at Chicago professional schools)
 2. Indiana Semester
 3. Iowa Semester
 4. Michigan Semester (expects to be on trimester by Fall 1965, Dearborn Center presently on trimester)
 5. Michigan State Quarter (and trimester at Oakland Center)
 6. Minnesota Quarter (and semester in law and evening school)
 7. Northwestern Quarter (and semester in law and evening school)
 8. Ohio State Semester
 9. Purdue Semester
 10. Wisconsin Semester

- B. Other midwest schools of importance
10 semester, 3 quarter; 1 institution will shift in 1962 from 2 semesters to a 4-quarter calendar
- C. Eastern schools (including Ivy League institutions)
24 semester, none quarter; 1 institution is moving to a transitional calendar preparatory to trimester operation
- D. Who's Who schools (25 major institutions, including the University of Minnesota)
19 semester, 6 quarter

Comment: At the present time the 2-semester (plus summer session) is by far the most common university or college calendar. More than half of the Big Ten schools are on semester programs, virtually all prominent Eastern schools follow a semester calendar and, of the 25 most prominent institutions in the country, over three-fourths follow the 2-semester plan.

V. Summary Comments

At the present time a number of people are following with great interest the progress of the calendar experiments by such institutions as the University of Pittsburgh. Because of the recency with which these programs have been adopted, it is still too soon to know what their ultimate impact on the enrollment and financial pictures will be.

It seems that within broad limits, the calendar changes enacted have had few insurmountable problems and, in general, have resulted in only insignificant disruptions in continuing programs. It is important to note, however, that even institutions such as Pittsburgh have been slow to adopt the trimester program "across the board" and still allow at least one of their professional schools to remain on a semester calendar. The implication of this fact for Minnesota would seem to suggest that some experimentation with the academic calendar is possible on a restricted basis without committing the University to a program whose implications are as yet unclear.

In considering a revision of the University calendar it may be helpful to keep two points in mind. First, calendar change may have (although not necessarily so) as a secondary outcome, constructive restudy of an institution's curriculum and program. Important as this reassessment may be, it has not generally been acknowledged as sufficient basis for a major calendar revision. Second, there has been some tendency to equate the trimester with more extended use of existing facilities. Although the trimester has evolved quiet naturally from institutions previously operating on a semester calendar, it is clearly only one of many alternatives for accomplishing this generally accepted objective. It has been suggested by a number of sources that the change from 2-semester to 3-semester (trimester) operation involves somewhat different problems than would be encountered in a change from 3 quarters to 3 trimesters.

The matter of summer school programs for inservice teachers has universally been recognized as a separate issue from general calendar revision and institutions on "year round" calendars usually parallel their summer terms with an abbreviated, concurrent summer session offering for teachers.

In conclusion, there probably has been no time in history when (proportionately) as many institutions of higher education have been studying their calendar arrangements with a view toward more effective use of their facilities as the present. The wide variety of changes adopted or proposed for accomplishing this end, however, suggests that objectives more specific than those of increased efficiency must be considered in any evaluation of the feasibility of various alternatives.

References

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, *The University Calendar*, 1961 (printed, 56 pages with bibliography).
 Association for Higher Education, *Summary Report on the Discussion Groups*, March 1961 (Thermofax excerpt, 1 page).
 Carleton College, *The Voice of the Carleton Alumni*, January 1961 (printed, 5 pages).
 North Carolina State College, *Compact Unit for Better Education: A Proposal for the More Effective Scheduling of the Academic Year*, February 1961 (mimeographed, 12 pages).
 Pettengill, T. E., *Report on Travel to Association for Higher Education Meeting*, March 1961 (Thermofax, 2 pages; attached, copy of a paper by A. C. Rankin titled, "The Trimester Plan of the University of Pittsburgh").
 University of Michigan, *Report of the University Calendar Study Committee of the University of Michigan*, June 1958 (printed, 80 pages with references).
 University of Michigan, *Report, Commission on Year-Round Integrated Education*, May 1961 (mimeographed, 90 pages with references).
 University of Michigan, *Calendar Study Begins* (ditto excerpt, 2 pages, from Michigan Alumnus, April 1961, page 239).
 University of Minnesota, *Interim Report of the Sub-Committee Studying the Semester vs. the Quarter System*, January 1953 (mimeographed, 12 pages).
 University of Minnesota, *Final Report of the Sub-Committee Studying the Semester vs. Quarter System*, June 1953 (mimeographed, 8 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, *Report of Committee on a Trimester Calendar*, April 1958 (mimeographed, 28 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, *Conference on the Trimester Calendar*, June 1960 (mimeographed, 17 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, *Proceedings of the Trimester Conference, University of Pittsburgh*, June 15, 1960 (mimeographed, 11 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, *Proceedings of the Conference on Year 'Round Education*, March 9, 1961 (mimeographed, 12 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, *Progress Report on Year 'Round Education*, Vol. I, No. 1, 1960 (mimeographed, 4 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, *Progress Report on Year 'Round Education*, Vol. I, No. 2, 1960 (mimeographed, 6 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, *Progress Report on Year 'Round Education*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1961 (mimeographed, 4 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, *Progress Report on Year 'Round Education*, Vol. III, No. 1, 1962 (mimeographed, 7 pages).
 University of Pittsburgh, Office of Institutional Planning, *Characteristics and Attitudes of Students Attending the University of Pittsburgh Under the Trimester Calendar*, University of Pittsburgh, 1961 (mimeographed, 63 pages).

PHILIP M. RAUP, Chairman

VIII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Reported for Information

1. *Approved Schedule for Basketball 1962-63*

December 1	Wake Forest College
December 3	Kansas State University
December 14	Bradley University
December 15	De Paul University—at Chicago, Ill.
December 18	Memphis State University—at Memphis, Tenn.
December 20	Southern Methodist University—at Dallas, Tex.
December 22	Arizona State University—at Tempe, Ariz.
December 27	Wichita University—at Wichita, Kan.
December 31	University of Houston
January 5	Ohio State University—at Columbus, Ohio
January 12	State University of Iowa
January 14	University of Michigan—at Ann Arbor, Mich.
January 19	Purdue University—at Lafayette, Ind.
January 26	Michigan State University
February 2	University of Wisconsin—at Madison, Wis.
February 9	Purdue University
February 11	Indiana University—at Bloomington, Ind.
February 16	Michigan State University—at East Lansing, Mich.
February 18	University of Wisconsin
February 23	Northwestern University—at Evanston, Ill.
February 25	University of Illinois
March 2	Indiana University
March 4	Ohio State University

2. *Grade Point Standards for Eligibility*

On November 2, 1961, during discussion of this committee's report in the University Senate, a request was made that the committee report to the Senate (1) the conference institutions, if any, which have scholastic requirements for eligibility (and financial aid) which are above the minimums specified by conference rules, and (2) what additional requirements might be appropriate for Minnesota. In response the committee reports:

1. Present conference rules provide that a student is not eligible for intercollegiate athletics unless he is making normal quantitative progress toward completion of the scholastic credit requirements for his degree and also has a satisfactory cumulative grade average.

a. Under the rules a student is not making "normal quantitative progress" unless he carries and earns each year at least the minimum number of credits that will qualify for "full work" under University requirements. (Minnesota has certified that its minimum full-work requirement is 36 credits per year and 12 credits per quarter.)

b. The minimum cumulative grade point levels for a "satisfactory" average under the conference eligibility rules (which minimums are also required at Minnesota) are 1.7 for the first (sophomore) year of competition; 1.8 for a second year of competition and for juniors who have not had previous competition; 1.9 for a third year of competition and for seniors who had only 1 year or no previous competition.

c. No freshman whose predicted first-year grade point average, on the basis of approved prediction tables, is below 1.7 is permitted to participate in organized freshman or varsity practice or to receive individual equipment or coaching, nor is he eligible to receive financial aid.

2. In response to our inquiry to all members of the conference . . .

a. Only one institution, the University of Michigan, reported a grade point requirement of 2.0 for eligibility and for all extracurricular activities throughout the institution; this is higher than the conference minimums referred to above.

b. Several institutions, including Minnesota, reported that individual schools or segments have grade point requirements that admission and/or retention which exceed conference minimums for eligibility. Thus student-athletes may be and have been excluded or dropped from certain schools of member institutions, and thereby become ineligible even though their cumulative grade point averages were above conference minimums.

With the exceptions referred to, the scholastic standards for eligibility appear to be quite uniform throughout the conference, keeping in mind that there are no doubt differences in grading practices and standards between and also within institutions.

3. The committee believes that at the present time additional or increased scholastic requirements for athletic eligibility are not necessary or appropriate unless required of all students for all extracurricular activities. This conclusion is based on the following considerations:

- a. On three previous occasions (December 18, 1930, October 19, 1933, February 16, 1939) the Senate has approved recommendations of its Committees on Student Work and on Student Affairs that 12 regular credit hours per quarter constitutes a minimum full program of work. By action of the Board of Regents a student registered for 12 credits must pay full registration fees. For many student-athletes who do not receive financial aid but are in part or wholly self-supporting, a mandatory load of more than 12 credits per quarter would constitute a real hardship. Also the committee is informed by the University recorder that about one-half of all students earning 4-year degrees at this University do not complete their work within 4 calendar years.
- b. In December 1961, a specific minimum grade point requirement for athletic eligibility of sophomores became effective for the first time. This new requirement will tend to bring about greater selectivity toward men with higher scholastic potential and promise among prospective student-athletes who are recruited, subsidized, or otherwise encouraged to enroll. In turn, this may result in higher scholastic achievement of student-athletes throughout their residence in school. Experience should demonstrate the effects of the new requirement for sophomores, over a period of time, before further modifications are implemented, at Minnesota or for the whole conference. Over the years, Minnesota has been one of the principal advocates for establishment of a grade point requirement to govern eligibility of sophomores. Whether the newly instituted requirement is realistic and fair remains to be seen. We now believe that it is.
- c. As shown in the following table, for which the committee is indebted to the University recorder, a sophomore who has attained only the required conference minimum grade point average of 1.7 at the end of his freshman year will still be in the upper two-thirds of men in his class (except in the College of Education). A large proportion of all sophomore men students in 1960-61 had a cumulative grade point average of less than 2 at the end of their freshman year.

Grade Data for Men, University of Minnesota, 1960-61

Class and College	Grade Points					
	Average	Median	1.7 as %ile*	1.8 as %ile	1.9 as %ile	2.0 as %ile
Freshman Men						
AFHE	2.029	2.000	39	44	47	50
Education	2.015	2.200	22	27	30	38
IT	2.070	2.000	34	38	42	50
SLA	2.030	2.000	35	39	42	50
General College	2.003	2.000	32	35	37	50
Sophomore Men						
AFHE	2.289	2.250		28	31	36
Education	2.397	2.467		16	18	24
IT	2.279	2.176		32	35	40
SLA	2.301	2.312		25	27	33
General College	2.169	2.181		25	27	37
Junior Men						
AFHE	2.566	2.500			16	21
Education	2.618	2.545			12	18
IT	2.312	2.312			26	27
SLA	2.511	2.428			19	26

* On a scale of 1 (lowest) to 100 (highest).

The table of grade data for men also serves as a basis for estimating what the effect of the higher requirements would be on the incidence of disqualifying sophomores, juniors, and seniors, respectively, from intercollegiate competition.

In this context it is important that as a consequence of the progressively increased cumulative grade point requirements for second and third years of competition, students whose average at the end of the freshman or sophomore years was at or near the required conference minimum, to become eligible for further competition must make later grade point averages which are substantially above the required minimums.

- d. Students who through their first 3 years of residence have achieved the minimum cumulative grade point averages required for eligibility, can readily reach, as seniors, the over-all cumulative grade point average required to qualify for graduation, one measure of successful completion of a college career.

Your committee believes that so long as student-athletes are required to make steady, regular quantitative and qualitative progress such that they can qualify for their degrees, in substantially the same period as their fellow-students, no additional scholastic requirements for eligibility should be imposed.

M. O. SCHULTZE, Chairman

(There will be a pause in the proceedings to permit the withdrawal of nonfaculty committee members.)

IX. REPORT OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

The Judicial Committee of the Senate is happy to report that there have been no instances during the past year of removal of a member of the faculty for cause, nor any requests by members of the faculty for a hearing before the committee on allegation of violations of the *Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure*. Therefore the committee has had no occasion to meet. The chairman of the committee has participated, as required by Section 7 of the Regulations, in 3 routine decisions to extend nontenure appointments of instructors beyond the usual maximum of 7 years.

C. H. McLAUGHLIN, Chairman

X. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY GENERAL EXTENSION

1. Reported for Action

1. On December 13, 1923 the Senate adopted the following regulation regarding the fulfillment of residence requirements in extension courses for the bachelor's degree:

Students who complete extension credit courses in extension classes shall be held to have satisfied, to the extent of those courses, the residence requirements of the University for obtaining a bachelor's degree.

It is now proposed that this regulation be amended to read as follows: Students who complete *degree* credit courses in extension classes shall be held to have satisfied, to the extent of those courses, the residence requirements of the University for obtaining a bachelor's degree.

2. It is proposed that the following regulation, passed by the Senate on February 24, 1924, be rescinded:

Voted as the sense of the University Senate that the action of December 13, 1923, with reference to the acceptance of extension class work as satisfying residence requirements, should be interpreted as applying only to the Twin Cities and Duluth.

2. Reported for Information

Summary of Report and Recommendations on Cooperation Among Extension Services of the State's Institutions of Higher Education

Proposed Co-ordinating Council for Extension Services in Minnesota

The proposals for comprehensive co-ordination among institutions of higher learning in the state of Minnesota are vast and complex in their implications. The development of the proposals may require lengthy and arduous sessions of negotiation and planning over a considerable period of time.

It is believed that in the extension and adult education areas the current operations of the various types of educational institutions have been moving forward with an increasing possibility of duplication of services. However, with co-ordinated planning, there would be opportunities for each institution to carry on its work in those areas where its competence is sure and its facilities the best available. Moreover, such developments are particularly desirable when the needs of the state dictate further expansion in adult education but resources to meet the increasing demands are restricted. In fact, an informal co-ordinating council for statewide extension activities might well act as an experimental device, and the extension area as a proving ground, for the far more elaborate system of joint operation contemplated by the Liaison Committee.

Statement on the University's Role in State Extension Activities

As a result of its deliberations, the committee offers the following guidelines in the development of the University's role in adult education or extension activities in the state:

1. There is a definite need for the expansion of existing and the development of new University extension services to outstate communities and individuals.
2. Such services need not conflict; indeed, they should be planned so as not to conflict with those services which are being or can adequately be performed by other of the state's institutions of higher education.
3. Even with the most judicious use of present resources and the full co-operation of other University units, the General Extension Division of the University can meet the state's needs in adult education or general extension activities only to a limited degree. To achieve any truly appreciable fulfillment of these needs, additional personnel, increased operating funds, and/or risk or venture capital is required.
4. Departments of the University have expressed demonstrated needs for extension offerings and, for example, are prepared to develop new and additional programs, resources permitting, in the following areas: business administration, industrial and labor relations, social work, general education, agricultural education, and certain areas of the liberal arts.
5. In order to determine those areas of service most suitable for the University's endeavors and to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, it is most important that some form of co-ordinating council for the development of extension activities be established among the institutions represented by the Liaison Committee on Higher Education in Minnesota. It is suggested that, if feasible, this council should also include representation from the private colleges of the state.
6. As determinations are made of the needs of the state in co-ordinated extension efforts, exhaustive study should be made of the extent to which the University can and should systematically engage its resources at various specified levels of financial support. Such a study, or studies, should be the joint responsibility of the Senate Committees on Education, Institutional Relationships and University General Extension and the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.

SHERWOOD O. BERG, Chairman

XI. NEW BUSINESS

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

DOCKET SUPPLEMENT - MAY 31, 1962

I. SENATE COMMITTEES FOR 1962-63

Reported for Action

The following Senate committees have been named by the President, subject to the approval of the University Senate, effective July 1, 1962:

Audio-Visual Aids: Huntington Miller (chairman), Robert J. Ames, C. Luverne Carlson, Norman J. DeWitt, Allen Downs, George D. Freier, Wesley J. F. Grabow, Ralph H. Hopp, Howard F. Koeper, George H. McCune, Milo J. Peterson, Raymond G. Price, Hubert H. Serr, Robert F. Spenser, Donald R. Torbert, Tracy F. Tyler.

Business and Rules: Elio D. Monachesi (chairman), Harold W. Chase, James L. Hetland, Jr., William P. Martin, True E. Pettengill.

Education: E. Adamson Hoebel (chairman), Carl A. Auerbach, Cyrus P. Barnum, Ruth E. Eckert, Stuart W. Fenton, Alexander C. Hodson, Robert J. Holloway, Richard C. Jordan, Gardner Lindzey, Merrill P. Rassweiler, Arthur E. Smith (Duluth), Donald K. Smith, John E. Stecklein--Students: Irwin Gubman, Gary Orfield.

Faculty Welfare: C. Arthur Williams, Jr. (chairman), Robert C. Brasted, Gertrude A. Esteros, Robert L. Heller (Duluth), Reynold A. Jensen, William A. McDonald, J. Russell Nelson, Willard L. Thompson.

Institutional Relationships: Robert J. Keller (chairman), Rodney A. Briggs (Morris), James I. Brown, Paul A. Cartwright, Norman J. DeWitt, Eleanor S. Fenton, John A. Goodding, Robert T. Holt, Theodore E. Kellogg, Jack C. Merwin, Norman W. Moen, Gerhard E. von Glahn (Duluth), Stanley J. Wenberg, Bob G. Woods--Students: Louise Blair, Carol Streufert.

Institutional Research: Philip M. Raup (chairman), John A. Buttrick, Thomas W. Chamberlin (Duluth), Robert J. Keller, Keith N. McFarland, Paul R. O'Connor, Sheldon C. Reed, Robert Edward Summers, E. Paul Torrance (ex-officio), Maurice B. Visscher, Malcolm M. Willey, E. W. Ziebarth--Students: Gary Filerman, Fritz Herrmann, Sara Streich.

Intercollegiate Athletics: Alfred L. Vaughan (chairman), Ike Armstrong, Raymond W. Darland (Duluth), Willis E. Dugan, E. Adamson Hoebel, Laurence R. Lunden (ex-officio), William E. Parham, Max O. Schultze (faculty representative), Robert Edward Summers, John H. Williams--Students: Richard J. O'Laughlin, Orville F. Peterson--Alumni: 2 to be named.

Judicial: Charles H. McLaughlin (chairman), Alfred L. Harvey, James L. Hetland, Jr., E. Fred Koller, Walter M. Lauer.

Library: Gaylord W. Anderson (chairman), Robert H. Beck, Clarke A. Chambers, Warren B. Cheston, A. Orville Dahl, Eugene C. Mather, Samuel H. Monk, Lloyd L. Smith, Jr., Edward B. Stanford, John G. Turnbull.

Reserve Officer Training Corps: Rodney C. Loehr (chairman), Carl A. Auerbach, Steve S. Barich, Harold W. Chase, John J. Cound, William T. Harris, Jr., Warren E. Ibele, Arthur L. Johnson, Arthur J.

mBm
D65

ARCKWES

Larsen (Duluth), Benjamin E. Lippincott, George H. McCune, Keith N. McFarland, Morris E. Nicholson, Roger B. Page, Harold P. Strom, Gerhard H. Weiss--Students: Joseph Fischenich, 2 to be appointed--Alumni: 2 to be named.

Student Affairs: Edwin Emery (chairman), Paul H. Cashman, David Cooperman, Norman J. DeWitt, John Forster, James L. Gibbs, Jr., Armin E. Grams, Walter Graves, ~~David L. LaRango, Clarence B. MacLellan,~~ George L. Shapiro--Students: John Austin, Margie Crump, Judy Erskin, Judy Frost, Jim Johnson, John Kronholm, Todd Lefko, Gordy Mork, Marion Oare, Norman Uphoff, Sue Ward, Andre Zdrasil, 2 to be appointed ex-officio--Alumni: 2 to be named.

Student Scholastic Standing: Roger B. Page (chairman), Ralph F. Berdie, Francis M. Boddy, Eleanor S. Fenton, N. L. Gault, Jr., Charles J. Glotzbach, John A. Goodding, Keith R. Heller, Mellor R. Holland, L. A. King, Cecil H. Meyers, Charles V. Netz, True E. Pettengill, Mabel K. Powers, Stephen B. Scallen, W. Donald Spring (Morris), Frank Verbrugge, Theodore E. Kellogg (non-voting secretary)--Students: Janice Olsen, Jane Widseth.

University Functions: William L. Nunn (chairman), Cyrus P. Barnum, Jr., W. Donald Beatty, Frederick E. Berger, Robert J. Elliott, Wesley J. Grabow, Edwin L. Haislet, Ralph L. Kitchell, James S. Lombard, Truman R. Nodland, Paul M. Oberg, Louise A. Stedman, Stewart C. Thomson, Edmund G. Williamson, E. W. Ziebarth--Students: Brad Gran, Bill Hosfield, John Pavlik.

University General Extension: Sherwood O. Berg (chairman), Paul A. Cartwright, Harold W. Chase, Willis E. Dugan, Herbert G. Heneman, Jr., J. M. Nolte (ex-officio), William L. Nunn, Luther J. Pickrel, W. Albert Sullivan, Jr., Stanley J. Wenberg, James H. Werntz, Jr., E. W. Ziebarth.

University Printing and Publications: Harold B. Swanson (chairman), John Ervin, Jr., Ralph H. Hopp, Laurence R. Lunden, William L. Nunn, True E. Pettengill, Harold W. Wilson--Students: Patricia Anderson, Sara Fisher.

II. REPORT OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Action

In the November 1962 general election there will be presented to the voters of Minnesota Amendment No. 2 which provides for removal of the present State debt limit of \$250,000. This is a particularly urgent matter for the University because, until the Constitution is amended in this regard, there can be no further State building programs. Should the Amendment No. 2 fail to pass in the next general election, an amendment of the Constitution cannot again be considered by the voters of the State until the general election in November 1964. With the critical space conditions that already exist at the University and the very large enrollment increases anticipated in the next few years, further delay in the building program will have disastrous effects on the University's capacity to carry out its educational, scholarly, scientific, and service functions. Failure to vote at all on an amendment counts exactly the same as a "no" vote.

Because of the vital significance of passage of Amendment No. 2 to the on-going program of the University and recognizing the effect of

failure to vote, the Faculty Consultative Committee recommends (1) that the University Senate record its support for Amendment No. 2, (2) that all staff members of the University be urged to vote at the general election in November 1962, bearing in mind that failure to vote is the equivalent of a "no" vote, and (3) that each staff member of the University inform his family and acquaintances of the importance of Amendment No. 2.

W. M. Myers, Chairman